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Where these Guidelines fit in the Standard
The DCED Standard specifies seven elements of a successful results measurement system. This guide covers the first part of the third element; measuring changes in indicators. It accompanies a ‘Practical Guideline for Conducting Research’. For guidance on the second part of the third element (Estimating attributable change), and the other six elements of the Standard, visit the DCED website, or click on the links below:

1) Articulating the results chain
2) Defining indicators of change
3) Measuring attributable change
4) Capturing wider change in the system or market
5) Tracking costs and impact
6) Reporting results
7) Managing the system for results measurement

How to use these Guidelines
These guidelines are for programmes implementing the DCED Standard for Results Measurement in Private Sector Development. The DCED Standard provides a practical framework for programmes to monitor their progress towards their objectives, enabling them to better measure, manage and demonstrate results.

The Standard specifies control points, which programmes should follow while measuring changes in indicators. Each control point is broken into compliance criteria, which indicate whether the control points are met or not. For each control point, this guide provides additional advice explaining what they mean, and how to comply. It also links to further guidance and resources.

Some of the control points are required for compliance with the Standard (highlighted below with ‘Must’) while others are recommended, but not required. Some compliance criteria are only applicable to programmes which have been operational for over a year, and these are marked ‘Use’.

Use these guidelines to better understand what the DCED Standard requires, and how to achieve it. By doing so, you will strengthen the quality of your results measurement system, and be better able to measure, manage, and demonstrate your results.

These guidelines are a work in progress, and we hope to update them in future. If you have any suggestions or contributions, please email Admin@Enterprise-Development.org
Measuring Changes in Indicators

Measuring change in indicators enables programmes to monitor their progress, report on successes, and improve less effective areas. It also checks that the logic in the results chain is valid, enabling programmes to select the correct strategy to achieve their desired impact.

For example, the results chain on the right assumes that, if the road is paved between the market and the village, villagers will sell more produce. To test this logic, the project should measure the amount of produce sold at the village. If this does not increase following the completion of the road, the logic appears flawed; the lack of a road was not the main factor preventing villagers from selling their produce. This knowledge allows the programme to develop other interventions that better support the village economy.

These guidelines discusses baselines, results measurement plans, and qualitative information. They accompany separate guidelines for conducting research, and further guidelines on how to select an appropriate sample size for quantitative surveys.

Control Point 3.1: Baseline information on all key indicators is collected. (Must)

Compliance Criteria:

- Plans to collect baseline information for each intervention results chain, covering market actors and beneficiaries, exist
- The plan to collect baseline information is thorough, realistic, timely and in accordance with good research practice
- Baseline information for each intervention results chain, covering market actors and beneficiaries, has been collected, analysed and reported in a timely manner using good research practices.

What is a baseline?

Baseline information measures the situation at the beginning of the project. This can then be compared to the situation after the end of the intervention, to establish what change has occurred.

The DCED Standard requires baseline information to be collected for all indicators that aim to show a change in the situation. Baseline information is important at all levels in the results chain, not only impact-level indicators. For example, the results chain on the right shows a programme that is simplifying organic fertiliser licensing, with the aim of promoting organic fertiliser and ultimately increasing crop yield.

It would not be sufficient to collect baseline information only on farmers’ yield (the top level in the results chain). It would also be necessary to gather baseline information for the middle and bottom boxes. In the middle, a baseline would show how many farmers use organic fertiliser before the intervention. This can be compared to the number of farmers using organic fertiliser after the intervention, in order to detect any increase. At the bottom level, baseline information should show, before the intervention, what problems producers of organic fertiliser have in getting licenses, how much time it takes, what the
existing government regulations are, etc. This will help demonstrate whether the programme really has made the licensing for organic fertiliser easier.

Baseline information is thus important at all steps in the results chain to enable programmes to measure whether predicted changes are actually occurring, and act to address any challenges that arise. It should be collected once a programme understands who is likely to benefit from the relevant intervention, but before any results are expected. For instance, a programme that provides training to shoe manufacturers should collect baseline information after the trainees have been selected, but before they have received training. This would be an appropriate time for a baseline, as it would be clear who would be expected to benefit (the trainees), but no change would yet be expected.

For interventions where a programme is working through intermediaries, it might be more appropriate to collect baseline information on different intermediaries at different points in time. For instance, suppose a programme partners with a company to provide training for its seed retailers, so that they can give better advice on farming practice to their client farmers. The programme can collect baseline information on the retailers once they have been selected and before they receive training. However the programme might choose to wait for the training completion to ask the retailers whether they pass on the knowledge learnt to client farmers, and for the names of these client farmers. As it normally takes at least one agricultural season for farmers to apply new information on farming practice, the programme can choose the beginning of the season to collect baseline information on last season’s farming practice and later go back to the same farmers and get impact data on this season’s practice.

Planning a baseline:

When planning your baseline, consider the following:

1. **What indicators are you measuring?** This is the core of your baseline. Exactly what data do you want to collect? This should be informed by your results chain, indicators and monitoring plan. Make sure to ensure that you are collecting baseline data for both qualitative and quantitative indicators.

2. **What’s your budget?** It is sometimes tempting to conduct the baseline as cheaply as possible, but this can be a false economy. If you cannot use the baseline data to later make a comparison with impact data, the money will be wasted.

3. **How rigorous will it be?** Results must be reliable, well-documented, and convincing to a well-informed observer. Conduct as rigorous a study as your budget will allow.

4. **Who will conduct it?** Projects frequently hire a consultant to conduct baseline studies. This can work well, but the project team must still dedicate sufficient resources to draft a clear terms of reference, manage the consultant, understand how the study was done and where the data comes from and read and understand the final report and data. Alternatively, the baseline could be conducted by project staff. This has the significant advantage that they will learn directly from the interviews, rather than relying on a report. It also helps in future when collecting outcome and impact data.

---

1 Adapted from [TMEA’s Guide to Planning Baselines](#).
• **What is realistic?** Perhaps an ideal baseline would survey 500 small businesses, to provide baseline information for all your key indicators and project impact five years into the future. However, think carefully about what can really be achieved with the budget and time available. If you ask for too much, you run the real risk of not receiving any useful information.

• **How will impact data be collected?** It is most useful to go back to the same respondents when collecting baseline and later collecting outcome impact data to ensure that there is homogeneity between the two groups and to compare a before and after picture. Make sure you keep this in mind while designing baselines so that you keep track of respondents and have the overall measurement plan in mind rather than doing a one-off study.

• **What already exists?** Baselines can be expensive, so effort should be made to identify pre-existing data, and understand how that can be used for your own baselines. This avoids wasting money duplicating data collection. At the same time projects should always refer back to the results chain and ensure that if there are pre-existing data, they really are relevant to their target groups. For instance national data on farmer’s yields might be lower than the average in a particular area where a project works in, in which case it won’t be applicable.

  **Note:** If comprehensive market research has been conducted, it may not be necessary to gather additional data to measure the status of the indicators; there may be sufficient information from the Market Study/initial market research and analysis. The project may therefore wish to take the following steps:
  - Determine what data on the indicators is available from previous market research and analysis
  - Based on these data, calculate and/or record a baseline figure for as many indicators as possible
  - Make a plan to gather any additional data needed to complete calculations, that is not available from previous market research
  - Gather the relevant data e.g. though surveys, interviews, focus group discussions etc.
  - Process the data and assess the status of the remaining indicators
  - Make a record of the status of all the indicators at the baseline

---

**Challenges of Using Baseline Surveys**

It is likely that there may be a relatively high program departure rate, and that many in the baseline sample may be difficult to locate later (a 20-25 percent non-find rate is considered normal for such studies). This problem is particularly high with respondents in urban areas and/or rented accommodation.

This risk can be minimised by asking respondents to provide contact information on someone who will know their whereabouts a year later.

---

**Retrospective Baselines**

In some cases a pre-intervention baseline study may not be feasible. This may be because the results chain or geographic area changed significantly during implementation. It may also be because the programme did not have time or resources to conduct a baseline at the appropriate time. It may be because the intervention is a scale up of a pilot/test case and the programme already has baseline data from the initial phase.
If a baseline was not established at the time of project design, programmes will need to gather a ‘retrospective baseline’. This reconstructs the baseline, trying to understand what the situation was when the project started. It will not be as accurate or reliable as collecting a baseline before the project, but is better than having no baseline at all. Conclusions will be more reliable if they are supporting with data derived from several different methods, such as:

- **Recall**: either in individuals or groups, ask people about their recollection of a situation and what would have happened if there had been no project. However, recall can be unreliable: “this is especially true for measuring change in areas where recall is weak, or if attitudes, opinions and behaviours are likely to change over time. For example, recall data on income, regular expenditures (e.g., on food) or self-esteem are not very reliable, especially when using a long reference period.”

- **Written records of partners**: businesses, business membership organisations, and governments should all have written records of some kind that throw light on where they were at the start of a project.

- **Other written and verbal sources**: especially in more developed economies, there may be general economic and other data that can be drawn on.

### Control Point 3.2: Monitoring information on all key indicators is collected. (Must)

**Compliance Criteria:**

- **Plans to collect monitoring information in a timely manner for market actors and beneficiaries exist.**

- **The monitoring plan is timely, uses appropriate tools and processes and takes attribution into account for all levels.**

- **Monitoring information for each intervention results chain and covering market actors and beneficiaries has been collected, analysed and reported in a timely manner using good research practices. Attribution has been assessed.**

This Control Point is about monitoring, usually conducted by programme staff on a regular basis, using relatively small sample sizes and not looking closely at impact level. The following Control Point is about impact assessments, usually conducted by specialist contractors at a later stage in implementation, to measure impact with some rigour. The general comments about good research practice and attribution are often relevant to both Control Points, so are included here and not repeated under Control Point 3.3 - even though they are definitely be relevant there too.

A monitoring plan should be developed for each separate results chain. While the format will vary from project to project, they typically show for each indicator:

- What information will be collected.
- When the information will be collected.
- How the information will be collected.

---

2 Source: Adapted from **SED Working Paper no1 Developing indicators in small enterprise development projects (2001) p31**

• How the indicator will be calculated.
• What tool will be used for data collection.
• Who is responsible for collecting and analysing the information.
• How the indicator will be used.

Monitoring plans should be developed with multiple stakeholders, as different people will be able to contribute to different sections. Typically, it is important to involve project staff, partners, and potentially key stakeholders from institutions that the project is supporting, such as business associations or government partners. Think carefully about who to involve – more is not always better.

Measurements should be made at appropriate intervals during the programme’s lifetime, to enable interim reporting and monitoring of the programme’s progress. Generally speaking, the timeframe for changes in behaviour and performance of service providers is relatively short, such as six months to one year. The timeframe for changes in behaviour and performance of enterprises will be moderate, such as one year to 18 months, whereas the timeframe for change at the level of sectors and poverty reduction will be longer, such as 18 months to two years. However, these numbers can vary significantly, for example in agricultural sectors with fruit trees that take five years or more to mature. If seasonal differences are significant, the follow-up measurements should be conducted during the same season as the baseline survey.

The monitoring plan should follow and document good research practices. The Table below offers some tips on key decision-making that would contribute towards a good survey design:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Tips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How intensive should results</td>
<td>Risk tolerance of program</td>
<td>The less often you measure, the less likely you are to catch mistakes early.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measurement be?</td>
<td>Pilot or upscale stage</td>
<td>Pilot needs more intensive measurement on expected changes all the way up the chain; during upscaling, verify (less intensively) if the results chain is still valid and add a more intensive measurement of outreach/scale and systemic change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How many different interventions</td>
<td>Each intervention needs to be measured, however the programme must take a pragmatic approach when deciding how to measure change in each:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>must be measured?</td>
<td>Less interventions and larger interventions – more intensive results measurement per intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size/budget for each intervention</td>
<td>More interventions and smaller interventions – less</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 USAID. 2006. Assessing the Impact of New Generation Private Sector Development Programs, Impact Assessment Primer Series Publication #1; p11
5 Adapted from Advanced Training Course Material on the Standard for Results Measurement prepared by Hans Posthumus, Aly Miehlbradt, Harald Bekkers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Considerations</th>
<th>Tips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intensive results measurement per intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If you have one/two main interventions (size and importance) with some additional, of course important but smaller interventions, then put more weight on measuring the important, big ones than the many small ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program budget</td>
<td>Result measurement is good management and an investment in being effective – not an overhead. So it may be appropriate, when working in dynamic and changing markets, to spend 5-10% of the budget on good monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How to assess attribution?</th>
<th>Always measure each step in the results chain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach: Of the people who could have been affected by the intervention, what % actually experienced a change?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of change: Of the observed change, what part was due to the intervention (as opposed to other factors)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Are other factors likely to have influenced change? | Always establish a counterfactual (what would have happened without intervention). Depending on how likely it is that other factors could have influenced change in addition to intervention activities, choose different tools to estimate attribution (qualitative evidence from respondents on why they changed, comparison of affected group with non-affected group, factor analysis to check which factors contributed to change). |
| Is the change an innovation or an improvement? | Innovation – If the intervention introduces a brand new product or service, observe and record presence and diffusion of innovation. Find out through interviews why it wasn’t happening before; would it have happened without the intervention? Improvement – compare affected group with a non-affected group if possible and other influences are likely |
| How close (in RC) is change to project activity? | Close – can rely on observation and qualitative evidence that change has (or has not) resulted from previous change Far away – consider comparing with a non-affected group if influence from other factors likely |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which info gathering tools to use?</th>
<th>Triangulate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Triangulate, within tools (cross checking questions) and among tools (observation + interviews, interviews + records, FDGs + surveys, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions</td>
<td>Considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of the change - attitude, behavior, performance etc.</td>
<td>Often, attitudes and behavior lend themselves to qualitative assessment, while performance can also be measured quantitatively. Interviews and semi-structured questionnaires offer the option of gathering both quantitative and qualitative information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of observing change</td>
<td>Easy – rely on observation of change, using records is OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of accurate records on change</td>
<td>If enterprises or other actors maintain reliable records, and you have access to them, use them – but always triangulate using other tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of understanding needed on change</td>
<td>The more risky, complex and or innovative; the more you will want to track and understand changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to use tool effectively – internal capacity, external context</td>
<td>Internal capacity: For example, FGDs and stakeholder meetings require careful facilitation; surveys require specific skills in questionnaire design, survey management, data analysis etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information on good research practices, download the DCED document; ‘Practical Guidelines for Conducting Research’. Example 1 at the end of this document gives some examples of research processes that should be documented.

The DCED has also produced specific guidelines on how to select sample sizes, and an accompanying sample size calculator. This guidance provides a simple, practical tool to help programmes using the DCED Standard to select the appropriate sample sizes for quantitative surveys. You can access it here: www.enterprise-development.org/page/calculator

The Standard also not only requires that programmes use good practices in their research but also that they document it properly for evidence that they are doing so. Box 5 below shows some points about research that should be documented:
Documenting the Research Process:

Transparency and good research practices are part of the Standard. In the reports of measurement studies, include the following points about the research:

- **Goal:** Why did you undertake this research, what was your objective, your research questions, your hypotheses? What decisions did you plan to make based on the findings?

- **Location(s):** Where was information gathered?

- **Population:** Who was the research trying to learn about? Approximately how many are in this ‘population?’ (For example, farmers who purchase inputs from trained input suppliers.)

- **Attribution Method:** What method(s) were used to assess attribution? Why was this method chosen?

- **Research Tools:** How was the information gathered? (focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, survey etc.) Why were these tools chosen?

- **Sample size:** How many respondents were there? If appropriate, per location and/or per group of the population (e.g. small farmers, micro farmers, input suppliers etc.) If appropriate, also describe the control group or non-affected group. How was this number decided? Which factors did you consider, why and how?

- **Sampling composition:** How were the respondents chosen? Why? If appropriate, also the control or non-affected group with an assessment of the similarities and differences to the affected group.

- **Questions:** What was asked and observed? Attach the questionnaire or question guide.

- **Data Gathering:**
  - How did you prepare the respondents for the data gathering?
  - How did you prepare the questions?
  - Who did the interviews? Who supervised? Who performed other roles?
  - When was the information gathered from respondents? (dates of the interviews)
  - If/how were the interviewers trained?
  - How did you ensure the quality of the information gathering? Interviewers’ supervision, back-checks, reviewing questionnaires etc.
  - Any problems with the data gathering and how they were handled
  - How did you deal with the tendency of respondents to give ‘desirable answers?’ (project staff or hired staff interviewing respondents)

- **Data Processing and Analysis:**
  - How was the data entered and tabulated or summarized? Manual or name of computer

---

6 Taken from Advanced Training Course Material on the Standard for Results Measurement prepared by Hans Posthumus, Aly Miehbradt, Harald Bekkers.
software for surveys, method of collating and summarizing data for FGDs, in-depth interviews etc.

- Who did the data entry and tabulation/summarizing?
- How did you ensure the quality of the data entry and tabulation/summarizing? Supervision, checks etc.
- How was the data analyzed?
- Who did the data analysis?
- How did you ensure the quality of the analysis? Team analysis, consultant assistance, etc.
- Any problems with the data processing and analysis and how they were handled

**Reporting and Use of Research:**
- How are you reporting (summarizing) the findings?
- Did the study answer your research objective?
- Who is going to use the information? What decisions will be made?
- Are these reports for internal or external use? Have you taken care of ‘confidentiality’- making respondents anonymous?

**Ethics:** Were there any ethical issues during the research? If so, how were they handled?

**Limitations:** What are the limitations of the research in terms of representing the population and gathering accurate information?

Attribution is addressed in a separate Implementation Guideline.

**Control Point 3.3: Impact assessment is conducted to assess attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains using methods that conform to established good practice. (Must)**

**Compliance Criteria:**
- Plans to assess the impact on market actors and beneficiaries of each intervention, in a timely manner, exist.
- Plans to assess the impact on market actors and beneficiaries for each intervention are thorough, realistic and in accordance with good research practices. The plan illustrates how attribution will be assessed.
- Impact information for each intervention has been collected, analysed and reported in a timely manner using good research practices. Attribution has been assessed.

This Control Point is about impact assessment, usually conducted by specialist contractors at a later stage in implementation, to measure impact with some rigour. The preceding Control Point 3.2 is about monitoring, usually conducted by programme staff on a regular basis, using relatively small sample sizes and not looking closely at impact level. The general comments about good research practice and attribution provided above are often relevant to both Control Points, so are not repeated here.
Control Point 3.4: The programme implements processes to use information from monitoring and results measurement in management of interventions and decision making. (Must)

Compliance Criteria:
- Mid and senior level programme staff describe the process for using information collected through monitoring and impact assessments
- Mid and senior level programme staff use the information collected through monitoring and impact assessment to manage interventions and the programme.

This Control Point relates to knowledge and practice of programme staff around use of results, according to the system developed under Control point 7.1. Please therefore refer to the Implementation Guideline for Managing the system for more information on the basis for this CP.

Control Point 3.5: The programme has a system for assessing and understanding differentiated results by gender. (Recommended)

Compliance Criteria:
- Plans to assess and understand differentiated results by gender of each intervention exist.
- Plans to assess and understand differentiated results by gender are relevant and appropriate.
- Gender differentiated results for each intervention have been collected, analysed and reported in a timely manner.

By understanding how their interventions affect men and women separately, programme managers can gather information which helps to maximise their effectiveness and mitigate any potential negative effects.

At a minimum, all programmes should disaggregate data by gender. The most appropriate method of doing this will vary according to the indicator. For example:

1. **SCALE** – Data should be divided to show the relative numbers of male and females benefitting.
2. **INCOME** – Data should be divided to show the additional net income accruing to men and that accruing to women.
3. **JOBS** – Data should be divided to show the number of FTE jobs that went to men, and to the number of FTE jobs that went to women.

Disaggregated results alone are not always the most effective way to understand how results vary by gender. For example, small farms are often family-owned, which can make it meaningless to try and disaggregate results by male and female. Consequently, disaggregated data should be seen as the starting point for an effective system for understanding results by gender, rather than all that is required.

Programmes may collect additional qualitative and/or quantitative data which help to understand how their interventions affect men and women differently. This might include, for example, interviews or focus group discussion with separate female and male respondents to understand who participates in the supported enterprises, the different roles of men and women, and who controls
the income that the household receives. It can also investigate the impact of the intervention on the role of women within the household or community.

Some programmes may explicitly aim to promote women’s economic empowerment. If so, the DCED Standard requires this to be effectively monitored. Guidance on how to do so can be found in the 2014 DCED publication: *Practical Guidelines for Measuring Women’s Economic Empowerment in Private Sector Development*. Those seeking guidance on how to incorporate WEE into programmes, structured on the same lines as the Standard, can refer to the *Synthesis Document: How to integrate gender and WEE into PSD programmes*, DCED 2017.

**Control Point 3.6: Programmes monitor to identify unintended effects. (Recommended)**

*Compliance Criteria:*

- Plans to collect, analyse and report monitoring and impact information on unintended (positive and negative) effects exist.
- Programme staff use information on significant unintended effects, if any, to review interventions.

By using the results chain, programmes set out what they expect to achieve, and how they expect their activities to benefit the poor. Market systems, however, are complex and unpredictable. For most programmes working in market systems, consequently, results chains will just be a best guess, and likely to change as the intervention develops. Other formats might be developed over time that demonstrate the pathway to systemic change better than results chains can.

Consequently, it is necessary for programmes to be alert to unintended effects of their intervention, as well as to intended effects. This presents a number of challenges to a monitoring system, which is why this is currently a ‘recommended’ rather than mandatory control point. While a predicted change can be assessed using surveys, reporting, and other common tools, it is much harder to collect information on unintended effects. Without knowing what these unintended effects are, a programme would not know what questions to ask in a survey, what information to request in a report, or what topics to cover in a key informant interview.

Monitoring unintended effects, consequently, relies primarily on qualitative data from unstructured interviews, and the alertness and observations of staff throughout their normal work. The latter can be a particularly powerful way to capture information about the intervention. Consider the following story:**

*A field coordinator is walking to her truck after just wrapping up the second of ten planned rural seed fairs she has organized that month. She sees a number of producers, talking with two reps from a new seed supplier. As she passes, she overhears them discussing the skit on good agricultural practices. They say that it was pretty funny and they learnt a lot.*

This kind of knowledge of field staff is *tacit knowledge*: understanding developed through experience, difficult to transfer because its foundations are built implicitly. Importantly, the headline

---

impression or judgement of tacit knowledge is can easy to communicate with others. What is difficult is to justify this impression. In the example above, when the field coordinator picks up her phone to tell her manager about the fair, she will probably be able to say that it went well and that momentum amongst market actors for change is building well. She might not be able to explain why she thinks that (she might not have been conscious of the effect on her impressions of seeing the producers crowd around the input supplier reps).

Staff should be encouraged to continually look out for unexpected effects of the intervention, and to reflect on what this means for the intervention results chain. Morcrette and Pennotti (2011) recommend that, in order to use tacit knowledge, programmes should ensure that their staff understand the programme logic, as set out in the results chain or programme level theory of change. In particular, they should be aware of the ‘killer assumptions’ that need to be monitored. This will help them understand what they should be looking out for. Tacit knowledge should be documented where possible, in particular where it is used to make a decision. This will leave a paper trail that allows programme staff to bring together observations from multiple sources, which can be assessed by evaluators and/or DCED auditors.

**Capturing unexpected changes in Samarth-NMDP**

Samarth-NMDP recognise the importance of capturing unexpected changes. Consequently, they have developed two processes to try and tap into that knowledge; an observations diary and an activity log. The Diaries and Logs require individuals to document relevant information from market player interactions and insights from field visits, so that these can be discussed among the whole project team at the next available opportunity. Diaries and Logs effectively constitute a ‘communal memory’ for each project team - of market intelligence and insight as well as a narrative of a particular partner’s ownership over what they are experimenting with (for sample contents of the Diary and Log, see Annex B). These are crucial components of the programme’s approach to learning and knowledge management and their utilisation ensures a flow of information and discussion points for debate in quarterly and monthly meetings.

**Observation diary excerpt**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type of entry</th>
<th>Diary entry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10-Apr-13</td>
<td>General Market Observation</td>
<td>There is a severe shortage of ginger seeds in Makwanpur at present. Due to poor production (quality and quantity) this year, farmers do not have enough quantity of quality seeds for this planting season. According to Mrs Ram (ginger trader) 40 tons of high quality seeds have been collected from Makwanpur and transported to Ilam by FAO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-Apr-13</td>
<td>General Market Observation</td>
<td>On average 75 tons of ginger passes through the Birgunj border to India on a daily basis during December to February. Two officers from the Plant Quarantine office provided this information which is in contrast to the previous information provided by traders from Makwanpur - that ginger trade through Birgunj border is limited due to problems en route.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resources

Baselines

TradeMark East Africa guide to making baselines.

The Monitoring and Evaluation Handbook for Business Environment Reform (IFC 2008), download here


Measurement System

T-G PEC. December 2006. Impact Assessment Guides In Staff Guidelines for Conducting Impact Assessment; p10-11 and 14-15


Qualitative Data Collection

Monitoring and Results Measurement in Value Chain Development: 10 Lessons from Experience by Alexandra Miehlbradt and Conor Riggs (2012)
Example 1
Documenting the Research Process.

Transparency and good research practices are part of the Standard. In the reports of measurement studies, include the following points about the research:

- **Goal:** Why did you undertake this research, what was your objective, your research questions, your hypotheses? What decisions did you plan to make based on the findings?

- **Location(s):** Where was information gathered?

- **Population:** Who was the research trying to learn about? Approximately how many are in this ‘population?’ (For example, farmers who purchase inputs from trained input suppliers.)

- **Attribution Method:** What method(s) were used to assess attribution? Why was this method chosen?

- **Research Tools:** How was the information gathered? (focus group discussions, in-depth interviews, survey etc.) Why were these tools chosen?

- **Sample size:** How many respondents were there? If appropriate, per location and/or per group of the population (e.g. small farmers, micro farmers, input suppliers etc.) If appropriate, also describe the control group or non-affected group. How was this number decided? Which factors did you consider, why and how?

- **Sampling composition:** How were the respondents chosen? Why? If appropriate, also the control or non-affected group with an assessment of the similarities and differences to the affected group.

- **Questions:** What was asked and observed? Attach the questionnaire or question guide.

- **Data Gathering:**
  - How did you prepare the respondents for the data gathering?
  - How did you prepare the questions?
  - Who did the interviews? Who supervised? Who performed other roles?
  - When was the information gathered from respondents? (dates of the interviews)
  - If/how were the interviewers trained?
  - How did you ensure the quality of the information gathering? Interviewers’ supervision, back-checks, reviewing questionnaires etc.
  - Any problems with the data gathering and how they were handled
  - How did you deal with the tendency of respondents to give ‘desirable answers?’ (project staff or hired staff interviewing respondents)

---

8 Taken from Advanced Training Course Material on the Standard for Results Measurement prepared by Hans Posthumus, Aly Miehlbradt, Harald Bekkers.
• **Data Processing and Analysis:**

  o How was the data entered and tabulated or summarized? Manual or name of computer software for surveys, method of collating and summarizing data for FGDs, in-depth interviews etc.
  o Who did the data entry and tabulation/summarizing?
  o How did you ensure the quality of the data entry and tabulation/summarizing? Supervision, checks etc.
  o How was the data analyzed?
  o Who did the data analysis?
  o How did you ensure the quality of the analysis? Team analysis, consultant assistance, etc.
  o Any problems with the data processing and analysis and how they were handled

• **Reporting and Use of Research:**

  o How are you reporting (summarizing) the findings?
  o Did the study answer your research objective?
  o Who is going to use the information? What decisions will be made?
  o Are these reports for internal or external use? Have you taken care of ‘confidentiality’- making respondents anonymous?

• **Ethics:** Were there any ethical issues during the research? If so, how were they handled?

• **Limitations:** What are the limitations of the research in terms of representing the population and gathering accurate information?