Complex PSD Programme Evaluations
Accountability to Developmental Evaluation
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Presentation Outline

• Key influencing factors for evaluation design
• Reflection on 2 recent Itad evaluative work examples, and Real World Evaluation (RWE)
  Challenges
  – The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Dutch Good Growth Fund (‘DGGF’): *End of Design Phase*
  – Rockefeller Foundation Digital Jobs Africa (‘DJA’): *Ending Implementation phase*
• Overview of BEAM Guidance Materials: (1) Evaluation and (2) Monitoring: Overview and next steps
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What informs the Design Framework?

• The **design** of the programme itself
• The **purpose** of the evaluation:

1. *Is the initiative delivering on outputs and outcomes as planned?* ([**efficiency and effectiveness**])
2. *Are the (or were the) activities and their delivery methods been effective? Are there aspects that could have been done differently?* ([**process effectiveness**])
3. *Is the wider project story being told? What range of outcomes (intended and unintended) has the project contributed to – taking account of each of social, economic, environmental and cultural considerations?* ([**relevance and impact**])
4. *How has the initiative influenced the appropriate stakeholder community, and what capacities has it built?* ([**relevance and impact**])
5. *Has the initiative being delivered on budget?* ([**efficiency**])
6. *Is the project impacting positively on key groups and issues that have been identified as important in project design – particularly gender, indigenous, youth and environment?* ([**relevance and impact**])
7. *Is there evidence that the initiative is likely to grow – scaling up and out – beyond the project life?* ([**sustainability**])

• **Users/audiences:** Client/donor, Programme implementers, Wider programme stakeholders, Broader community
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## Evaluation Purpose: Key Design Implications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Purpose</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>Roles/responsibilities</th>
<th>Itad: Recent Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Accountability, External Learning</strong></td>
<td>Discrete pre-defined timeline: Baseline, Mid Line, and Endline, <strong>and/or</strong> Endline, and/or Ex-Post</td>
<td>Evaluator independent, works closely with implementers/ MRM</td>
<td>Dutch Good Growth Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEQs:</strong> Asked Ex-post: Sustainability, Relevance and Impact, Efficiency and Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Developmental and/or Formative</strong></td>
<td>Ex Ante, or at Scale Up Decision Phase(s)</td>
<td>Evaluator external, but mixed, collaborative, variable, emergent roles</td>
<td>Digital Jobs Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KEQs:</strong> Asked Ex-Ante or Ongoing: Sustainability, Relevance and Impact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MFA Dutch Good Growth Fund
Design Features: (Very!) Complex

- **Why?** Key Intended Impacts/LT Outcomes: Poverty Reduction, Catalytic System Effects: Sustainable SME financing, Knowledge Transfer
- **For Whom?** Target Groups: SMEs, including female-owned, youth entrepreneurs, located in fragile state, and Dutch businesses (and subsidiaries). Multiple sectors- Ag, Fin Serv.
- **Where?** Geographical scope: Up to 68 countries
- **How?** Intervention Modalities: Fund-of-Funds and direct Impact Investing in SMEs, using range of financial instruments and also knowledge transfer Operational Modalities: Three different ‘Track Managers’
- **With What?** Inputs: Eur700m with Eur70m TA Fund. Net Revolving to 0.
MFA Dutch Good Growth Fund: ToC 1
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MFA Dutch Good Growth Fund: ToC 2

2-5 years

Medium term Direct Outcomes:
- static sustainability
- Beneficiary behaviour response

Short Term Outcomes:
- Beneficiary behaviour response
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MFA Dutch Good Growth Fund: ToC 3
## Complex Evaluation Design: MFA DGGF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is measured?</th>
<th>Evaluation Modules, and Timing</th>
<th>Data Collection / Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Direct, Indirect, Induced Jobs**      | **Evaluator:** Baseline – Endline: 4 MIXED METHOD, COUNTRY CASES:  
- QUANT impact assessment – exploring what and by how much (change in revenues, profits of SMEs)?  
- **QUAL**— exploring why and how change happens and in what context  
**T2 Manager:** Baseline- Endline MIXED Methods: – IF Evaluations  
Tracks 1 and 3 Manager: Baseline Endline QUAL-Thematic studies | **Data Collection Tracks** – monitoring data from Funds- Primary and Secondary Indicators, management data: DCED Standard  
**Evaluator** – qualitative data collection 4 country cases: Baseline: Survey DGGF SMEs, benchmark data; Endline: KII, Ints DGGF SMEs, Ints non-DGGF SMEs.  
**Evaluator:** Analysis, Synthesis,  
- QUANT: Statistical analysis: DiD (if large N, and possible)  
- QUAL: Contribution analysis, Synthesis (ALL MODULES) |
| **Demonstration Effect:** IF and SME levels: ‘ER’ |                                                                                               |                                                                                          |
| **Catalytic Effect:** IF and SME levels: ‘AA’ |                                                                                               |                                                                                          |
| **Cornerstone Effect:** DGGF >IF Level : ‘AA’ |                                                                                               |                                                                                          |
| **Financial Additionality:** DGGF>Fund and Fund>SME level |                                                                                               |                                                                                          |
# DGGF: Some RWE Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some RWE Challenges</th>
<th>RWE Mitigation / Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Insufficient timeframes</strong> to adequately measure any LT market level changes or Impact.</td>
<td>• Use intermediate indicators of systemic change and extrapolate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Limited budget</strong>: Generalisability is limited if evaluating across whole PF</td>
<td>• Findings will make this clear. Sampling of IF evals and country cases critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Governance/Political</strong>: Evaluator commissioned a year after start</td>
<td>• Rapidly agreeing Evaluative and other work responsibilities PMU, Client. Adjust design framework around work already commenced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Data</strong>: Challenges working with <strong>Investment funds: limited MRM data</strong> - #SME clients, # employees</td>
<td>• Adjust methods!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Importance of QA of all evaluative work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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RF Digital Jobs Africa Design: Complex

• **Why? For Whom?** Key Intended Impacts/LT Outcomes: Social and Economic Wellbeing for High Potential Disadvantaged Youth (DY), their families and communities through linking with Digital Jobs

• **How?**
  – **3 Strategies:** Online work, BPO, Demand Driven Training:
  – **Intervention Modalities:** Market System Approach: Supply and Demand side, global and country levels: Influencing buyers/employers to ‘Impact Sourcing’, grants to Training providers, grants to online work awareness raising (total grantees ~20)

• **With What?** USD70m, RF facilitation and convening

• **How Many? By When?** 1m total lives impacted, 200,000 DY in digital jobs by 2019

• **Where?** Geographical scope: 6 countries in Africa
DJ A Learning cycles – Facilitated by Developmental Evaluation

Phase 1
- Act
- Observe
- Reflect
- Plan

Jan-June 2015: Development Eval

Phase 2
- Act
- Observe
- Reflect
- Plan

July 2015: Strategy Soak
Dec ’15
>>> Fen ’16 New Op Plan
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# DJA Developmental, Formative Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is measured?</th>
<th>Evaluation Modules, and Timing</th>
<th>Data Collection and Analysis (Who)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUANT:</strong></td>
<td><strong>M&amp;L Partner:</strong> Quarterly, for Mid-Term, Developmental Evaluation</td>
<td><strong>Grantees/RF</strong> – MRM data from grantees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QUANT /QUAL Grantee data verification</td>
<td><strong>M&amp;L Partner</strong> – 26 QUAL DY case studies in two countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QUAL: grantee and stakeholder interviews against M&amp;L questions</td>
<td><strong>M&amp;L Partner: Analysis, Synthesis</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QUAL: secondary data and research synthesis</td>
<td>- QUAL: synthesis against M&amp;L questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QUAL ‘representative’ DY case studies – exploring experiences of DY and wellbeing</td>
<td>- Contribution analysis at grantee level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>M&amp;L Partner, emergent: Q3 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- QUAL ‘emerging’ DDT-Employer case studies: Learning from success</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>QUAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>M&amp;L Partner, emergent: Q3 2015</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- DY wellbeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Systemic Change (Demonstration Effect and Facilitation): ‘ER’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluation Modules, and Timing**

- **QUANT:**
  - #Induced and Indirect Jobs
  - #DY placed in Digital Jobs
  - #DY trained
  - #Corporate Partners
  - #Y reached by Online Work Awareness campaign

- **QUAL**
  - DY wellbeing
  - Systemic Change (Demonstration Effect and Facilitation): ‘ER’
Some RWE Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Some RWE Challenges</th>
<th>Mitigation/ Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Insufficient timeframes in many cases to measure any early stage system change.</td>
<td>• Additional Deep Dive case studies added in Q3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data/Evidence: What constitutes ‘good enough’ evidence to flex a programme?</td>
<td>• Highlight preliminary indicators of systemic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tension between strong evidence and timely evidence</td>
<td>• Clear methodology, balanced and impartial viewpoint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Political: Assessing contribution of Foundation’s investment in grantees compared</td>
<td>• Over-sample, back up interview plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with others, and therefore #jobs per RF investment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Data collection: Drop out rate and lack of availability: youth and employers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BEAM Exchange M&E Guidance Materials

• BEAM Exchange Evaluation Guidance: https://beamexchange.org/guidance/evaluation-guidance/

• BEAM Exchange Monitoring Guidance: https://beamexchange.org/guidance/monitoring-overview/

Please comment and contribute to version 2!
Summary

• PSD Evaluation Design informed by Programme Design, MRM system, Purpose of evaluation, and Audiences.

• Itad recent examples illustrate:
  – the complexity of many PSD programmes:
    • global or regional, with MSA expectations
    • Complex modalities and ToC
  – Evolving role of evaluative work in conjunction with MRM: who does, when, and how?
  – Key RWE challenges with PSD evaluations, and management/mitigation

• And a call to action: please review the BEAM Guidance!
Thank you for listening

Any Questions?