

Control point	How to maximize the score?	What may lead to losing points?
3.1 Baseline information on all key indicators is collected. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline data exists with information on how it was gathered. • The baseline plan is in line with the attribution strategy which will be used to assess attribution when doing impact assessment. • If the baseline is imminent then there is a research plan on how to operationalize it. • The timing of data collection is appropriate (For example before intervention activities have an impact or collected retrospectively where there is less likelihood of recall bias). • Baseline research is conducted with appropriate quality control. • Data are analysed clearly and correctly with all assumptions and facts clearly noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Baseline quantitative data collected more than two years after intervention started, leading to potential recall bias. • Generic data from secondary literature used as baseline without verifying whether it applies to beneficiary or other market actor. • Baseline data have not been collected without convincing reason. • Inappropriate information gathering methods or faulty analysis.
3.2 Monitoring information on all key indicators is collected. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan exists for collecting monitoring data for beneficiary, partner, and market actors. • Plan is timely enough to track whether intervention activities are happening as per plan and leading to desired outputs and outcomes. • Monitoring plan is appropriate to collect information that gives a reasonable indication of what is happening as a result of intervention actions (outputs, outcomes, any early signs of impact.). For example, plan to collect opinions on how and why change is happening. • Both qualitative and quantitative data are collected, compiled, and accurately analysed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No monitoring plan exists at intervention level, with only a general description of monitoring activities in the results measurement manual. • Data are only collected during final impact assessment and there is no interim monitoring. • Data are gathered but not compiled or analysed. • No attention is paid to attribution; are changes due to the intervention, or are non-users also experiencing changes?
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)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a plan to collect impact data for all relevant indicators in the results chain. • The impact assessment plan has an appropriate attribution strategy. • If the impact assessment is imminent then there is a research plan on how to operationalize it. • The timing of data collection is based on when impact is expected to occur. • Impact assessment is conducted with appropriate quality control and conform to good research practice (e.g., representative sample assessed). • Data are analysed clearly and correctly with all important assumptions and facts clearly noted. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A biased sample is used to estimate impact across a large population with no verification on whether the same results apply to all. • The attribution approach is a before/after comparison, yet the changes could have been influenced by other external factors (so another research approach would have been more appropriate). • There are significant mistakes in data analysis.
3.4 The programme implements processes to use information from monitoring and results measurement in management of interventions and decision making. (Must)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff provide a clear explanation of the processes (such as review meetings and meetings to discuss findings) for checking and using information on progress against the indicators to inform intervention management. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff cannot give specific case examples of when and how they took decisions based on monitoring and impact information (such as what worked or didn't work).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff can give specific examples on when and how they took decisions based on monitoring and impact information. 	
<p>3.5 The programme has a system for assessing and understanding differentiated results by gender. (Rec)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A documented plan exists to collect information for assessing gender differentiated results. • Gender disaggregated data are collected and analysed in a timely manner using appropriate tools and processes and based on the outlined gender parameters. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no qualitative assessment of issues related to gender addressed by the interventions.
<p>3.6 The programme monitors to identify unintended effects. (Rec)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection tools and processes, such as field visit templates, include questions to capture unintended effects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans, tools, and processes to collect data on unintended effects are biased to focus mainly on positive effects.

WHAT WILL NOT LEAD TO POINT DEDUCTION:

- It is okay if baseline data is not collected for a change by a certain actor as it is assumed to be a baseline of zero with a reasonable justification. For example, a partner starts to expand production capacity to produce a new variety of seed for the first time due to an intervention. Then the total volume of that specific seed produced in the baseline year is zero.
- It is okay if research plan for an impact assessment of an intervention has not been designed as impact is not yet expected to have occurred.
- Programmes can choose to do contribution analysis for an intervention as long as it provides a justifiable reason on why it was not possible to assess attribution. For example, in an intervention on strengthening the Business Enabling Environment (BEE), where change is reliant on external factors beyond the control of the programme, such as a law that needs to be changed by the government.
- In some cases, programmes can do baselines/impact assessments using very small sample sizes as long as it provides a justifiable reason for doing so (disaster, remote location). However, in such a case, the data should ideally be validated by triangulating with different sources or by having a plan to do a follow-up assessment to increase sample size.