



The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development

Final Report on the DCED Global Seminar on Results Measurement, Bangkok 24-26 March 2014

3rd April 2014

In 2007, the Donor Committee for Enterprise Development (DCED) developed a Standard for measuring and reporting results in private sector development (PSD), in collaboration with practitioners and consultants in the field. The second Global Seminar on Results Measurement brought together member agencies and practitioners interested in using the Standard, in order to share and generate new thinking on results measurement in general and the Standard in particular. A wealth of material relating to the Seminar - including PowerPoints, case studies and links to further reading - is available on our [dedicated Seminar webpage](#). Below is a brief summary of just a few of the discussions at the Seminar which stood out to the Secretariat.

Participants

Participants included a mix of field practitioners, consultants and representatives of 6 DCED member agencies. They came from 36 countries, representing 55 organisations, field programmes and governments.



Presentations

All presentations can be downloaded from <http://www.enterprise-development.org/page/seminar2014>. They covered the following topics:

- Overview of the DCED and results measurement (3 presentations)
- Good practice in designing new programmes and managing existing ones (6)
- Experiences of adopting the Standard during implementation (3)
- Experiences of applying the Standard in particular contexts (4)
- The audit process and evaluation (2)
- Using the Progress out of Poverty Index in monitoring results (1)

Key discussion points

Observations about the application of the Standard



Many presentations described the benefits to their programmes of applying the Standard. In the words of one participant, “*My number-one lesson on the DCED Standard is how monitoring and results measurement contributes to improved planning and performance of development interventions and also helps organisations to learn from each other based on a standardised approach.*”

Several practitioners also noted that by adhering to the Standard, and in particular passing the audit, they are able to demonstrate to donors that their results are based on rigorous measurement. Aly Miehlbradt further explained that she had encountered donor agency representatives who felt more confident in communicating about field programmes to colleagues when these programmes had passed the audit.

Management using the DCED Standard

The 2012 Seminar concluded that good monitoring is a core management task, which should not be left to external experts. At the time it was felt that little thought had yet been given to how to create a working culture of good management and honest reporting of results, while at the same time motivating staff to achieve good results. Presentations at the 2014 Seminar, on the other hand, offered suggestions for achieving this. A general message was that long-term training and team building is necessary to engage staff in results measurement. Three presentations noted the value of sourcing staff locally because of their familiarity with complex or fragile contexts. Matt Ripley suggested that a flexible recruitment process, which prioritised willingness to learn over demonstrable technical skills, was important to find the staff who would engage most effectively in results measurement.



Using the Standard in different contexts

At the 2012 Seminar, participants requested more guidance on how to apply the DCED Standard to PSD in different contexts, such as challenge funds and business environment reform (BER) programmes. Adam Kessler and Amanda Jupp's presentation introduced the [DCED's new guidelines](#) on how challenge funds can measure results effectively. The key recommendation was that



resources for measuring results should be focused on the 'star' performers within a Challenge Fund – with a minimum level of monitoring applied initially to all projects in order to identify the 'stars'.

In 2013, the DCED published an [Annex to the Practical Guidance on Supporting Business Environment Reform](#) (BER) focusing on how to measure donor-supported BER results. At the 2014 Seminar, Gareth Davies used the case study of ENABLE Nigeria to explore whether, and how, to apply the DCED Standard to BER programmes. Assessing the contribution of an intervention to the passing of a reform, and of attributing changes in impact-level indicators to that reform, emerged as particular challenges. Potential solutions were introduced. Quotes from decision-makers acknowledging the significant role of an intervention in leading to a reform can be used to demonstrate a 'high' level of contribution. The DCED hopes to run a free webinar on using the Standard in BER programmes in the near future, as part of a series exploring key aspects of the Standard in more depth.

Challenges in applying the Standard, and future work and directions

In terms of next steps, the most common request of respondents on the feedback form was for more knowledge products and guidance on specific issues, in particular measuring attribution, measuring systemic change, and measuring employment.

The difficulty of attributing results of private sector development programmes was a recurring theme of the Seminar. A practical suggestion from Matt Ripley was to combine quasi-experimental techniques with the 'sense-check' of using the results chains to see if intermediate changes have happened as expected: if changes have occurred at the top level of a results chain, but not the mid-levels, this is an immediate red flag. To build up a qualitative narrative of attribution, surveys can ask why changes occurred. However, as Ripley and others suggested, some 'detective work' may still be needed. Given this, concern was expressed that placing a heavy burden of proof on programmes attempting to assess attribution could inhibit them from trying at all. Ultimately, donor pressure to demonstrate attributable results suggests that guidance on this topic is of significant value. The DCED has produced [guidelines for estimating attributable changes](#).



Defining and measuring systemic change was another topic of much discussion. Perhaps the most common question was how to report on systemic change in the short-term. Several programmes noted that initial signs of systemic change were could be hard to uncover using standard research techniques. As Ravy Ty explained, CAVAC Cambodia experimented with two methods to assess copying (i.e. farmers passing on their new knowledge to others.) The CAVAC Cambodia team initially conducted randomised household surveys looking for knowledge of new practices in villages where lead farmers told them that information had been passed on. However, the team were not able to find evidence of copying - likely because the knowledge had reached only a tiny proportion of farmers. The second method was to ask lead farmers who they shared information with, and follow up with these people directly. This was easier, but less reliable. Tim Ruffer pointed out that long-run ex-post evaluations are able to assess systemic change, and that they can be written in to funding contracts and terms of reference when programmes start up. However, monitoring for initial signs of systemic change is still very important for programmes seeking to maximise the impact of their interventions.



Job creation was felt to be challenging to measure, and an irrelevant indicator for some PSD programmes. Jim Tanburn stressed that the Standard does not require programmes to report on job creation, as long as they provide a reasonable explanation for not doing so. However, donor pressure to report on jobs is unlikely to disappear. Consequently, the DCED is currently preparing a guidance document on this topic.

Similarly, it was emphasised to those concerned about how to measure changes in women's economic empowerment (WEE) that the Standard aims to support programmes seeking to promote

WEE, rather than insist that WEE is a compulsory target to report against. The DCED has commissioned research into how household-level indicators can be used to help programmes measure results in WEE.

Participant feedback

42% of the participants completed a feedback form; of those, all felt that their expectations had been fully or partly met and 60% felt that they had been fully met or exceeded. 41% of respondents listed the practical experiences of different projects applying the Standard as the most useful aspect.

Comments include:

“Very much appreciated. ...Sometimes we feel we are unique but in fact we all go through similar constraints. Sharing knowledge and learning from other programmes implementing the DCED Standard really helped me broaden my understanding and widen my vision as well. ... The whole programme was well organised and it was worth taking part in every session. ...Thank you!”



“This Seminar has greatly helped me to appreciate [that results measurement and intervention management should not be considered as separate responsibilities], and encouraged me to change my initial thinking. RM is everyone’s responsibility, even more as everyone is now moving in this direction, as it helps to be on top of your interventions as well.”

Knowledge Management Systems

Discussion group DCED March 2014

Knowledge Management systems

Knowledge Management seeks to support learning by identifying knowledge gaps, (co-)creating and exchanging of knowledge and structuring information and feedback loops,

The discussion group focused on the latter two, namely exchange platforms and information systems in support of adaptive management.

Overviews are provided of different systems and their main characteristics, not to be complete but to inspire. The inventory shows that no integrated MRM supported system is in use by any of the participants, which opens up the question of if a tool should or could be developed.

1. SCIFORMA

- Costs: investment of \$80,000, tokens \$1,500 and \$300/year/user; web based, open source project management tool that includes dashboard, performance monitoring (critical indicators, baseline data, progress on indicators, reporting module and aggregated view with range of parameters to choose from)

2. MOBENZI

- Mobile app

3. Dropbox

- Free (limited use)

4. Catalyst

- Exchange forum for documents, calendar and blogs with notification (low price).

5. Salesforce

- Exchange for a with mobile app, dashboard, customized reporting, CRM and document management and notifications (free limited for NGOs)

6. ZOTERO

- Doc management system – free

7. ActKnowledge

- Free online software for building and adapting color coded result chains including defined indicators per box.

8. PBMS

- Web based Project Based Management Software including mobile app, tracks data relevant to specific indicators, integrated GIS software (costly).

9. CEMOR

- Free software developed and distributed by USAID, availability unknown. Incorporates project management at activity level, a mobile app for (multiple) data entry, linking research data to a management database system.

10. Zilicus

- Google software, web based, and custom fit possible, tariff low.

11. Logframer

- Free program design software, enabling indicators by result and incorporating inputs (time and capacity)

12. Open ERP

- Open source ERP software

13. AFFM

- Web based Open source programme management information software enabling management and monitoring of funds, does not incorporate result chains, design not flexible (ie not in support of adaptive management).

14. Mango apps

- Low cost web based exchange forum that incorporated dashboard, documents, wiki pages, chat function, management structure, notification, no financial data nor result chains.

15. SHIREE

- Means STAIRS. Software designed and shared by DFID that includes a mobile app, manages research data that is simple and reliable, custom fit possible.

