

# THE DCED STANDARD FOR MEASURING RESULTS IN PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT

## CONTROL POINTS AND COMPLIANCE CRITERIA

---

*Version VI, January 2013*



# DCED

---

The Donor Committee for Enterprise Development

**The DCED Standard for Measuring Results**  
**in Private Sector Development**  
*Version VI, January 2013*

**Table of Contents**

<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>UNIVERSAL IMPACT INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>1. ARTICULATING THE RESULTS CHAIN.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. DEFINING INDICATORS OF CHANGE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. MEASURING CHANGES IN INDICATORS .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4. ESTIMATING ATTRIBUTABLE CHANGES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>5. CAPTURING WIDER CHANGES IN THE SYSTEM OR MARKET .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6. TRACKING PROGRAMME COSTS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>7. REPORTING RESULTS.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>8. MANAGING THE SYSTEM FOR RESULTS MEASUREMENT .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>COMPLIANCE CRITERIA FOR SCORING .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>SCORING SHEET – STANDARD VERSION VI, JANUARY 2013 .....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>DEFINITIONS.....</b>	<b>15</b>

## **Introduction**

Pressures are growing rapidly to measure and report on the results of private sector development; current PSD programmes are often not getting credit for what they are achieving. This Standard outlines key elements in a practical process for estimating results that can be managed by programmes internally. The objectives are:

- To make it easier for programmes to measure and report on their results;
- To work towards a shared understanding of acceptable accuracy in the estimation of results so that programmes' reported results are both credible and useful;
- Wherever possible, to measure a small number of “universal impact indicators” (defined below) in a common way, to enable donors and others to aggregate their impact across programmes; and
- To enable programmes to use results measurement for day-to-day management, particularly to validate the assumptions on which the programme logic has been based.

The participation of PSD programmes in the Standard process offers donors:

- a common approach to results measurement, that can be applied to a variety of PSD programmes at little extra cost;
- clarity on what programmes will report, with consistent supporting documentation or ‘paper trail’;
- regular and credible estimates of programmes’ results;
- universal indicators which donors can add together across multiple programmes; and
- potential to reduce oversight costs, particularly with smaller programmes.

Adopting the Standard offers additional benefits to programme managers:

- a means to clarify expectations with donors about results measurement;
- credibility for programmes in presenting their results;
- fewer questions about how results are measured by internally managed systems;
- clarity and uniform guidance on some of the more challenging aspects of results measurement; and
- regular and useful information for programme management.

This Standard is based on the articulation of results chains: the logic implicit in any intervention. All of the elements outlined in this document together comprise a very practical system that programmes can use to measure the results they are achieving. To ensure that the results reported are credible, the system can then optionally be [audited](#) by an external auditor.<sup>1</sup> In all cases, the auditor looks for good practice and practical solutions to measurement challenges; the key test is whether the approach taken by the programme would convince a reasonable but sceptical observer.

For each element in the Standard, a control point summarises the minimum requirement that would satisfy the auditor. The compliance criteria by which the auditor would assess a programme against each control point are given separately in the DCED Standard scoring sheet; documentation can be in any form. Those items labelled “Must” are deemed necessary for all participating programmes (and are shown in green); those labelled “Rec” (Recommended) conform to good practice, but may be difficult for some programmes to comply with at this point (shown in yellow). These Recommendations may become “Musts” in the future as the field of results measurement improves. The sections in the Standard are not stand alone parts but are expected to be implemented in an integrated way. Each of the parts depends on the others. As a whole, the Standard may be considered a checklist for a results measurement system that conforms to established good practice.

At the end of this Standard there is a “scoring sheet” which elaborates on each compliance criterion against which a programme will be scored. There are also definitions of terms to help ensure that programmes, reviewers and donors have a common understanding of the control points and compliance criteria. Separately, the DCED has also published accompanying “[implementation guidelines](#)” and other documents<sup>2</sup>, which offer

---

<sup>1</sup> For more information on audits, please refer to <http://www.enterprise-development.org/page/audits>

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.enterprise-development.org/page/implementing-standard>

explanations of each control point and compliance criteria, advice on how to meet each control point and examples.

This Standard is the result of a field-based process of discussion, testing and consensus among programme managers and consultants during 2008 -2012, and of engagement with many agencies and programmes. The Standard, the audit process and the support that programmes need to adopt these elements will continue to develop.

The Standard is not a substitute for expertise or common sense, but provides a framework within which programme managers can identify the important gaps in their current measurement work, and address those gaps effectively. It does not mandate the impossible, but rather provides an incentive to measure more of the possible, than has been measured in the past. In all cases, results should be measured through the best means available, and ‘triangulated’ through more than one approach. However, in the words of John Maynard Keynes, “it is better to be roughly right than precisely wrong”.

**Note:** At the current time, programmes may choose to implement the DCED methodology either for their entire programme, or for selected components or interventions. Each intervention consists of all of the activities needed to achieve one, coherent results chain; it is therefore taken as the main unit of analysis for this Standard. In the terminology used, several interventions may make up a component, and several components may make up a programme.

## Universal Impact Indicators

These indicators are recommended for use by all participating programmes so that donors and other stakeholders can aggregate impact across programmes, wherever possible.

**Scale:** Number of target enterprises who realize a financial benefit as a result of the programme’s activities per year and cumulatively. The programme must define its “target enterprises.”<sup>3</sup>

**Net income:** Net additional income (additional sales minus additional costs) accrued to target enterprises as a result of the programme per year and cumulatively. In addition, the program must explain why this income is likely to be sustainable.

**Net additional jobs created:**<sup>4</sup> Net additional, full time equivalent jobs created in target enterprises as a result of the programme, per year and cumulatively. “Additional” means jobs created minus jobs lost. “Per year” comprises 240 working days. The program must explain why these jobs are likely to be sustainable. Jobs saved or sustained may be reported separately.

---

<sup>3</sup> Target enterprises are the final beneficiaries that a programme aims to benefit. These are usually the poor producers and/or workers in the enterprises.

<sup>4</sup> Some programs are uncomfortable with this indicator because job creation per se does not lay the foundation for long term, pro-poor growth. These programs would prefer an indicator related to labor productivity and/or competitiveness. However, due to the challenges of designating an indicator of this type applicable across many programs as well as adding up this kind of indicator, and in recognition of the interest of many partner governments and donors for this indicator, it has been retained.

The focus on impact that the Standard brings is much appreciated by those in the field. Clearly, however, there are some situations and activities where impacts cannot be credibly estimated or attributed, and in those situations, the Standard does not require it. For instance, sometimes the success of an intervention might depend on conditions beyond the influence of the programme. Or it might be difficult to separate out the impact of a project from the impact caused by other programmes. However it is important in such cases to document the reasons why the programme is unable to meet the requirements of the Standard, so that in the case of an audit, the auditor can also assess whether they represent a reasonable explanation.

Furthermore, the final choice of impact indicators is somewhat agency-specific, and the Standard allows for the list given above to be tailored to the needs of individual agencies and programmes – for example to focus on the development goals they already have. Publication of results remains the responsibility of the programme or agency; the DCED may use aggregated numbers across several programmes in its publications, but will not otherwise make any information about individual programmes publicly available without permission.

Note that the Universal Impact Indicators refer to enterprise-level impact; mapping this onto household-level impact is a demanding process, particularly with respect to attribution, because households may have multiple income streams. It is anticipated, therefore, that funding agencies commission separate research by specialists, to measure attributable household-level impacts, if they need that information.

## 1. Articulating the Results Chain

No.	Control Point	Level
1.1	An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain is articulated explicitly for each of the interventions.	Must
1.2	Each results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis.	Must
1.3	Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities; key partners can explain the logic of interventions.	Must
1.4	The results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players and the programme circumstances.	Must
1.5	The results chain(s) include the results of broader systemic change at key levels.	Rec
1.6	The research and analysis underlying the results chain(s) take into account the risk of displacement.	Rec

## 2. Defining Indicators of Change

No.	Control Point	Level
2.1	There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each change described in the results chain(s).	Must
2.2	The universal impact indicators are included in each relevant results chain.	Must
2.3	There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results.	Must
2.4	Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress.	Must
2.5	Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators, to appropriate dates.	Rec

## 3. Measuring Changes in Indicators

No.	Control Point	Level
3.1	Baseline information on key indicators is collected.	Must
3.2	Information for each indicator is collected using methods that conform to good research practices.	Must
3.3	Qualitative information on changes at various levels of the results chain is gathered.	Must
3.4	Reported changes in indicators that are extrapolated from pilot figures are regularly verified.	Rec

#### 4. Estimating Attributable Changes

No.	Control Point	Level
4.1	Attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains are estimated using methods that conform to established good practice.	Must

#### 5. Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market

No.	Control Point	Level
5.1	The results of systemic change at key levels in the results chain(s) are assessed using methods that conform to established good practices.	Rec

#### 6. Tracking Programme Costs

No.	Control Point	Level
6.1	Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	Must
6.2	Costs are allocated by major component of the programme. (Applicable only to programmes with more than one main component.)	Rec

#### 7. Reporting Results

No.	Control Point	Level
7.1	The programme produces a report, at least annually, which clearly and thoroughly describes results to date.	Must
7.2	Contribution of other publicly funded programmes and private contributions are acknowledged.	Must
7.3	Reported changes in key indicators are disaggregated by gender.	Must
7.4	Results of systemic change and/or other indirect effects are reported.	Rec
7.5	Results are published.	Rec

#### 8. Managing the System for Results Measurement

No.	Control Point	Level
8.1	The programme has a clear system for results measurement that ensures that findings are used in programme management and decision-making.	Must
8.2	The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.	Must
8.3	The system is integrated with the management of the programme.	Must

## Compliance Criteria for Scoring – Standard Version VI, January 2013

This scoring sheet has been prepared to outline the compliance criteria by which an auditor would assess a programme against each control point outlined in the DCED Standard for Measuring Achievements in Private Sector Development Version VI (January 2013).

Each control point has been divided into compliance criteria, which will be rated out of a maximum of 10 points based on the degree to which the programme meets those compliance criteria. The rating for each compliance criterion will be based on examining a selection of individual projects/interventions within a programme, as well as the overall programme. The compliance criteria for the control points have been formulated to score programmes on whether they have the different elements in place, whether they are of good quality and on whether they are being used.

The DCED appreciates the fact that new initiatives also wish to know if the system that they are establishing is likely to be compliant with the Standard – before they have had time to use that system with any regularity. Some of the compliance criteria have therefore been marked “Use”, in which case compliance is not required for initiatives that have been established for less than one year. In that case, auditors will only certify that the system in place is compliant, not that it is in regular use, or generating credible information on results being achieved. Compliance criteria that will not be applicable for all programmes, are marked as W/A (where applicable).<sup>5</sup>

Programs will be given a rating as follows:

- ‘Must’ control points out of 100 per cent total possible (10 points for each compliance criterion)<sup>6</sup>
- ‘Recommended’ control points out of 100 per cent total possible (10 points for each compliance criterion)<sup>7</sup>

The final rating will be presented as a check (✓) on the following tables:

‘Must’ control points:

Percentage	Description	Programme Rating
91-100	Strong results measurement system	
81-90	Reasonable results measurement system	
71-80		
61-70	Moderate results measurement system	
51-60		

<sup>5</sup> For instance in control point 2.1, the compliance criteria for validating proxy indicators is only applicable if a programme is using proxy indicators.

<sup>6</sup> The total score might differ between different programmes as certain compliance criteria are not applicable. The percentage score is the total score as a proportion of the total possible for that programme.

<sup>7</sup> Same as for Musts



41-50	with notable weaknesses	
31-40		
21-30	Weak results	
11-20	measurement system	
0-10		

'Recommended' control points:

Percentage	Description	Programme Rating
81-100	Results measurement system with strong additional features	
61-80	Results measurement system	
41-60	with some additional features	
21-40	Results measurement system	
0-20	with few additional features	

## Scoring Sheet – Standard Version VI, January 2013

### 1. Articulating the Results Chains

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
1.1	An appropriate, sufficiently detailed and logical results chain is articulated explicitly for each of the interventions.	A results chain is developed and documented for each intervention.	
		Each results chain shows all key changes arranged in logical order, demonstrating as far as possible how the selected intervention leads to achievement of development goals.	
		Each results chain is sufficiently detailed so that changes at all levels can be assessed quantitatively and/or qualitatively.	
1.2	Each results chain is supported by adequate research and analysis	The programme has documentary evidence that underlies the logic of the steps in each results chain.	
		Each results chain and/or supporting documentation outlines significant assumptions that support the logic of the results chains and mentions relevant contributions of other initiatives.	
		The documentation explains how the changes outlined in each results chain are likely to lead to lasting impact.	
1.3	Mid and senior level programme staff are familiar with the results chain(s) and use them to guide their activities; key partners can explain the logic of interventions.	Mid and senior level programme staff can describe the respective results chain(s) covering their work.	
		Mid and senior level programme staff can give examples of how they will use or how they have used (for programmes more than 1 year old) results chain to guide their work.	
		Key partners can describe the logic of interventions that is reflected in results chains. (W/A)	
1.4	The results chain(s) are regularly reviewed to reflect changes in the programme strategy, external players and the programme circumstances.	The programme has a clear system for reviewing the results chain(s) at least once a year.	
		Use: The programme has evidence to show that the results chain(s) have been reviewed at least once in the last year. It has evidence to justify changes or lack of changes made to results chain(s).	

1.5	The results chain(s) include the results of broader systemic change at key levels.	The results of expected systemic or market-wide changes are clearly included in each results chain. (W/A)	
1.6	The research and analysis underlying the results chain(s) take into account the risk of displacement.	The programme can cite or produce evidence that displacement has been taken into account in the development of the results chain(s).	

## 2. Defining Indicators of Change

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
2.1	There is at least one relevant indicator associated with each change described in the results chain(s).	Quantitative and/or qualitative indicators are defined for each change in the results chain(s).	
		The indicators are relevant to the associated changes in the results chain(s).	
		Evidence of validation is provided for proxy indicators if used. (W/A)	
2.2	The universal impact indicators are included in each relevant results chain(s).	Each results chain includes the universal impact indicators at the relevant level wherever possible, or written justification is provided for each such indicator if not included.	
2.3	There are specific indicators that enable the assessment of sustainability of results.	Specific indicators (qualitative and/or quantitative) are defined to assess the sustainability of results in the results chains.	
		The indicators are relevant and appropriate to assessing the sustainability of results at key levels of the results chains.	
2.4	Mid and senior level programme staff understand the indicators and how they illustrate programme progress.	Mid and senior level programme staff can describe the indicators covering their work.	
		Mid and senior level programme staff can give examples of how they will use or how they have used (for programmes more than 1 year old) information on changes in indicators to inform their strategy and implementation decisions.	
2.5	Anticipated impacts are realistically projected for key quantitative indicators to appropriate dates.	There are clear projections for key quantitative indicators to specific dates during or beyond the intervention. Projections are expressed as a change in indicator value due to the programme by a specific date.	
		<b>Use:</b> Documents show that projections have been reviewed at least once in the last year with changes or lack of changes justified.	
		The projections are supported by documented research, analysis and clear calculations, with sources of information and assumptions explicitly outlined.	

		Wherever possible, there are projections for the universal impact indicators (or other common impact indicators) to either the end of programme or to two years after the end of the programme.	
--	--	---	--

### 3. Measuring Changes in Indicators

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
3.1	Baseline information on all key indicators is collected.	A documented plan is in place to gather baseline information, <b>Use:</b> The programme has collected baseline and outlined the status of key indicators before activities have led to changes	
3.2	Information for each indicator is collected using methods that conform to good research practices.	A documented plan is in place to collect information for each indicator at appropriate times. The plan is thorough, realistic and in accordance with good research practice. It shows for each indicator what information will be collected, when and how the information will be collected and how each indicator will be calculated or described. <b>Use:</b> The programme can demonstrate that it used the plan to collect information. <b>Use:</b> The programme can demonstrate that information collection conformed to established good practices (in terms of research design, timing, sampling, quality control, etc.)	
3.3	Qualitative information on changes at various levels of the results chain is gathered.	Assessment of changes includes qualitative information gathering. Qualitative information gathering enables an appropriate assessment of why changes are or are not taking place and the character, depth and sustainability of changes at various levels of the results chain.	
3.4	Reported changes in indicators that are extrapolated from pilot figures are regularly verified.	When changes in indicators are calculated for large numbers of enterprises using data from small samples or a pilot phase, a method for regularly validating the extrapolation is in place. <b>Use:</b> The method for validating the extrapolation is in regular use.	

#### 4. Estimating Attributable Changes

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
4.1	Attributable changes in all key indicators in the results chains are estimated using methods that conform to established good practice.	The programme has a documented plan for assessing and estimating the attribution of observed changes to programme activities for each of the key indicators in the results chain.	
		The methods chosen to assess and estimate attribution link back to the results chains, are appropriate to the programme context and conform to established good practices.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme has used the plan to estimate attributable change in indicators.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme can demonstrate and staff can explain the methods used to assess and estimate attribution and how the methods conform to established good practices.	
		<b>Use:</b> Figures are supported by clear calculations; assumptions are outlined if necessary.	

#### 5. Capturing Wider Changes in the System or Market

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
5.1	The results of systemic change at key levels in the results chain(s) are assessed.	The programme has a documented plan for assessing and estimating the results of systemic change outlined in the results chains.	
		The methods chosen to assess systemic change link back to the results chains, are appropriate to the programme context, take attribution into account and conform to good research practices.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme has used the plan to assess and estimate the extent of systemic change.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme can demonstrate and staff can explain the methods used to assess systemic change and how the methods conform to established good practices.	
		<b>Use:</b> Figures are supported by clear calculations; any assumptions are outlined.	

## 6. Tracking Programme Costs

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
6.1	Costs are tracked annually and cumulatively.	A clear, accounting system is in place to track costs and produce annual and cumulative totals of all programme-related costs spent in country.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme has annual and cumulative totals of all programme-related costs spent in country.	
6.2	Costs are allocated by major component of the programme. (Applicable only to programmes with more than one main intervention.)	The accounting system enables management to estimate and produce totals on costs spent on each major component of the programme for which impact is estimated.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme has annual and cumulative estimates of costs for each component for which impact is estimated.	

## 7. Reporting Results

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
7.1	The programme produces a report at least annually which clearly and thoroughly describes results to date.	The programme has a documented system for estimating programme-wide impacts for universal impact indicators (and/or other high level common indicators) at least annually.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme has an annual report with clear estimates of programme wide impacts for universal impact indicators (and/or other high level common indicators). The report outlines the context and any qualitative information needed to understand the numbers produced.	
		<b>Use:</b> The programme can clearly explain how the estimates were derived and show supporting calculations. These calculations takes overlap into account. (W/A)	
7.2	Contributions of other publicly funded programmes and private contributions are acknowledged.	Where the reported changes are/will be due in part to the work of other publicly-funded programmes and private contributions, they are acknowledged in the report above.	
7.3	Reported changes in key indicators are disaggregated by gender	All reported changes, and particularly impact indicators, are disaggregated by women and men. Where figures are not disaggregated, justification is provided as to why this was not possible or appropriate.	

7.4	Results of systemic change and/or other indirect effects are reported.	The results of systemic changes and other indirect effects are reported. When these or other indirect effects are quantified, the figures are divided as 'direct' and 'indirect.'	
7.5	Results are published.	A document with the results and costs described in sections 7.1-7.4 is made publicly available. The auditor may choose to 'sign off' on this report.	

## 8. Managing the system for results measurement

No.	Control Points	Compliance criteria broken down for Scoring	Score (10)
8.1	The programme has a clear system for results measurement through which findings are used in programme management and decision-making.	The programme has a documented plan in place to show how information from the results measurement system will inform management decision making.	
		The plan is realistic and ensures that results information is regularly and effectively integrated into management decision making.	
		All programme staff have access to written guidance (e.g. a manual or staff guide) on how to implement all elements of results measurement (each of the sections above).	
		Use: Managers can explain to what extent underlying assumptions in the results chain(s) are proving to be valid, and can cite decisions they have made based on the information provided by the results measurement system.	
8.2	The system is supported by sufficient human and financial resources.	The program can show that sufficient human and financial resources are available and have been allocated to manage and implement the results measurement system.	
		Tasks and responsibilities in relation to results measurement are appropriate and documented.	
		Staff are able to accurately describe their tasks and responsibilities in results measurement.	
8.3	The system is integrated with the management of the programme.	Evidence exists of the results measurement system having been institutionalized, for example in the form of inclusion in programme management documents, job descriptions, staff performance reviews, regular meetings etc.	
		All programme staff can provide examples of results measurement activities that they have undertaken in the last month.	

## Definitions

**Note:** Where possible, the definitions given below are in line with the *Glossary of Key Terms* developed by the DAC Network on Development Evaluation<sup>8</sup>. Definitions taken directly from the DAC Glossary are *given in italics*. In many cases, further detail has been added, in order to give the level of specificity required for the purpose of this methodology.

**Activity:**

A discrete piece of work, typically represented by a contract between the programme and a contractor, partner or consultant. Interventions typically consist of several activities, that are intended to achieve change at various different points in the overall market system.

**Aggregate:**

To combine the impact a programme has caused from various interventions; overlap must be taken into account when aggregating impact.

**Assess:**

To gauge the change in an indicator using either, or both, quantitative and/or qualitative methodologies.

**Assumption:**

A supposition or best guess which forms part of the basis for calculation of an indicator value.

**Attribution:**

*The ascription of a causal link between observed (or expected to be observed) changes and a specific intervention.*

**Baseline:**

*An analysis describing the situation prior to a development intervention, against which progress can be assessed or comparisons made.*

The status of indicators before an intervention starts or before they have been influenced by intervention activities, and against which changes can be measured later to see intervention impact.

**Calculate:**

To compute the value of an indicator based on several different pieces of information.

**Collaborating programme:**

A public programme (donor or government) with which the programme has a written agreement outlining collaboration and which has contributed to the attributable changes claimed.

**Component:**

A part of a programme that forms a coherent set of interventions, typically around a thematic interest.

**Copying:**

Other target enterprises copying behavioural changes that those affected directly by programme activities have adopted.

**Crowding in:**

Enterprises at levels other than the target level copying behaviours that those affected by programme activities have adopted or entering a sector or value chain as a result of improved incentives and environment created (at least partly) by the programme. This term also applies to government agencies or civil society organizations, who are not directly involved in the programme, copying behaviours of those who are directly involved in the programme, or who change their behaviour as a result of improved incentives or environment created (at least partly) by the programme.

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/29/21/2754804.pdf>



**Direct impact:**

Changes that are caused as a result of programme interventions on service providers with which the programme has had significant contact and target beneficiaries. Direct impact does not include the results of systemic changes such as copying or crowding in.

**Displacement:**

Some enterprises may be negatively affected because others are benefiting from programme activities. Displacement is the amount of negative effect on those enterprises harmed by programme activities.

**Estimate:**

An approximation of the value of an indicator or of attribution based on information gathered.

**Impact:**

*Positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended.*

**Impact Assessment:**

The process of estimating a programme's impact on enterprises, poverty reduction and/or other development goals.

**Indirect impact:**

Changes caused, at least partly, by programme activities which cannot be linked in a direct line to organizations or enterprises with which the programme has had significant contact. Indirect impact includes the results of systemic changes such as copying, crowding in and second order changes resulting from a programme's direct or indirect impact, for example changes in non-targeted sectors or changes in local economies resulting from the increased purchasing power of a programme's target beneficiaries.

**Indicators:**

*Quantitative or qualitative factor or variable that provides a simple and reliable means to measure achievement, to reflect the changes connected to an intervention, or to help assess the performance of a development sector.*

**Information gathering:**

The collection of qualitative and quantitative information to measure the changes resulting from a programme at any level of the programme's results chain and to estimate attribution.

**Intermediate indicator:** An indicator of change at any level other than the goal or final level.

**Intervention:**

A coherent set of activities that are designed to achieve a specific system change, reflected in one results chain. An intervention is generally as subset of a component.

**Job:**

Full-time equivalent, taken over one year (240 days/year); may be seasonal, paid in kind etc, but does not include unpaid family labour.

**Measure:**

To assess the value of an indicator.

**Methodology:**

A means to assess the value of indicators, for example a survey, focus group discussion or key informant interviews.

**Monitoring:**

*A continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing development intervention with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds.*

**Overlap:**

When two different interventions reach the same target enterprises there is overlap. Programmes need to correct for overlap instead of adding the impact of all interventions (when overlap is likely) in order to avoid double counting.

**Poor:**

MDG1 originally referred to people living on less than \$1 per day, on 1993 purchasing power parity; this has now been considerably expanded – see the revised MDGs. USAID, CGAP and others are working on country-specific baskets of poverty indicators. Many countries have their own definition.

**Primary research:**

Information gathering directly from respondents (enterprises, service providers, government agencies etc.) in the field.

**Private contributor:**

A private enterprise that has contributed to the impact claimed by the programme.

**Programme:**

A programme is the typical unit of analysis for a donor, often contracted to one overall partner or company. A programme consists of several components.

**Projection:**

A reasonable estimate of future results, based on current, informed knowledge about the overall system.

**Proxy indicator:**

An indicator for which measurable change is clearly and reliably correlated with an indicator of a change that the programme aims to achieve (but is more practical to measure).

**Reasonable:**

A conclusion that an external, unbiased and relatively informed observer would come to.

**Results Chain:**

*The causal sequence for a development intervention that stipulates the necessary sequence to achieve desired objectives beginning with inputs, moving through activities and outputs, and culminating in outcomes, impacts and feedback.*

**Results measurement:** The process of designing a measurement system in order to estimate a programme's impact so that it can be used to report results and improve project management.

**Secondary research:** Information gathering that relies on existing studies and reports.

**Survey:**

Gathering information from a specific number of respondents in a specific population generally using a set of questions for which the answers can be quantified.

**Sustainability:**

*The continuation of benefits from a development intervention after major development assistance has been completed. The probability of continued long term benefits.*

(For measurement purposes, sustainability will be indicated by continuation of benefits at least two years after the end of a programme).

**Systemic change:**

Change in systems that are caused by introducing alternative innovative sustainable business models at support market level (such as in private sector, government, civil society, public policy level). These changes often cause widespread indirect impact by crowding in at support market levels impact and copying at final beneficiary level.

**Target enterprises:**

The enterprises that a programme aims to benefit.

**Target population:**

The type of people that a programme aims to benefit.

**Unintended impacts:**

Any changes that are due to a programme's activities and that were not anticipated when designing the activities. These impacts may be positive or negative.