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Brief overview of presentation

- Two paradigms in impact evaluation
  - ‘Randomistas’ (*Did it work? How much??*)
  - ‘Realistas’ (*Under what conditions? For whom?*)

- PART ONE - Theory-based evaluation design:
  - Intervention logic
  - Contribution analysis
  - Counterfactual thinking

- PART TWO - Skilful mixing of methods:
  - Surveys: Case 1: Certification in cocoa
  - Process tracing: Case 2: Value chain partnerships
  - Qualitative Comparative Analysis: Case 3: Innovation grants

- Discussion
WHAT DO WE WANT?
EVIDENCE-BASED CHANGE
WHEN DO WE WANT IT?
AFTER PEER REVIEW
1. Randomistas

- Did the intervention cause the change?
- Testing and modifying theory

Synergy

- Anticipate generalisation
- Intervention logic
- Theory-based evaluation

Realistas

- What combination of factors caused the change?
- Generating and modifying theory

2. Randomistas

- Attribution of outcomes to intervention
- Quantitative research
- Regressional analytic methods

Synergy

- Span of direct influence
- Validity threats
- Combine causal logics

Realistas

- Contribution of intervention to outcomes
- Qualitative research
- Configurational comparative methods
PART ONE – OBJECTIVES OF IMPACT EVALUATION
Objectives of impact evaluation
Objectives in impact evaluation

**RANDOMISTAS**
- Did the intervention cause the change?

**SYNERGY**
- Testing and modifying theory
- Anticipate generalisation

**REALISTAS**
- What combination of factors, next to the intervention, caused the change?
- Generating and modifying theory
What works? Under what conditions? For whom?

What works, for whom and under what conditions?
Objectives of impact evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANDOMISTAS</th>
<th>SYNERGY</th>
<th>REALISTAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did the intervention cause the change?</td>
<td>TESTING AND MODIFYING THEORY THEORY-BASED EVALUATION ANTICIPATE GENERALISATION INTERVENTION LOGIC</td>
<td>What combination of factors caused the change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing and modifying theory</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generating and modifying theory</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Randomistas

Synergy

Realistas

Design Principles

- Anticipate Generalisation
- Intervention Logic
- Theory-Based Evaluation
THE HOLY GRAIL: THEORY-BASED EVALUATION
Define the intervention logic

- **Area of Control**
  - Internal to the Organisation

- **Outputs**
  - Reach Direct Beneficiaries

- **Area of Influence External**
  - to the Organisation

- **Inputs** (Resources)

  - Activity

  - Efficiency

- **Outputs**
  - Activities Participation Products

- **Immediate Outcomes**
  - Learning

- **Intermediate Outcomes**
  - Action

- **Impact**
  - Consequences

  - Final Outcomes
... focus on key indicators....

- **Monitor** on indicators that are informative in understanding the dynamics in the partnership

- **Evaluate** indicators that are informative for benchmarking performance of the intervention

- **Learn** with information that helps to build and adjust the specific intervention theory
To get real evidence on the contribution or relevance of an intervention you need to go beyond before-after measurements:

- In relatively simple settings:
  - research designs that take other intervening factors into account, to get ‘net-effects’

- In more complex settings:
  - research designs that feed counterfactual reasoning (‘what would have happened when we had not intervened?’)
“Moving from outputs, (..), to understanding outcomes and proving impact is extremely complicated and seems to require randomized control trials that demonstrate the counter-factual. (..) But these studies are expensive, and it is impractical to spend $250,000 researching the impact of a $500,000 investment—unless such a study could be used to understand the impact of similar investments in our portfolio and others for years to come.”

(Trelstad - Acumen Fund, 2008:109)
THE QUEST FOR THE HOLY GRAIL
Get the stakeholders together....

- Theory-based evaluation starts with a session with those groups/persons that shape the programme interventions:
  - knowledgeable on change processes likely to be triggered by the intervention
- Speaking ‘the same language’ is difficult:
  - need for a small group of key persons.
... identify evaluation questions.....

1. Make the logic behind the intervention/programme explicit:
   - logic models / result chains / theory of change
2. Come to a list of learning questions and key assumptions based on a reflection on this logic
3. Select those questions and assumptions that are interesting for similar types of interventions (e.g. countries/sectors)
   - Impact-oriented questions: these relate to intermediate and ultimate outcome/impact.
   - Overarching learning questions: to the learn about the processes in these specific type of support interventions (‘good practices’)
   - Project specific learning questions: Additional learning questions prioritized by the pilots to be incorporated in monitoring and evaluation, also to get buy-in for the above more general data-collection efforts
...and find related outcome indicators....

- **Impact-related questions:**
  - Find (proxy-)indicators that are (partly) dependent on the performance of the programme/intervention (‘if they go down, we have a problem’)
  - Though they need pilot/project specific operationalizing, these can often be phrased in similar terms to facilitate uniform reporting and benchmarking
and appropriate research tools.

- Methods can only be chosen after you know the indicator to measure for the question to ask, and the level of detail needed
  - ‘Measure the easy ones with easy methods’
  - The use of one single-method for measuring outcome indicators tends to generate important validity threats
  - Generally, you need a mix of methods and triangulate findings
THE MORALE
You only get there when you believe in the interventions......

- We experience reluctance in stakeholders when asked to explicit their intervention logic
  - “things never go as expected”
  - “we are learning by doing”
- We explain that an intervention logic is always an expectation (‘program theory’), and need to be adjusted regularly
Defining ‘outputs’ is safe: total control
Defining ‘ultimate outcomes’ is safe: no attribution
Defining intermediate outcome indicators makes you vulnerable:

- You might have assumptions about change processes that prove to be wrong
- You can be benchmarked with other programmes that try to reach similar things
In short: impact evaluation for partnerships

- **Monitor immediate outcomes**
  - Learn for increased performance with immediate outcome indicators that help to build and adjust the specific intervention theory

- **Measure intermediate outcomes**
  - Evaluate changes in intermediate outcome indicators that are informative for benchmarking performance of the intervention

- **Build a plausible narrative for the contribution to the ultimate outcomes**
  - Make use of existing information to reflect on the impact logic
  - Collect information that can both support and challenge your story-line
PART TWO – MIXING OF METHODS
SKILFUL MIXING OF METHODS
Methods in impact evaluation

**RANDOMISTAS**
- Attribution of outcomes to intervention
- Quantitative research
- Regressional analytic methods

**SYNERGY**
- Design Principles

**REALISTAS**
- Contribution of intervention to outcomes
- Qualitative research
- Configurational comparative methods
Methods in impact evaluation

**RANDOMISTAS**

- Attribution of outcomes to intervention
- Quantitative research
- Regressional analytic methods

**SYNERGY**

- **DESIGN PRINCIPLES**

- **SPAN OF DIRECT INFLUENCE**

**REALISTAS**

- Contribution of intervention to outcomes
- Qualitative research
- Configurational comparative methods
Impacts of certification schemes
### Impact pathways in an intervention logic


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
<th>Key impact pathway A: Train farmers on sustainable practices for better yields and better planet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key impact pathway B: Encourage better labour contracts, remuneration and working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key impact pathway C: Convince companies and farmers to invest in sustainable input supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Key impact pathway D: Improve access to services through strengthening of farmer groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACTIVITIES & OUTPUTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>ULTIMATE OUTCOMES</th>
<th>DEVELOPMENT IMPACT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Improved sustainability in people, planet and profits**
Improved sustainability in people, planet and profits

ATTRIBUTION PLAUSIBLE + NET-EFFECT MEASUREMENT FEASIBLE = QUASI-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN APPROPRIATE

CONTRIBUTION ANALYSIS = NEED FOR LEAN MONITORING AND A CREATIVE MIX OF METHODS

Key impact pathway A

Key impact pathway B

Key impact pathway C

Key impact pathway D

ACTIVITIES & OUTPUTS

IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

ULTIMATE OUTCOMES

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

ULTIMATE OUTCOMES

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

ULTIMATE OUTCOMES

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

ULTIMATE OUTCOMES

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT

IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES

ULTIMATE OUTCOMES

DEVELOPMENT IMPACT
## Sample size are constrained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Actual sample size (N)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
<th>Variability (b)</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immediate outcomes</td>
<td>Knowledge score</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0.246</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate outcomes</td>
<td>Implementation score</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultimate outcomes</td>
<td>Yield (kg/ha)</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Net income (USD/ha)</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2718</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Methods in impact evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RANDOMISTAS</th>
<th>SYNERGY</th>
<th>REALISTAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attribution of outcomes to intervention</td>
<td>SPAN OF DIRECT INFLUENCE</td>
<td>Contribution of intervention to outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative research</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regressional analytic methods</td>
<td></td>
<td>Configurational comparative methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design Principles**

- Validity Threats
  - Attribution of outcomes to intervention
  - Contribution of intervention to outcomes
  - Span of direct influence

**Logics**

- Causal
  - Quantitative research
  - Qualitative research

- Configurational comparative methods

- Regressional analytic methods
Methods in impact evaluation

**RANDOMISTAS**
- Attribution of outcomes to intervention
- Quantitative research
- Regressional analytic methods

**SYNERGY**
- Design principles
- Span of direct influence
- Validity threats

**REALISTAS**
- Contribution of intervention to outcomes
- Qualitative research
- Configurational comparative methods
Four types of validity threats to conclusions

- **Statistical conclusion validity**: how are inferences drawn from data-set observations?
  - comply with proven methods and correct interpretation of statistical analysis.

- **Internal validity**: how is causality attributed?
  - What is the mechanism how interventions contribute to the observed change.

- **Construct validity**: how are generalizations made from the categories used in the evaluation to broader units of representation?
  - Careful and precise definitions and concepts.

- **External validity**: how are the findings generalizable?
  - Define the ‘generalization domain’. 
# Exploring Validity Threats to the Core Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Validity Threat</th>
<th>Main Threat</th>
<th>Additional Design Elements</th>
<th>Result/Observation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statistical Conclusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of validity threat</td>
<td>Main threat</td>
<td>Additional mixed methods</td>
<td>Result/observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistical conclusion</td>
<td>Selection bias between treatment and comparison group</td>
<td>Case-based statistics to maintain case integrity in group comparisons</td>
<td>Instead of measuring and comparing averages of impact, we identify types of responses related to types of contexts and types of constellations of factors. These typologies are refined/validated in focus group discussions with key stakeholders. Evidence of ways that organizations change their organizational capabilities by collective marketing activities is gathered, with thick descriptions of key moments to do so. The evidence underpins claims that experience with value-added activities translates into learning and refined internal regulations and incentive structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal</td>
<td>Attribution in complex systems</td>
<td>Process tracing based on significant experiences in resolving agency dilemmas in collective action</td>
<td>The self-assessment procedure for qualifying the strength of farmers' organizations is cross-checked before assuming that it can be used as a monitoring device.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>Measurement of organizational capabilities</td>
<td>Repetition of measurement of the self-assessment procedure with differing panel composition in the same organization</td>
<td>By focusing on behavioural incentives for internal control, instead of functional diversity in economic activities, common challenges of organizations are explored and solutions presented with a defined generalization domain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External</td>
<td>Diversity in extremis</td>
<td>Structured case studies, with due attention to incentive structures (mechanisms) that limit opportunistic behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## EXPLORING VALIDITY THREATS TO THE CORE METHOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF VALIDITY THREAT</th>
<th>MAIN THREAT</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL DESIGN ELEMENTS</th>
<th>RESULT/OBSERVATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STATISTICAL CONCLUSION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERNAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Choose an appropriate core methodology (question, time, budget)
- Check for validity threats to the likely conclusions, and add complementary methods accordingly
- Don’t phrase your conclusions too bold
Value chain partnership
Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Within case analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop background narrative of practical strategies and actions of immediate problem-solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify instructive events and construct time-paths to trace processes in case study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collect (anecdotal) evidence and case studies that show the mechanisms activated in the partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use counterfactual reasoning to specify the context of the configuration that produced these observed outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oilseed SubSector Platform in Uganda

- Results:
  - The platform acted in a context of competitive pressures from international markets, fluctuating prices and relatively low levels of market coordination and producers’ organisation.
  - The platform transformed tactic behaviour into joint strategic behaviour:
    - make tensions manageable
    - facilitate networking between farmers and lead firms
    - achieve consensus on priorities presented to non-chain actors outside the oilseed sector.
  - It improved coordination among value chain actors, such as banks, and induced a new governance of a sector policy supported by IFAD.
Warehouse receipt system in Rwanda

Results:

- The partnership between the MFI and the investment and trading company created the conditions for the implementation of an inventory credit scheme.
- These achievements became visible in the public domain and encouraged the network of supporting programmes and organisations to promote inventory credit as an alternative for the practice of informal credit.
- The inventory credit scheme aligned with the interests of a relatively small group of well-networked farmers that benefitted from the experiences.
- The enforcement of public regulation by the Rwandan government pressured farmers and chain actors to develop other ways in securing finance for production, harvesting and trade.
What did we learn from these cases?

- Both case studies suggest that partnerships do not realise the observed changes and development outcomes ‘alone’.
- Counterfactual reasoning shifted attention to a configuration of factors that influenced the outcomes.
- We showed that in both cases, in Uganda and Rwanda, a wider constellation of factors was active in shaping the intermediate outcomes of the partnership. The partnering activities were (at most) a contributing factor in this constellation.
Methods in impact evaluation

**RANDOMISTAS**
- Attribution of outcomes to intervention
- Quantitative research
- Regressional analytic methods

**SYNERGY**
- SPAN OF DIRECT INFLUENCE
- VALIDITY THREATS
- COMBINE CAUSAL LOGICS

**REALISTAS**
- Contribution of intervention to outcomes
- Qualitative research
- Configurational comparative methods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>OLD</th>
<th>LARGE</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>RICH</th>
<th>SUCCESSFUL GRANT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ON AVERAGE NO FACTOR PREDICTS...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>OLD</th>
<th>LARGE</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>RICH</th>
<th>SUCCESSFUL GRANT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
... BUT ONE CONFIGURATION DOES!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>OLD</th>
<th>LARGE</th>
<th>STRONG</th>
<th>RICH</th>
<th>SUCCESSFUL GRANT?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Impacts of innovation grants on collective marketing groups
Methodological approach


- Contribution analysis
- High diversity of cases and constrained sample size
  - Need for ‘small-N’ case-based comparisons
- Process tracing in a sample of 26 grant beneficiaries
  - Using time series data on sales and expenses
  - Using qualitative in-depth interviews in 2011 and 2013
  - Concilation of analysis by two independent researchers
- Qualitative Comparative Analysis to explore for predictors of success and failure
Contribution analysis:
Verify key assumptions in the intervention logic in order to strengthen the impact story
Methods

- Check the correlation between progress of business plans and the scoring on feasibility at baseline by the committee

Result:
- Fair prediction of progress in investments, but no prediction of progress in production and marketing
Methods

- Household survey (N=1,945)
- Likert scale statement on relevance of these groups versus other community organisations

Results:
- Economic farmer organisations are considered key for local economic development
- Two-thirds would like to market collectively
**Methods**

- In-depth interviews in 2011 and 2013 (N=31)
- Progress tracing
- Time-series of indicators
- Qualitative Comparative Analysis: searching predictors of effectiveness

**Results:**

- Disappointing!
- Well-endowed groups proved very unsuccessful
- Sourcing seems prohibitive for raising group income
Capacity to pay organisational costs (using the free *Kirq* application)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>row</th>
<th>start conditions</th>
<th>type of group</th>
<th>observations consistent with successful outcome</th>
<th>observations consistent with unsuccessful outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high tcc</td>
<td>strong sales</td>
<td>large scale</td>
<td>sourcing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>TRUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
<td>FALSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 7.24  Grant dynamics in the well-endowed organisations that proved consistently unsuccessful

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Grant dynamics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CECAOT</td>
<td>CECAOT used their grant, in 2009, to repair an optical quality control unit in their plant, to limit labour costs in the plant. The maximum amount available from FONDOECAS (US$10,000) motivated them to repair the equipment instead of buying a completely new machine (US$40,000). However, the equipment broke down again in 2010, partly due to improper handling. The optic sensor has not been repaired anymore due to the high costs. Instead, CECAOT considered buying a completely new optical sensor, which they did not do, however, partly due to the crisis and resulting internal organisational problems in 2011 which resulted from the failure to obtain a pre-harvest sales contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CELCCAR</td>
<td>CELCCAR channelled the FONDOECAS grant to one of its member cooperatives. They experimented with fruit processing on a pilot scale. They mention internal organisational problems and lack of complementary equipment as the major factors that negatively affected the business plan. The capacity of the equipment was considered by the 2013 interviewees to be too low to seriously create market access. An expansion of production capacity is needed to obtain real access to the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIAPEC</td>
<td>CIAPEC wanted to develop a production line for roasted coffee for the national market in La Paz, and had expectations for export. It started to experiment with roasting and packaging but the production capacity was lower than expected and they experienced technical problems with the equipment after only one year of operation. They consider the equipment not suitable for processing on an industrial scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COAINE</td>
<td>The equipment bought with the grant was far too small for the use that COAINE projected. Additional access to markets has not been created, nor has COAINE visibility in the market been enhanced by the grant. The average yearly turnover of processed coffee was an insignificant amount when compared to the size of the total turnover and size of membership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOPROQUI</td>
<td>SOPROQUI wanted to invest the grant in processing and packaging equipment to supply processed quinoa products (quinoa popcorn, quinoa soup) to the market, including the school meal programmes. However, the equipment was never properly delivered and installed and the project never took off. The current board members do consider quinoa processing still to be an interesting business opportunity but indicate that other machinery and skilled personnel is needed to start doing so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: For details, see Annex 1
Methods in impact evaluation

**RANDOMISTAS**
- Attribution of outcomes to intervention
- Quantitative research
- Regressional analytic methods

**SYNERGY**
- Design Principles
  - Span of Direct Influence
  - Validity Threats
  - Combine Causal Logics

**REALISTAS**
- Contribution of intervention to outcomes
- Qualitative research
- Configurational comparative methods
Key points in relation to conference questions

- 3 key conference questions:
  - *What do we mean by partnerships?*
    - Private sector receives public support
  - *What is specific about the M&E of partnerships?*
    - Contribution instead of attribution
  - *In order to contribute to SDGs, what is needed in terms for M&E to support existing as well as new partnerships?*
    - Identify predictors of success for replication and/or scaling of effective interventions
Questions and discussion!

Giel Ton

giel.ton@wur.nl

http://tinyurl.com/pr88j6c
www.wageningenUR.nl/cdi
https://www.facebook.com/events/65151774951553/
www.twitter.com/#MEpartnering