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The BEAM Evidence Map
BUT...WHAT IS IT?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF INTERVENTION</th>
<th>RESULTS LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to finance</td>
<td>5 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to information</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved input supply</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved marketing of products</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved product / service delivery</td>
<td>9 1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Systemic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to finance</td>
<td>5 1 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to information</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved input supply</td>
<td>3 2 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved marketing of products</td>
<td>1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved product / service</td>
<td>9 1 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Systemic change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to finance</td>
<td>5, 1, 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALL  LOW  HIGH
These studies uncover how providing small businesses and farmers with better quality and more timely information can help their enterprises grow.
WHO MAKES THE CUT?
EVIDENCE:

“the findings from research using robust and transparent measurement and analysis practices.”
WHO MAKES THE CUT?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SECONDARY CRITERIA</th>
<th>GRADED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TRANSPARENCY</td>
<td>HIGH CONFIDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDIBILITY</td>
<td>LOW CONFIDENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COGENCY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Internet search based on pre-defined search strings, both in relevant databases and using popular search engines.

2. 'Eye-ball' elimination of some documents coming up as a result of the search string. This is used particularly when it is very clear a document does not meet the relevance criterion.

3. Crowd-sourcing using BEAM’s networks and community

4. Snowball searching for documents through key informants and contacts in implementing organisations
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Overview

The synthesis showed that there are now sufficient evidenced examples of programmes promoting economic development, improving access to services and reducing poverty, to validate the market systems approach.

However, this headline masks a nuanced picture. Our review examined results from a wide variety of programmes, across different geographies and sectors. It allowed us to delve deeper into the BEAM Evidence Map and analyse the characteristics of the evidence base.
What type of evidence exists:

Figure 1: Type of document (n=97)

- Case study: 40
- Project monitoring report: 14
- External review: 13
- Internal project review: 12
- Impact evaluation: 12
- Literature review: 5
- Donor review: 1
What type of evidence exists:

Figure 2: Number of documents per sector (n=97)

- Agriculture: 59 documents
- Multi-sectoral: 17 documents
- Business & professional services: 7 documents
- Financial services: 5 documents
- Health: 3 documents
- Media: 2 documents
- Informal sector: 2 documents
- Water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH): 1 document
- Energy: 1 document
What type of evidence exists:

**Figure 3: Regional distribution of evidence documents**
- East and Southern Africa: 29%
- Multiple: 26%
- South Asia: 19%
- South East Asia and Pacific: 8%
- West Africa: 8%
- Eastern Europe: 6%
- Middle East: 2%
- Latin America and Caribbean: 2%

**Figure 4: Authorship by internal or external staff (n=97)**
- Produced by the organisation: 42%
- Produced by an external body: 46%
- Produced by an organisation with external support: 11%
- Not clearly indicated: 1%
What type of evidence exists:

![Bar chart showing the number of results described by category: Interventions (78), Systemic change (74), Access and growth (61), Poverty reduction (36).]
Examples:

We also undertook a more detailed examination of a sample of six examples that have documented systemic and poverty reduction-level change.

Was not intended to be a representative sample but there were nonetheless some interesting insights.
Examples:

**ADAPT**
Initial partner(s) has ‘invested’ in the pro-poor change adopted, independently of programme support

**RESPOND**
Non-competing market players adjust their own practices in reaction to the presence of the pro-poor change (supporting functions and rules)

**ADOPT**
Partner(s) takes up a pro-poor change that is viable and has concrete plans to continue it in future

**EXPAND**
Similar or competing market players copy the pro-poor change or add diversity by offering variants to it

Piloting phase
Crowding-in phase

Source: Nippard, D. et al., The Springfield Centre (2014)
Examples:
Recommendations:

For funders and implementers

- **Budget for impact evaluations.** To increase the number of evidenced, high confidence examples.

- **Conduct further research and undertake systematic analysis on where evidence is being generated across market systems.** To increase the number of evidenced, high confidence examples.
Also, for implementers and evaluators

- **Investigate and discuss unintended and negative outcomes.** To build a fuller understanding of the impact of MSA programmes to the wider market system.

- **Disaggregate data more fully and analyse differences in results – with a particular, but not exclusive, focus on gender.** To further build our understanding of whom MSA is impacting and how.

- **Be explicit about methodology.** To allow others to better interpret the results from evidence documents.
Recommendations continued:

For funders and implementers:

- Budget for impact evaluations.
- Further research and undertake systematic analysis on where evidence is being generated across market systems.

For implementers and evaluators:

- Investigate and discuss unintended and negative outcomes.
- Disaggregate data more fully & analyse differences in results – with a particular, but not exclusive, focus on gender.
- Be explicit about methodology
BEAM Evidence Map vs DCED Evidence Framework

Incomes and welfare of poor people increase

Employment increases → Economy grows

Productivity/revenues increase

Improved or cheaper products & services for poor people

New firms start/register → Firms/beneficiaries change behaviour

Creating enabling conditions for growth: Business Environment Reform

Addressing constraints within markets: Business, Value Chain, and Market Development

Engaging individual businesses: Donor-Private Sector Partnerships
How do we go forward?

What about results measured by programmes?
How do we go forward?

What are we trying to achieve through evidence?
How do we go forward?

Do we need to get better at advocacy and influencing?
Question 1:
Do the results from DCED-compliant programme monitoring systems meet the criteria of ‘evidence’? Should they?

Question 2:
Have MSD practitioners convinced people outside the MSD community of the merit of an MSD approach? Why?
Points to take forward from discussion
Thank you