Reviewing the evidence - how effective is the MSD approach?
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The market systems lens

BEAM’s Exchange GOALS

1. Capacity building:
expand and strengthen the cadre of capable well-informed practitioners at all levels in our field

2. Coherence:
build consensus and consistency about the meaning, principles and practices of the market systems approach

3. Credibility:
compile, synthesise and raise awareness of the evidence that describes the impact and effectiveness of the MSD approach
Evidence inclusion criteria

**Relevant:** Aligned with the objective of the BEAM evidence base

**Accessible:** Publicly accessible or available on the BEAM website

**Transparent:** Clear about the methodologies of data collection and analysis that are used to measure results

**Credible:** Methods of data collection generate a credible dataset, and methods of analysis generate credible results.

**Cogent:** Presents a convincing argument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review point</th>
<th>Mar 2016</th>
<th>Mar 2017</th>
<th>Dec 2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of evidence documents</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Result levels in the Evidence Map

1. Poverty Reduction
2. Pro-poor growth or improved access to basic services
3. Market system change

Intervention
Types of intervention area in the Evidence Map

- Access to finance
- Access to information
- Input supply
- Marketing of products
- Product or service quality
- Coordination along the value-chain
### Evidence map

#### RESULTS LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Intervention</th>
<th>Intervention</th>
<th>Systemic change</th>
<th>Growth and access to services</th>
<th>Poverty reduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to finance</td>
<td>3 5 8</td>
<td>6 4 10</td>
<td>2 4 6</td>
<td>3 11 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to information</td>
<td>5 6 11</td>
<td>3 7 10</td>
<td>8 5 14</td>
<td>2 14 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved input supply</td>
<td>4 8 12</td>
<td>7 7 14</td>
<td>3 3 6</td>
<td>5 17 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved marketing of products</td>
<td>2 5 8</td>
<td>2 5 7</td>
<td>5 2 7</td>
<td>3 14 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved product / service quality</td>
<td>2 6 8</td>
<td>11 6 17</td>
<td>6 5 11</td>
<td>6 18 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved value chain coordination</td>
<td>12 10 22</td>
<td>10 9 19</td>
<td>7 5 12</td>
<td>9 18 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Evidence map

## Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Intervention</th>
<th>Low Confidence</th>
<th>High Confidence</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to finance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved access to information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved input supply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved marketing of products</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved product / service quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved value chain coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## External review

- Any
- Case study
- Impact evaluation
- Internal review
- Project monitoring report

## Method

- Impact evaluation
- Program change
- Process evaluation
- Sector evaluation
- Service evaluation

## Data source

- Growth and access to services
- Reduction in poverty
- Results from markets
- Results from policies
- Results from projects

## Agriculture

- Growth and access to services
- Reduction in poverty
- Results from markets
- Results from policies
- Results from projects
Documents listed here show impacts on poverty, attributable to interventions that improved access to information for private enterprises, their suppliers or customers in the targeted market system.

E.g. changes in income, nutrition, health or well-being experienced by women and men living in poverty.
Evidence review: Terms of reference

What does the BEAM evidence base tell us about:

- The outcomes of MSD interventions (market systems change)
- The impact of MSD programmes (poverty reduction)
- The cost-effectiveness on the MSD approach
- Your conclusions & recommendations
What we did
Evidence of variety of results documented

Principal type of results described in evidence documents

- Intervention Level: 31
- Systemic Change Level: 50
- Access to Services/Growth Level: 29
- Poverty Reduction: 41
Evidence of variety of results documented

Number of evidence documents by sector

- Agriculture: 108
- Manufacturing: 8
- Tourism: 8
- Cross-sectoral: 13
- Financial Services: 6
- Infrastructure: 4
- Energy Services: 10
- Health / Social Services: 9
- Water & Sanitation: 4
- Education: 3
Some programmes achieve impressive results
Cattle Silage

Example: MDF Silage, Pakistan

- INNOVATIVE SILAGE BUSINESS MODEL + FINANCE
- INCREASE IN BUSINESSES OFFERING SILAGE TO FARMERS
- YEAR-ROUND CATTLE FEED
- 11,000 FARMERS IMPROVED MILK YIELDS
- $15M INCREASE INCOME FOR FARMERS
Example: PRISMA, Pork Production, Indonesia

- **$26M INCREASE INCOME**
- **48,000 FARMERS BENEFIT**
- **IMPROVED PIG SECTOR VALUE (WEIGHT, HEALTH, MEAT)**
- **INCREASE IN BUSINESSES OFFERING GRP TO FARMERS**
- **GOOD REARING PRACTICES + DEMAND**

**PRISMA**

*Promoting Rural Income through Support for Markets in Agriculture*
**Soybean Malawi**

- **$1.4M INCREASE INCOME**
- **17,500 FARMERS IMPROVE ACCESS**
- **IMPROVED PRODUCTION: 15,000 TO 78,000**
- **SUPPORT BUSINESSES PILOT COMMERCIAL INNOCULANT PRODUCTION + DISTRIBUTION**
- **IMPROVE INNOCULANT POLICY + SUPPLY**

Example: MOST, Oil Seed Production, Malawi
The achievements come with caveats...

- Reliant on internal reviews
- Reliant on project-focused case studies
- Publication bias
- Focused on programme logic, not implementation logic
Finding 3 – There is no evidence regarding VFM

Over 50 new resources in 2018
- Only 8 discuss VFM
- Only 4 clear VFM

Challenges:
• Ex-post data absent yet that’s where results are!
• Requires change in how programme spend date is collected
• Conceptually challenging /limited
What kind of evidence is required?

- MSD is challenging for evaluation
  - Self-selecting
  - Lack of control
  - Adaptive
  - Complex

- Research should be:
  - Longitudinal
  - Independent
  - Theory based
What does a solid evidence base look like?

- Clearly define aspect of MSD under evaluation
- Moving from project-based research to:
  - Comparative studies
  - Market system based
- Ex post evaluations