



Monitoring and Measuring Results in Private Sector Development. Good practices for SDC program managers to enable implementing partners to design, apply, and benefit from a monitoring and results measurement system that enables learning and reporting credible results and that complies with the DCED Standard for Results Measurement.

The Good Practices paper was developed in 2016 and in late 2018 we sought feedback using an on-line survey and conducting in-depth interviews with SDC program managers. The Good Practices Paper is with more than 750 unique downloads **among the top three of the most-downloaded resources** from the DCED website. We share the feedback and highlight a few changes made in the revised Good Practices Paper that can be downloaded [here](#).

An overwhelming majority of the respondents¹ state that they are convinced that **the DCED Standard helps to improve program performance and credible reporting**, and that this Good Practices Paper helps to understand the principles, benefits and resources needed to apply the DCED Standard.

SDC program managers find that it helps them to **steer the tender process and program implementation**, helps them to **manage the relationship with the implementing agency** and helped to **build a stronger monitoring system**.

SDC program managers confirm that its often the implementing agency that proposes to apply a DCED compliant monitoring and results measurement system but a majority of the respondents now feel that **the request for tenders should specify that the monitoring and results measurement system should be compliant with the DCED Standard**.

Most SDC program managers are of the opinion that programs that apply a DCED compliant monitoring and results measurement system **should be audited**. Half of the respondents feel that the formal audit could be replaced by an external review of the MRM system. Among the reasons included are the presumed high auditing costs, the resource-intensive audit preparations, and limited added value in terms of learning. However, few SDC program managers are aware of **the difference between these reviews and formal DCED audits**. The reviews are not the best tool to assess the degree of DCED compliance and are better characterized as technical assistance to help identify the strength and weaknesses and help address the gaps in the monitoring and results measurement system.

The Good Practices Paper has been revised to address some of the feedback. A major addition is the information on the MRM system reviews (also known as pre-audit reviews) and formal DCED audits: **why programs should be reviewed and audited, when and how to plan for reviews and formal audits, how to budget for them and elaborating the roles and responsibilities of the SDC program managers**.

For more information contact [Peter Beez](#) (Focal Point e+i: SDC network of employment and income projects and programmes) or [Hans Posthumus](#) (Trainer Consultant HPC).

¹ N=15, and for most statements mentioned here they reflect the opinion of more than 90% of the respondents.