

Economic Poverty / Assets / Housing - Outcomes Indicators - Draft Recommended List for Feedback

Indicator	Note	Criteria				
		Salient	Usable	Clear	Feasible	Comparable
Theme: Economic Poverty						
After years 3 and 5 : % of client households above the benchmarked poverty line, who were below the line at entry	Baseline indicator: % new client households below benchmarked poverty line	√+	√+	√+	√	√+
After years 3 and 5 : % poor clients in year 1 still with MFI, % of them now above the poverty line, % still below the poverty line		√+	√+	√+	√	√+
% change in client households' poverty rate per the PPI		√	√+	√+	√+	√+
Theme Notes: 1. The broad indicator is: 'change in poverty level'. 2. Usable/Feasible: Regarding PPI – recommend it where it is available - it is simple, straightforward and easy to use. Can be supplemented with additional indicators from other themes relevant to rural or urban context. Not every country has a PPI – or the PPI may be out of date. If the PPI is unavailable, check for a local poverty index, or other measurement method. 3. Comparable – to national benchmarks 4. Salient and Usable over longer time horizon. Every loan cycle has data, but evidence suggests may want to do analysis in years 3 and 5 per Social Indicators Project.						
Theme: Assets		THIS THEME DOES NOT INCLUDE BUSINESS ASSETS				
% HH acquiring additional key household assets , by year, (such as radio/tape player, chairs/table/benches, bed frame/mattress, stove, refrigerator, TV, bicycle etc.), since joining the program	Baseline indicator: % HH having key household assets, such as radio/tape player, chairs/table/benches, bed frame/mattress, stove, refrigerator, TV, bicycle etc.	√+	√	√+	√+	√+
Theme Notes: 1. Comparable - to national benchmarks (DHS - http://dhsprogram.com/) 2. Feasible - There are a large number of potential assets to collect, but select only the most relevant as they can take a large amount of time to collect and analyze. 3. Salient - Specific choice of assets varies between context - terminology and examples should be adapted locally. 4. Usable - A time dimension is important in assets to look at the direction of change in the household and to recognize that often assets may be built up over a longer period of time and there may be big differences in the value of the same asset (A new mobile phone compared to one that is 5 years old). Another consideration is when an asset becomes obsolete; underlines the usable selection criteria related to % of clients with an asset at baseline. 6. Clear - The distinction between household and business assets is often not clear.						
Theme: Assets - Quality of Life						
% of HH with access to electricity, as compared to baseline		√	√-	√+	√+	√+
% of HH who have access to an improved type of toilet, since baseline		√	√	√+	√+	√+
% of HH with improved main source of drinking water since baseline		√	√	√+	√+	√+
% of HH using clean or efficient energy sources for cooking since baseline		√	√	√+	√+	√+
Theme Notes: 1. Salient – more relevant to rural context than urban context where there might be more established infrastructure; access dependent upon environment and not necessarily the influence of the MFI. 2. Comparable – indicators can be compared to national benchmarks (DHS - http://dhsprogram.com/) 3. Regarding the criteria of Usability –Water and sanitation do come up in relation to housing and the status of the household in terms of the services that the house has access to. Are these outcomes of microfinance in general vs. specialized products and services focused on improving water/sanitation?; does the outcome indicator align to specified inputs/program interventions; does it respond to the capability of MFI to influence? Opted to include here because they do reflect the socio-economic status of the household.						

Economic Poverty / Assets / Housing - Outcomes Indicators - Draft Recommended List for Feedback

Indicator	Note	Criteria				
		Salient	Usable	Clear	Feasible	Comparable
Theme: Housing						
% HH who made specific changes to the home in the last two years: (1) fixed or improved existing roof, floor, or walls; (2) expanded the house (built new room, shed, attic, or fence); (3) improved water or sanitation system (new well, drainage/sewage system, showers or latrine); or (4) percent who got electricity or major improvement in lighting since baseline	Overlap with Quality of Life Indicators: water, sanitation, etc.	√	√	√+	√+	√+
Theme Notes:						
<p>1. Usable - While housing is universally important, it is very contextual. It seems to be impossible to have standardized indicators, so think in terms of dimensions.</p> <p>2. Are these outcomes of microfinance in general vs. specialized products and services focused on improving housing?; does it respond to the capability of MFI to influence?</p> <p>3. Feasible - Reliable and cost-effective outcome area (clients with housing finance services (MFR)).</p> <p>4. Salient - Housing is a long term investment and therefore it needs security of tenure, for the future etc. In a volatile context housing is not likely to be a good indicator.</p> <p>5. Comparable - to national benchmarks (DHS - http://dhsprogram.com/)</p>						
Theme: Income - Not Recommending						
Many of these indicators are related to the stability of income, from single or diverse sources.		Salient	Usable	Clear	Feasible	Comparable
Average % change in household income		√+	√	√	√-	√
% HH whose overall household income has increased over the last twelve months		√+	√	√	√-	√
% of clients with increase in income or stabilization of income		√+	√	√	√-	√
HH with ↑, →, ↓ number of sources of income since baseline		√	√	√	√	√-
<p>1. Feasibility - to collect the data and be managed within any method applied by the FSP is difficult. Income calculations—especially in group lending methodology—are vulnerable to loan officer bias and limited experience conducting the kind of thorough due diligence needed to capture the full picture (WWB). Different approaches to measuring income - 1. to quantify income vs. 2. the perception of change (issues with recall). Difficult to measure accurately given seasonality</p> <p>2. Salient – Income indicators aren’t relevant in all contexts (depending on household size, a change in one income may not effect the household (AIMS))</p> <p>3. Not recommending, but if used, then the method, questions and the analysis need to be carefully thought through considering the above points.</p>						