Cadasta Foundation

Odisha & Jharkhand, India
Welcome To Your 60dB Results

We enjoyed hearing from 180 of your beneficiaries – they had a lot to say!
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Cadasta Performance Snapshot

Cadasta performs particularly well in the Net Promoter Score and reaching beneficiaries who live in poverty.

**Profile**
- 91% live in poverty

**Impact**
- 26% quality of life 'very much improved'
- 57% quality of life 'slightly improved'

**What Impact**
- Increased sense of safety/security
- Anticipated improvement in access to govt services
- Future investment

**Beneficiary Voice**
"My experience has been excellent. The entire process took a month, versus alternatives which would have taken as much as 6 months. With the help of Cadasta, it was much easier."

**Data Summary**
Quintile Assessment compares Cadasta’s performance with 60dB Global Benchmark comprised of 286 companies and 118,263 beneficiaries. Full details can be found in appendix.

**Net Promoter Score®**
- 69 on a -100 to 100 scale

**Usage of Govt. Services**
- 38% have increased access to government services as a result of mapping

**Level of Worry**
- 74% have level of worry reduced

**Rights**
- 85% report improved ability to protect rights, post-mapping

**Performance vs. 60dB Benchmark**
- TOP 20%
- TOP 40%
- MIDDLE
- BOTTOM 40%
- BOTTOM 20%
**Top Actionable Insights**

**Overall, Cadasta is doing great at satisfaction and reducing ownership vulnerability. This will likely deepen further once beneficiaries receive documentation.**

**Headline**

**Going Great:**
Beneficiary satisfaction is excellent, in fact it is the highest in the sector.

**Detail & Suggested Action**

The Net Promoter Score was excellent at 69 (anything above 50 is excellent)! beneficiaries really loved the quality of Cadasta’s mapping service and how the process was straight-forward and educational.

**An idea:** Ensure helpers emphasize the simplicity of the process and point out the benefits that beneficiaries report.

**A Finding That Jumped Out:**
Mapping has had a significant effect on ownership vulnerability. These effects could increase further once documentation is received.

**For discussion:** Analyse if there is anything that can be done to streamline the documentation step of the process.

**Area For Improvement:**
While beneficiaries were positively impacted, they have not had access to many additional services.

**Detail & Suggested Action**

Despite having high impact across multiple metrics, a smaller segment of beneficiaries reported gaining access to government and private services, as well as making investments. This could be due to lack of information.

**A recommendation:** Disseminate and promote the benefits of the mapping service beyond reducing ownership vulnerability.

*This high proportion is likely driven by the fact that many respondents were only recently mapped, anecdotal feedback suggests it is a time-consuming process, and Coronavirus is likely to have had a significant effect.*
Beneficiary Voices

We love hearing Beneficiary voices. Here are some that stood out.

**Impact Stories**

83% shared how Cadasta had improved their quality of life

“There has been so much change in our lives. They gave us information about newer techniques of farming, informed us on how to improve our savings and open bank accounts.”

“We can now build our house on our land. This is a great improvement for me and my family.”

“I got my land rights [with help from Cadasta] after 10 years without any proof. If I did not have the documentation, the government could have taken our land anytime.”

“Our lives have improved very much. We will use the documents to get caste certificates and for our children’s education.”

“This proof can help us get government benefit schemes like loans, water storage and irrigation.”

“We were worried because the forest department was going to plant trees in our land without our will. Now our confidence to protect our rights has increased.”

“My experience has been excellent. The entire process took a month, versus alternatives would have taken as much as 6 months. With the help of Cadasta, it was much easier.”

“They did so much for us where nobody helped before. The measurement method was fast and easy compared to alternatives.”

**Opinions On Cadasta Value Proposition**

75% were Promoters and were highly likely to recommend

“Hey, our lives have improved very much. We will use the documents to get caste certificates and for our children’s education.”

“This proof can help us get government benefit schemes like loans, water storage and irrigation.”

“We were worried because the forest department was going to plant trees in our land without our will. Now our confidence to protect our rights has increased.”

“My experience has been excellent. The entire process took a month, versus alternatives would have taken as much as 6 months. With the help of Cadasta, it was much easier.”

“They did so much for us where nobody helped before. The measurement method was fast and easy compared to alternatives.”

**Opportunities For Improvement**

6% had a specific suggestion for improvement

“They came to do the mapping but did not finish before leaving. They haven’t come back.”

“I have not received any proof or formal documentation regarding land rights yet. This is the only complaint I have.”
Key Questions We Set Out To Answer

Who is Cadasta Reaching?
- Demographics & Income Profile
- Household Characteristics

Are Beneficiaries Satisfied with Cadasta?
- Net Promoter Score
- Beneficiary Satisfaction by Segment

What Impact is Cadasta Having?
- Impact on Quality of Life
- Property Rights and Ownership Vulnerability
- Households’ Access to Services
- Resulting Investments by Households

“I got my land rights after 10 years without any proof. If I did not have the documentation, the government could have taken our land anytime.”
Beneficiary Profile: Demographics

68% of beneficiaries are male; the average household size is 6.3. There was a wide range in age with the average being 37 years old.

Cadasta appears to be serving a relatively homogenous beneficiary base.
There was a wide degree of variability in demographics.
This suggests that Cadasta’s value proposition is appealing to a broad demographic.

About the Beneficiaries We Spoke With
Data relating to beneficiary characteristics (n = 160)

- **Gender**
  - Male: 68%
  - Female: 32%

- **Age**
  - 90% between 18 – 51 years old
  - 90 Eldest
  - 37 Average
  - 18 Youngest

- **Household Size**
  - Average size: 6.3

- **State**
  - > Odisha (94%)
  - > Jharkhand (6%)
Beneficiary Profile: Inclusivity

Using the Poverty Probability Index® we measured how the income profile of your beneficiaries compares to the Indian average.

Cadasta is serving a significantly lower-income group than the Indian national average, resulting in an inclusivity ratio of 2.0x.

Compared to national averages you’re doing an excellent job at serving relatively less well off beneficiaries.

Income Distribution of Cadasta Relative to India Average
% living below $xx per person / per day (2011 PPP) (n = 180)

Inclusivity Ratio
Degree that Cadasta is reaching low-income beneficiaries in India

2.0x

We calculate the degree to which you are serving low-income beneficiaries compared to the general population.

1 = parity with nat. pop;
> 1 = over-serving;
< 1 = under-serving.

See Appendix for calculation.
Lean Data Insights For Cadasta

Key Questions We Set Out To Answer

- Who is Cadasta Reaching?
  - Demographics & Income Profile
  - Household Characteristics

- Are Beneficiaries Satisfied with Cadasta?
  - Net Promoter Score
  - Beneficiary Satisfaction by Segment

- What Impact is Cadasta Having?
  - Impact on Quality of Life
  - Property Rights and Ownership Vulnerability
  - Households’ Access to Services
  - Resulting Investments by Households

“My experience has been excellent. The entire process took a month, versus alternatives would have taken as much as 6 months. With the help of Cadasta, it was much easier.”
Beneficiary Satisfaction: Net Promoter Score

The Net Promoter Score® is a gauge of satisfaction and loyalty. Anything above 50 is considered very good. A negative score is considered poor. Cadasta’s score of 69 is excellent.

Asking respondents to explain their rating explains what they value and what creates dissatisfaction. These details are on the next page.

We saw that female beneficiaries had a higher NPS than male beneficiaries.

Cadasta has a Net Promoter Score® of 69 which is excellent, and higher than the 60dB Global Average of 41.

**Insight**

You’re the highest rated company in the property rights sector (admittedly our sample size of companies is still relatively small!)

You’re also in the top 20% of our benchmark for this indicator both globally and regionally.

**Net Promoter Score® (NPS)**

Q: On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely are you to recommend the Cadasta service to a friend or family member, where 0 is least likely and 10 is most likely? (n = 172)

**NPS Benchmarks**

- **60 Decibels Global average**: 41
  
  280+ companies

- **South Asia average**: 40
  
  84 companies

- **Property Rights average**: 35
  
  7 companies

NPS = % Promoters — % Detractors

9-10 likely to recommend
0-6 less likely to recommend
NPS Drivers

Promoters value helpful staff and prompt help. Detractors complain about not having received documentation yet.

75% are Promoters

They love:
1. Helpful staff and prompt help
   (64% of Promoters / 46% of all respondents)
2. Reduced worry about land and future
   (45% of Promoters / 32% of all respondents)
3. Getting documentation reliably
   (45% of Promoters / 32% of all respondents)

“They like: “They educated us and taught us to get the documentation efficiently and spending less.”

Tip: Highlight the above value drivers in marketing. Promoters are powerful brand ambassadors — can you reward them?

19% are Passives

They love:
1. Help in documenting process
   (62% of Passives / 15% of all respondents)
2. Reduced uncertainty over land rights
   (27% of Passives / 5% of all respondents)

But complain about:
1. Not having received documentation
   (33% of Passives / 6% of all respondents)

“They appreciate the effort but we haven’t received any formal documentation yet.”

Tip: Passives won’t actively refer you in the same way that Promoters will. What would it take to convert them?

6% are Detractors

They love:
1. Help in documenting process
   (82% of Passives / 15% of all respondents)
2. Reduced uncertainty over land rights
   (27% of Passives / 5% of all respondents)

But complain about:
1. Not having received documentation
   (80% of Detractors / 4% of all respondents)
2. More proper mapping
   (20% of Detractors / 1% of all respondents)

“I appreciate the effort but we haven’t received any formal documentation yet.”

Tip: Negative word of mouth is costly. What’s fixable here?
There was a clear trend in the NPS by gender. Women appeared to have higher NPS on average than men. In addition, having received the documentation or not was a relevant factor. Those who had not received documentation had an NPS of 72, while those who had received it had an NPS of 61, quoting it was incomplete or was only a receipt.

Females had a higher Net Promoter Score than males, albeit based on a small sample size.

Net Promoter Score by Gender

Q: On a scale of 0 to 10, how likely are you to recommend the Cadasta service to a friend or family member, where 0 is least likely and 10 is most likely? (n = 172)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Detractors</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passives</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoters</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NPS: Male 64, Female 81, Total 69

Recommendation

NPS is a helpful metric to track over time to detect subtle changes in Beneficiary satisfaction. Companies looking to improve their NPS set a target of increasing NPS by 7 points over 12 months, on average.
Key Questions We Set Out To Answer

Who is Cadasta Reaching?
- Demographics & Income Profile
- Household Characteristics

Are Beneficiaries Satisfied with Cadasta?
- Net Promoter Score
- Beneficiary Satisfaction by Segment

What Impact is Cadasta Having?
- Impact on Quality of Life
- Property Rights and Ownership Vulnerability
- Households’ Access to Services
- Resulting Investments by Households

“There has been so much change in our lives. They gave us information about newer techniques of farming, informed us on how to improve our savings and open bank accounts.”
Impact Performance: Quality of Life

To gauge depth of impact, beneficiaries were asked to reflect on whether their quality of life has changed because of Cadasta’s product. In total, 83% said their life had improved, with 26% of all beneficiaries reporting it had ‘very much improved’. This is lower than the 60dB benchmark of 34% in the Property Rights sector. Beneficiaries who report ‘very much improved’ quality of life are also more likely to have increased confidence in rights being protected by authorities and mention decreased level of worry.

83% of beneficiaries report an improved quality of life because of Cadasta, with 26% saying their quality of life had “very much improved”.

Perceived Quality of Life Change
Q: Has your quality of life changed because of Cadasta? (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of Life Change</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very much improved</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly improved</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No change</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got slightly worse</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got much worse</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Very much improved: “We have learned many things, not just land related but also about farming, improving our lives and coming out of poverty.”

Slightly improved: “With the documentation, we are now more relaxed and can focus on our farming and growing new crops.”

No change: “We don’t have the documentation yet. People from other villages are still occupying our land.”
Quality of Life: Top Outcomes

Beneficiaries were asked to describe—in their own words—the positive changes they were experiencing because of Cadasta’s information and communication materials. The top outcomes are shown on the right.

Others included:

> Increased happiness (42%)
> Awareness of land rights (19%)

Beneficiaries report that they feel safer, and that they are looking forward to accessing more services as well as making investments in farming and education.

Top Three Self-Reported Outcomes for 83% of Beneficiaries Who Say Quality of Life Improved

Q: Please explain how your quality of life has improved. (n = 180). Open-ended, coded by 60 Decibels.

64% mentioned increased sense of safety (53% of all respondents)

“Our worry has been reduced. We are happy now that we have our land and our rights are protected.”

50% talked about expected improved access to services (42% of all respondents)

“With the documentation, we will be able to get a gas connection, obtain farmer loans and even get a caste certificate.”

46% reported future investments, in farming and education (38% of all respondents)

“Now that I have the documentation, I plan to do more farming and start pisciculture.”
Ownership Vulnerability: Overview

Documenting land has generated a significant positive impact on ownership vulnerability. Beneficiaries report decreased worry, increased confidence and less disputes.

The impact of documenting land has been clearly beneficial for beneficiaries. The vast majority state that their level of worry and likelihood of losing their property have decreased, while their ability and confidence to protect their rights have increased. Documentation has also brought tangible results, such as a reduction in the number of disputes or conflict arising from land ownership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection of Rights</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>reported increased ability to protect their rights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Authorities</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>reported increased confidence on defending rights if challenged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Worry</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>reported a reduction in their level of worry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes</td>
<td>93%*</td>
<td>reported a reduction in the number of disputes regarding ownership *(this is among the 24% who reported experiencing prior disputes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losing Rights</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>reported a lower likelihood of losing their property rights</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ownership Vulnerability: Level of Worry

19% of beneficiaries reported being ‘very worried’ and 56% ‘slightly worried’ of losing their property before having their land registered. However, the impact of registration has been significant, as 74% of them now feel less worried and more protected from the government or other claims.

Before mapping, 75% of beneficiaries were ‘very worried’ and ‘slightly worried’ about losing their property. However, after documentation, 74% report this worry has decreased.

Before Mapping: Perceived Level of Worry
Q: Before your land was mapped/registered, were you worried that you could lose the right to use this property against your will in the next five years? (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very worried</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly worried</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not worried</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Mapping: Change in Level of Worry
Q: Has the amount you worry changed since having your land mapped/registered? (n = 180)

- **Decreased**: 74%
  - “Now that everything is mapped and registered, we have no worries.”
  - 32% mentioned it was due to registration of land (43% of decreased / 32% of all respondents)
  - 18% felt more protected from government (25% of decreased / 18% of all respondents)
- **Stayed the same**: 26%
  - “I don’t have the documents yet, when I do, I will be stress free.”
  - 13% were not previously worried (49% of stayed the same / 13% of all respondents)
  - 12% reported documentation had not arrived yet (47% of stayed the same / 12% of all respondents)
Ownership Vulnerability: Losing Rights

Despite having a greater proportion of beneficiaries who were unlikely to lose their property rights (50%) versus those who believe it was likely (40%), 58% of them reported this likelihood had decreased.

**Before Mapping: Likelihood to Lose Property Rights**
Q: Before your land was mapped/registered, how likely were you to lose the right to use this property, or part of this property, against your will in the next five years? (n = 180)

- **Very likely**: 8%
- **Somewhat likely**: 32%
- **Unlikely**: 28%
- **Very unlikely**: 22%
- **Don’t know**: 11%

**After Mapping: Likelihood Change**
Q: Has the possibility of losing this property against your will changed since having your land mapped/registered? (n = 180)

- **Decreased**: 58%
  - “Nobody can remove my name from the registration without my will.”
  - Pointed land mapping was crucial (84% of decreased / 48% of all respondents)
  - “We would have never lost the land as there were no recent disputes.”
- **Stayed the same**: 42%
  - Reported generational ownership of land (72% of stayed the same / 31% of all respondents)
  - Talked about increased confidence (25% of stayed the same / 11% of all respondents)
- **Increased**: 11%
  - 31%
Ownership Vulnerability: Protection of Rights

59% of beneficiaries believed they were not able to protect their property rights before documentation, but 85% have perceived an increase in ability.

Before Mapping: Ability to Protect Rights
Q: Before your land was mapped/registered, if the state or a private entity tried to challenge your rights to live in or otherwise use your property, would you have known how to defend your rights? (n = 180)

- Yes: 25%
- No: 59%
- Don't know: 16%

After Mapping: Change in Ability
Q: Has your ability to protect or defend you or your community’s rights changed since having your land mapped/registered? (n = 180)

- Increased: 85%
  - “The registration will help us defend our rights and benefits.”
  - 46% pointed at the legal proof to back claim (54% of increased / 46% of all respondents)
  - 33% reported increased confidence (39% of increased / 33% of all respondents)
- Stayed the same: 15%
  - “I hope we had learned more and had a person to refer to.”
  - 6% mentioned documentation had not arrived yet (41% of stayed the same / 6% of all respondents)
  - 4% talked about lack of information (30% of stayed the same / 4% of all respondents)
Ownership Vulnerability: Confidence in Authorities

Before documentation, 5% of beneficiaries were ‘very confident’ and 17% were ‘somewhat confident’ that authorities would protect them regarding property rights. The impact of registration has been significant, as 82% report their confidence in authorities has increased.

22% of beneficiaries were confident to some extent on receiving support from authorities. However, since registration, 82% reported this has increased.

**Before Mapping: Confidence of Authorities Support**

Q: Before your land was mapped/registered, how confident were you that the authorities would protect you if the state or a private entity tried to take away your right to use your property against your will? (n = 180)

- Very confident: 5%
- Somewhat confident: 17%
- Not confident: 35%
- Not confident at all: 21%
- Don’t know: 22%

**After Mapping: Change in Confidence**

Q: Has your confidence in your land rights being protected by the authorities if the state or a private entity threatened them changed since having your land mapped/registered? (n = 180)

- Stayed the same: 18%
- Increased: 82%
Ownership Vulnerability: Disputes

The majority of beneficiaries, 73%, reported they had not experienced any disputes or conflict beforehand. However, 22% stated they occasionally experienced these issues.

After registering, 65% of those who reported disputes before, reported these disputes had decreased, a positive sign of the impact of property rights.

73% of beneficiaries reported not having previous disputes or conflict over their property rights. Of those who did, 65% reported number of related issues has decreased.

Before Mapping: Recurrence of Disputes
Q: Before your land was mapped/registered, did you experience disputes or conflict over the ownership of your property/land? (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, regularly</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, occasionally</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Mapping: Change in Disputes
Q: Has the number of disputes or conflicts over ownership of your property/land changed since having your land mapped/registered? (n = 43)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stayed the same</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the proper documentation, 38% of beneficiaries reported increased access to government services such as benefit schemes, irrigation, farming inputs and basic needs including water, gas and electricity.

Similarly, 27% mentioned their access to private services has increased, citing loan facilities, financial services (i.e. bank accounts), irrigation and farming techniques as the most important.

While most beneficiaries reported their access to services (government or private) has stayed the same, 38% reported an increase in government and 27% in private services.

### Access to Government Services

**Q:** Since having your land mapped/registered, has your access to government services (e.g. water sources) changed? (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased access</th>
<th>Decreased access</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top services:**
- Government benefit schemes (71% of increased / 27% of all respondents)
- Water, gas and electricity (22% of increased / 8% of all respondents)
- Irrigation and farming inputs (13% of increased / 5% of all respondents)

### Access to Private Services

**Q:** Since having your land mapped/registered, has your access to private services (e.g. a loan) changed? (n = 180)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased access</th>
<th>Decreased access</th>
<th>Stayed the same</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Top services:**
- Loan facilities (67% of increased / 18% of all respondents)
- Farming inputs (18% of increased / 5% of all respondents)
- Financial services (8% of increased / 2% of all respondents)
Resulting Investments

16% of beneficiaries have already invested in further farming (new crops and inputs), as well as non-land items such as their children’s education or construction work.

17% state that they have not invested yet, but will do so in the near future, specifically in farming inputs.

Another 17% state that they have not invested due to not having access to additional government schemes or private services.

Investments as a Result of Documenting Land

Q: Have you made any investments in your property, business, crops or family education as a result of documenting your land through the indigenous and community land-mapping project? (n = 180)

16% of beneficiaries stated documenting land resulted in investments, while 78% reported it did not. However, 17% of respondents plan to invest in the near future.

- Farming new fruits and vegetables (61% of yes / 9% of all respondents)
- Bought more farming input (i.e. seeds) (39% of yes / 6% of all respondents)
- Invested in education of children (14% of yes / 2% of all respondents)
- Have not received documentation yet (69% of no / 54% of all respondents)
- Plan to invest in the future (21% of no / 17% of all respondents)
- No access to additional services (21% of no / 17% of all respondents)

6% Don’t know
What Next?

…& Appendix
How To Make The Most Of These Insights

Example tweets or Facebook posts to share publicly:

- 83% of our beneficiaries say the quality of their lives has improved since working with us. "We have learned many things, not just land related but also about farming, improving our lives and coming out of poverty." #listenbetter with @60_decibels

- 85% of our beneficiaries have an increased ability to protect their property rights and 74% are less worried after mapping their land. What about you? #listenbetter with @60_decibels

Here are ideas for ways to engage your team and use these results to fuel discussion and inform decisions.

---

What You Could Do Next. An Idea Checklist From Us To You :-)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What You Could Do Next</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engage Your Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Share staff quiz</td>
<td>– it’s a fun way to fuel engagement &amp; discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Send deck to team &amp; invite feedback, questions and ideas. Sometimes the best ideas come from unexpected places!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Set up team meeting &amp; discuss what’s most important, celebrate the positives &amp; identify next steps</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spread The Word</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reach a wider audience on social media &amp; show you’re invested in your beneficiaries – we’ve added some example posts on the left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Close The Loop</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Let us know if you’d like us to send an SMS to interviewed beneficiaries with a short message letting them know feedback is valued and as a result, you’ll be working on delivering documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- If you can, call back the beneficiaries with challenges and/or complaints to find out more and show you care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- After reading this deck, don’t forget to let us know what you thought our feedback survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Take Action!</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Collate ideas from team into action plan including responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Keep us updated, we’d love to know what changes you make based on these insights</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Comparison to benchmarks can be useful to identify where you are under- or over-performing versus peers, and help you set targets. We have aligned your results to the Impact Management Project framework – see next slide.

Information on the benchmarks is found below:

**Company Data**
- # beneficiaries: 180

**60dB Global Average:**
- # companies: 286
- # beneficiaries: 118,263

**60dB Property Rights Average**
- # companies: 7
- # beneficiaries: 1,741

**60dB South Asia Average**
- # companies: 84
- # beneficiaries: 28,552

**Detailed Benchmarking Comparison**

Cadasta performs particularly well on serving relatively less well off beneficiaries. Quality of life ‘very much improved’ is an area for improvement relative to comparables.

**Comparison of Company Performance to Selected 60dB Benchmarks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Cadasta</th>
<th>60dB Global Average</th>
<th>60dB Property Rights Average</th>
<th>60dB South Asia Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>% live in poverty (below $3.20 line)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusivity Ratio</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Much</td>
<td>% reporting quality of life very much improved</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting quality of life slightly improved</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Impact</td>
<td>% reporting increased ability to protect rights</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting increased confidence on defending rights</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting reduction in level of worry</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting reduction in number of disputes</td>
<td>93*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting lower likelihood of losing rights</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>% reporting increased access to government services</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% reporting increased access to private services</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% making investments as a result</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>Net Promoter Score</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This is for 24% of respondents who reported experiencing prior disputes. If taken at a proportion of total respondents, it is 22% reporting reducing in number of disputes.
We aligned your results to the Impact Management Project. We’re big fans of the IMP – it’s a simple, intuitive and complete way of conceptualizing impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Who</td>
<td>The Who of impact looks at the stakeholders who experience social and environmental outcomes. All things equal, the impact created is greater if a particularly marginalised or underserved group of people is served, or an especially vulnerable part of the planet protected. For the who of impact, we tend to work with our clients to understand poverty levels, gender and disability inclusivity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What Impact</td>
<td>What investigates the outcomes the enterprise is contributing to and how material those outcomes are to stakeholders. We collect most of this what data using qualitative questions designed to let beneficiaries tell us in their own words the outcomes they experience and which are most important to them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How Much</td>
<td>How Much looks at the degree of change of any particular outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution</td>
<td>Contribution seeks to understand whether an enterprise’s and/or investor’s efforts resulted in outcomes that were better than what would have occurred otherwise. In formal evaluation this is often studied using experimental research such as randomised control trials. Given the time and cost of gathering these data, this is not our typical practice. We instead typically ask beneficiaries to self-identify the degree to which the changes they experience result from the company in question. We ask beneficiaries whether this was the first time they accessed a product of technology like the one from the company, and we ask how easily they could find a good alternative. If a Beneficiary is, for the first time, accessing a product they could not easily find elsewhere, we consider that the product or service in question has made a greater contribution to the outcomes we observe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>Impact Risk tells us the likelihood that impact will be different than expected. We are admittedly still in the early days of figuring out how best to measure impact risk – it’s an especially complex area. That said, where beneficiaries experience challenges using their product or service, we do think that this correlates with a higher risk that impact does not happen (i.e. if a product or service is not in use then there’s no impact). Hence, we look at challenge rates (the percent of beneficiaries who have experienced challenges using a product or service), and resolution rates (the percent of beneficiaries who experienced challenges and did not have them resolved) as Beneficiary based proxies for impact risk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For those who like to geek out, here’s a summary of some of the calculations we used in this deck.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Calculation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Net Promoter Score®</td>
<td>The Net Promoter Score is a common gauge of Beneficiary loyalty. It is measured through asking beneficiaries to rate their likelihood to recommend your service to a friend on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is least likely and 10 is most likely. The NPS is the % of beneficiaries rating 9 or 10 out of 10 ('Promoters') minus the % of beneficiaries rating 0 to 6 out of 10 ('Detractors'). Those rating 7 or 8 are considered 'Passives'.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Inclusivity Ratio           | The Inclusivity Ratio is a metric developed by 60 Decibels to estimate the degree to which an enterprise is reaching less well-off beneficiaries. It is calculated by taking the average of Company % / National %, at the $1.90, $3.20 & $5.50 lines for low-middle income countries, or at the $3.20, $5.50 and $11 lines for middle income countries. The formula is;  

\[
\frac{\sum_{x=1}^{3} \left( \frac{\text{Company Poverty Line } x}{\text{Country Poverty Line } x} \right)}{3}
\]

Summary Of Data Collected

180 phone interviews completed between March and June 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Survey mode</td>
<td>Phone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>India</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Oriya, Hindi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>March – June 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses Collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margin of error</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About 60 Decibels

60 Decibels makes it easy to listen to the people who matter most. 60 Decibels is an impact measurement company that helps organizations around the world better understand their beneficiaries, suppliers, and beneficiaries. Its proprietary approach, Lean Data℠, brings Beneficiary-centricity, speed and responsiveness to impact measurement.

60 Decibels has a network of 280+ trained Lean Data℠ researchers in 35+ countries who speak directly to beneficiaries to understand their lived experience. By combining voice, SMS, and other technologies to collect data remotely with proprietary survey tools, 60 Decibels helps clients listen more effectively and benchmark their social performance against their peers.

60 Decibels has offices in London, Nairobi, New York, and Bengaluru. To learn more, visit 60decibels.com.

Your Feedback

We’d love to hear your feedback on the 60dB process; take 5 minutes to fill out our feedback survey here!
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I am now tension free.

We used to get into disputes.

This gave us confidence.

We learned about

> new farming techniques
> how to live better lives
> help ourselves out of poverty
> focus on our children’s education

from this experience.
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