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The cycle of public policy
The importance of evaluation in decision making

- Identify and measure social challenges
- Analysis
  - What works?
- Program design
- Budget allocation
- Program implementation
- Monitoring & Evaluation

Why do we need evidence?
- Improve social policy
- Make better decisions (management, design, budget, etc.)
- Accountability
The cycle of public policy

Improving the decision-making process

- Identify and measure social challenges
- Analysis
  - What works?
- Program design
- Budget allocation
- Program implementation
- Monitoring & Evaluation

Who needs evidence for decision-making?
- Congress
- Ministry of Finance
- Local governments
- Social organizations
- Citizens
- New governments

What evidence-based products do they need?
- Medium/Large-term goals
- Evaluation Report of the Social Development Policy
- Considerations for the budgetary process
- Annual performance report
- Criteria to assess new governments’ proposals
- Practical evidence guidelines
Why countries are interested in evaluations?

* Learning only (China)
* Political incentives:
  - Showing off (State of Coahuila in Mexico)
  - Politicians climbing-up the political ladder
* Accountability from Congress and NGOs (Mexico)
* Improve planning (Colombia)
* Improve management (USA)
* Improve budgetary planning (Chile)
* Build a holistic understanding of development challenges (Canada)
Evaluation criteria

OECD, new

- **Relevance** (Is the intervention doing the right thing?) Assessment involves looking at differences and trade-offs between different priorities or needs.

- **Efficiency** (How well are resources used?). Compare con with other feasible alternatives.

- **Effectiveness** (Is the intervention achieving its immediate objectives? Including unintended outcomes)

- **Sustainability** (Will the benefits last?)

- **Impact** (What difference is the intervention making?) High level effects. Examine the holistic and enduring changes in systems or norms; potential effects on wellbeing, human rights, gender equality, environment.

- **Coherence** (How well does the intervention fit?)
Only **one** type of evaluation (evidence) **cannot address all** these issues, **cannot please** all stakeholders and cannot be on **time**.
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At Stage 0, the program is being designed. Stage 1 onwards corresponds to the amount of years the program has been operating.
### Types of evaluation: Programs and Policies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New Program Initial Assessment</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Consistency and Results</th>
<th>Implementation Process</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define the problem and justify that it is a public problem</td>
<td>Internal logic and consistency</td>
<td>Diagnosis of institutional capacity to achieve results</td>
<td>Analysis of business processes and their contribution to fulfill the purpose</td>
<td>Assessment of policies and strategies for social development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Complementary</th>
<th>Thematic (Integrales)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synthetic assessment of program information</td>
<td>Relevance and scope of the indicators of a program</td>
<td>Measure the net effects of the program</td>
<td>Deepening on relevant aspects of performance</td>
<td>General analysis on the performance social programs for an specific sector of topic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Evaluation

New program initial assessment (diagnosis). M of Finance

Initial analysis to properly define the social problem and justify the program’s creation.

Program’s responsibility
Then, assessment by evaluation teams
Types of Evaluation (M. of Finance and Eval. Office)

**Design**

Evaluates how the program is **logically thought-out**. Yes/No questions. Justification. Evaluator asks the program.

**Key questions it seeks to answer:**

- What problem is the intervention meant to solve?
- What are the expected results?
- Who suffers from this problem? What characteristics do these people have? How many people are there?
- Why was this intervention chosen over others? Has this intervention been successful in other countries?
- What goods and services are meant to be delivered? How? By whom?
- Log Frame. Vertical, horizontal
- Does this intervention overlap with other interventions? How so?
Types of Evaluation

**Design**

- Is the design of the program written in an institutional document?
- Is there an official diagnosis of the program?
- Is the outcome of the program related to the sectorial program?
- Is there a logical link to the National Development Plan?
- Is there a logical link to the SDGs?
- How many people suffer from this specific problem? How many people should be the long-term objective of this problem? How many people will be in the program this year?
- Are there clear mechanism for selecting the beneficiaries?
- Has the program a plan to increase the coverage?
- Is there systematic information on the beneficiaries?
- Are there clear and official operational rules for this program?
- What is the evaluation of the Log-Framework?
Types of Evaluation

Indicators

Identifies the quality of the indicators being used to measure results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation categories</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Outstanding                   | - How does the program measures results? Measures results with all the categories established.  
                                  | - Results and / or findings. The result has all the established characteristics.  
                                  | - Progress of the indicators. The progress of the indicators is between 90 and 110%.                                                   |
| Adequate                      | - How does the program measures results? Measures results with three of the established categories.                                    |
                                  | - Results and / or findings. The result has three of the established characteristics.                                                  |
                                  | - Progress of the indicators. The progress of the indicators is between 80 and 90%.                                                       |
| Moderate                      | - How does the program measures results? Measures results with two of the established categories.                                      |
                                  | - Results and / or findings. The result has two of the established characteristics.                                                   |
                                  | - Progress of the indicators. The progress of the indicators is between 70 and 80%.                                                       |
| Opportunity for improvement   | - How does the program measures results? Measures results with at least one of the established categories.                             |
                                  | - Results and / or findings. The result has at least one of the established characteristics.                                             |
                                  | - Progress of the indicators. The progress of the indicators is less than 70% or greater than 110%.                                    |
| SD                            | - There is no information to assess this element.                                                                                      |
Types of Evaluation

Consistency and results

Analyzes institutional, organizational, and management capacities. Covers six areas: design, strategic planning, program’s implementation, coverage/targeting, beneficiaries’ perception and results.

Key questions it seeks to answer:

• Is the program’s objective tied to the institutional plan?
• Is the target population properly identified in the initial assessment and all official documents?
• Is there a yearly work plan?
• Is data being collected? Is the program’s operation being properly documented?
• Is overall beneficiary satisfaction being measured?
• Are results being measured with strategic indicators and evaluations?
Types of Evaluation

Consistency and results

- Which were the changes made to the implementation of the program to make it inclusive for various social groups?
- Does the program have targeting mechanisms?
- Did the program expand from an evaluated pilot scheme?
- What is the beneficiaries’ perception of the program?
- How does the program measures officially outcomes and impact?
- What the results?
- Is the program aware of the results of impact evaluations for similar programs?
- Does this program have an impact evaluation?
Types of Evaluation (Programs)

Implementation process

Generates information to **improve** the program’s implementation process. Through field work, the evaluation analyzes if the operative processes are done effectively and efficiently.

1. Describe the operation process
2. Identify normative issues that slow-down the benefit delivery process
3. Analyze how each step of the process feeds into the next.
4. Analyze what Works and what could be improved upon.

Diagram:
- Planning
- Roll-out
- Beneficiary applications
- Beneficiary selection
- “Benefit” production
- “Benefit” delivery
- “Benefit” hand-out
- Follow-up and monitoring
- Beneficiary satisfaction
**Impact**

Measures the **effect of a social program on a defined population group**. Using rigorous methodologies, these evaluations identify whether the effects are caused by the policy’s intervention.

**Key factors:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Choosing the right methodology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cuasi-experimental</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Having the right evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Bias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Available data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Data on program beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Program data- registries, databases, administrative records, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Cost and financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Efficient use of funds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Proper communication strategies towards policy makers and the public</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Monitoring (Presidency)

Monitoring and evaluation fact-sheet

Offers a **quick glance** of a program’s performance: results, operation, design and improvements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Objective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results Measurement</td>
<td>Presents and evaluates how the program measures its results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Presents and evaluates the results and findings of the program stemming from external evaluations, as well as indicator progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sector analysis</td>
<td>Describes the program’s contribution to the achievement of sectoral objectives or to the improvement of the sector in general.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT Analysis</td>
<td>Analyzes the program’s strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspects Susceptible of Improvement (ASI) follow-up</td>
<td>Describes the improvement commitments resulting from external evaluations and the progress of each program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive incidence</td>
<td>Analyzes benefit incidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social right or Economic Wellbeing</td>
<td>Links the programs and federal actions with social rights and the economic wellbeing dimension.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the decrease of poverty indicators</td>
<td>Analyzes the contribution of the program to the abatement of the poverty indicators.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Evaluation (M of Finance)

Performance

8-page evaluations that reveal how the program has performed. They intend to monitor progress towards the final goal and targets through the analysis of the program's main monitoring indicators.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Results Related to the Program’s Objectives</th>
<th>Improvements on the Delivery of Goods and Services</th>
<th>Improvements on Indicators and Goals Analysis</th>
<th>Coverage</th>
<th>Coverage Efficiency</th>
<th>% of Achievement on Following the Recommendations from External Evaluations</th>
<th>Progressivity Level</th>
<th>Distributional Impact</th>
<th>2010 Budget Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programa de Empleo Temporal (PET)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>379.59%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
<td>The program is VERY PROGRESSIVE</td>
<td>99.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programa IMSS-Oportunidades</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>90.0%</td>
<td>The program is VERY PROGRESSIVE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seguro Popular (SP)</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>88.54%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>The program is VERY PROGRESSIVE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programa Comunidades Saludables</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Opportunity for Improvement</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>Without Information</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programa Caravanas de la Salud (PCS)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Without Information</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reducción de Enfermedades Prevenibles por Vacunación</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Opportunity for Improvement</td>
<td>Opportunity for Improvement</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Opportunity for Improvement</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Without Information</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROCAMPO para Vivir Mejor</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>99.43%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>The program is VERY REGRESSIVE</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fondo de Apoyo para la Micro, Pequeña y Mediana Empresa (Fondo PYME)</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>150.30%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>Without Information</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Social program inventory

A social program inventory is an extremely useful tool to identify how many social programs are there, at what government level do they operate, their respective target populations, budget, amongst other key characteristics.

The inventory must have:

- Main characteristics
- Objectives (social rights)
- Target population
- Budget
- Evaluation results
- Recommendations’ follow-up

- Type of service provided
- Year in which the program was created
- Geographical area where it operates
- Ministry responsible for the program’s operation

@GHLicona
Types of Evaluation

Thematic

A thematic evaluation analyzes how existing social programs interact with each other and contribute to improving a specific sector/social right (health, housing, employment, social security, primary education...)

The evaluation must:

- Analyze the underlying problem common to all programs
- Describe how each of the existing programs mean to alleviate the problem
- Analyze how each program contributes to solve the problem
- Identify the strengths and achievements of each social program
- Identify the main challenges when trying to intervene together: interactions and gaps
- Summarize what has worked so far (success)
- Elaborate key recommendations
Types of Evaluation

Policy (Planning offices)

Analyzes a public problem and the government’s overall response to address it.

New methodologies to evaluate public policies and government strategies

Social rights diagnosis

Accessibility
Disponibility
Quality

Evaluations of “Ramo 33”

- Evaluation of resources for financial strengthening
  - FAFEF
  - FORTAMUN

- Evaluation of payroll resources
  - FONE
  - FASSA
  - FAETA

- Evaluation of resources for infrastructure
  - FAIS
  - FAM

- Evaluation of resources directed to programs and actions
  - FASP
  - FAM

Evaluation of the Programs derived from the National Development Plan 2013 - 2018
Gain knowledge on what works
Properly identify interventions that, based on evidence, contribute to specific development questions (New Governments)

Encourage the development of impact evaluations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What has already been evaluated in Mexico?</th>
<th>Encourage the evaluation of the impact of existing programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence on the effectiveness of interventions in Mexico.</td>
<td>Disseminate the importance of impact evaluations, their scope and limitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and disseminate existing evaluations to encourage their use.</td>
<td>Develop capacities in impact evaluations within government agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Encourage the development of impact evaluations through technical support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evidence dissemination

Different alternatives have been explored to disseminate the evidence and help to inform public policy, based on systematic reviews and other evidence resources:

a) Repository of systematic reviews relevant to the Mexican context, to contribute to the availability of information, containing their original source and a synthesis of their content in the local language

b) Practical guidelines for improving public policy
Build a holistic understanding of our challenges
Synthesize evidence and create practical guidelines for policy making

Chronic Child Malnutrition

Synthesis of available evidence on a specific topic based on systematic reviews, following eligibility criteria
Improve budgetary planning (Ministers; governors)

Allocate resources efficiently to programs that really contribute to national priorities and goals.

Based on evaluation results, CONEVAL elaborates annually a document called “Considerations for the Budgetary Process”.

This document provides relevant information to the Finance Ministry and the legislative Branch, that’s taken into account when defining a social program’s annual budget.


Note: The program base is not the same in the 4 years because of programmatic and operational changes, but the same methodology for the analysis is applied.
Results
Achievements from evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of evaluation</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring sheet</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistency and Results</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectorial</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1,735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Achievements from evaluation

**Public policy improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of improvement</th>
<th>2010 Programs</th>
<th>2010 Relative participation (%)</th>
<th>2011 Programs</th>
<th>2011 Relative participation (%)</th>
<th>2012 Programs</th>
<th>2012 Relative participation (%)</th>
<th>2013 Programs</th>
<th>2013 Relative participation (%)</th>
<th>2014 Programs</th>
<th>2014 Relative participation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Correct activities or processes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify supports</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantially reorient</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add or relocate</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspend the program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monitoring information use

The improvement of social policy requires that accurate, clear and objective information reaches the actors responsible for making decisions, so CONEVAL follows up on the use made of the information it generates.

From January 2007 to December 2016, **4,214 uses** have been identified

The main actors who make use of the information are:
- Decision makers
- Civil society,
- Academia,
- International organizations,
- Mass media

Source: [http://www.coneval.org.mx/quienessomos/Paginas/Uso-de-la-informaci%C3%B3n-del-CONEVAL-.aspx](http://www.coneval.org.mx/quienessomos/Paginas/Uso-de-la-informaci%C3%B3n-del-CONEVAL-.aspx)
Changes in policy due to evidence

Qualitative examples

**Evidence findings**

- CONEVAL reported that poverty increased between 2008 and 2012.
- The impact evaluation of the “Piso Firme” program showed that the program reduced the number of gastrointestinal diseases.
- The design evaluation of the “Primer Empleo” program showed several flaws in its design and operation, and therefore recommended rethinking the pertinence of maintaining it.
- The impact assessment of the “Progresa-Oportunidades” program identified that iron was not absorbed by the children benefiting from the program through the dietary supplement.

**What happened?**

- In 2013, the federal government implemented a poverty strategy, according to the Multidimensional Poverty Indicator.
- The program’s budget increased by nearly 400% between 2007 and 2012.
- The program was canceled in 2009.
- In 2003 the formula of the dietary supplement of the Progresa-Oportunidades program was modified.
Useful Tips

• Convince a policy maker about an evaluation by thinking how this person is going to win politically. *Link evidence to political incentives.*

• Get some stakeholder’s support to convince a policy maker about an evaluation. *With a little help from my friends.*

• Make public the evaluation when it can include the changes made to the program due to the evaluation process. *Don’t feed the press so easy.*

• Start the evaluation system with an evaluation with high possibilities of showing relatively good results. *Don’t shot on your own foot.*

• SDGs: Implementation for countries has been very difficult. Evaluation is not easy. Let’s focus on implementation first: how to combine SDGs with the countries’ own priorities and address interlinkages.

• Take main stakeholders out for a beer. *Do this with anyone, irrespective of the evaluation process!*

• *Building a (country) evaluation system is a political challenge with technical elements, not the other way round.*
Annex
# Stakeholders

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation firms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financing firms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable foundations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Ministry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistics agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government agencies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program operators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public policy decision-makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategical planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Satisfy political incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Good Evaluation Results</strong></th>
<th><strong>Bad Evaluation Results</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Show-off to media and voters</td>
<td>• Opposition parties get strong evidence to question ongoing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Greater capacity to negotiate more resources for programs</td>
<td>• Media questioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Credibility</td>
<td>• Public opinion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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