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**I. KCP Type**









**II. General Information**

**KCP Title: IMPACT EVALUATION TRAINING, WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS FOR GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, EXECUTING AGENCIES AND OTHER KEY STAKEHOLDERS**

**OPUS Number: Date of Proposal: New KCP: Linked to project:**

   

**Team Leader / Unit:**

 

**Joint Proposal:**

If yes, identify units: (1)  (2)  (3) 

**Proposed amount** in USD equivalent (enter whole number only, ex. 99,800): USD ****

**Unit of Technical Responsibility:**  **Unit of Disbursement Responsibility:** 

**Letters of Request available Non-objection**

**Execution:** (or equivalent) **available**

  

**Execution period:  months Disbursement period:  months**

**Executing Agency:**



**Executing Agency description and capacity:**



**Country of Origin of Executing Agency:**



**Contact in the Executing Agency:**



**E-mail address:**



**Beneficiary Countries:**













If ALL 26 borrowing member countries (LAC) will benefit from the project, check: 

 CAN  CCB  CID  CSC  REGIONAL

**Beneficiary entity:** 

**Sector:** 

**III. Relation to IDB’s Institutional Priorities (GN-2518-20)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 1. Social Policy for Equity and Productivity | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 2. Infrastructure for Competitiveness and Social Welfare | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 3. Institutions for Growth and Social Welfare | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 4. Competitive Regional and Global International Integration | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 5. Protecting the Environment and Responding to Climate Change | |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| **--------------------------------------------------------------------------** | |
|  | |
| Cross-cutting | |
|  |  |
|  |  |

3.1 For Advisory Services and Policy and Capacity KCPs, briefly explain how this KCP is aligned with the country or regional programming and client needs. For Outreach and Dissemination and Research and Development KCPs, briefly explain how this KCP is aligned with the need to deepen the Bank’s knowledge in new areas or disseminates it in the region:

Training and technical advice will be provided in order to design and implement rigorous impact evaluations. This outreach and dissemination effort will be done through IDB-developed courses that provide a practical introduction to the main issues in impact evaluation, and that highlight the key aspects to consider when working in the field in order to carry out successful evaluations. In the context of the implementation of the Development Effectiveness Framework, SPD/SDV has developed a course on impact evaluation that has been offered to professional Bank staff in nine sector divisions (EDU, FMM, SPH, GDI, SCT, ICS, CMF, RND and WSA). SPD/SDV has been contacted by development partners in the region to provide a similar course, and has done so in Guatemala (Technical Secretariat of the Presidency, 2009), El Salvador (Technical Secretariat of the Presidency, 2010), Guyana (Central Housing Planning Authority, 2010), Costa Rica (*Instituo Mixto de Ayuda Social, 2010)* and Argentina (Government of Buenos Aires Province, 2010).

The courses are based on readily available knowledge on how to design, implement and use impact evaluations, packaged in a practical way. The objective of such courses is to promote the use of impact evaluations, that in turn will generate evidence of what works (or not) and why. This knowledge needs to be disseminated in order for others to learn from these experiences and also to adapt and improve particular projects. The courses also emphasize, in line with the principles of the DEF applied within the Bank, the need for stakeholders and governments to take steps to institutionalize the practice of monitoring, learning and evaluation. Elements to do so successfully are also part of the courses.

**IV. OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED RESULTS AND ACTIVITIES**

4.1 Briefly describe the knowledge gap that KCP intends to close; lessons learned from previous similar KCP; objectives and expected results.

During the training courses on impact evaluation provided to IDB staff, there were two important lessons that are relevant to understand the need for this KCP. First, in all of the courses participants expressed the need to strengthen local capacities in impact evaluation. These include executing agencies, line ministries, central ministries (finance and/or planning) as well as other government agencies and key stakeholders such as academic institutions. IDB Professionals suggested offering a similar course in the region, with the purpose of transferring core evaluation abilities to stakeholders in the region. The courses offered to IDB-Staff do not intend to form expert evaluators, but rather to train people on how to become a sophisticated consumer of evaluations, as well as becoming aware of common opportunities to design and implement impact evaluations that in many occasions are not properly identified. This approach has been successful with Bank staff, and is the same approach that is being used and demanded in the courses in the region.

Given that successful impact evaluations are closely linked and related to project execution and implementation, it is essential to train executing agencies on impact evaluation so that they are aware of the implications that changes in implementation have on the evaluation mechanisms. People in the field are key at all stages of an impact evaluation, from posing relevant evaluation questions to detecting opportunities for innovative evaluation approaches to ensuring that the project and the evaluation are implemented in a timely manner.

A second lesson is that some sectors are lagging behind others in terms of evaluation. Although overall in the region there is a need to emphasize the importance of impact evaluations, the need is stronger in sectors outside education, social protection and health. Other sectors such as transport, competitiveness, housing and agriculture require additional support in order to incorporate impact evaluations in their mainstream work.

Finally, PRODEV has also documented, within its Evaluation System in the area of Management for Results, that Monitoring and Evaluation (along with Budgeting by Results) is the area where the region is further behind. In a scale of 0-5, the region averages less than two, and even in those countries that are relatively ahead there are important challenges such as working with local governments, where the bulk of the budget is spent but where the M&E systems typically do not operate, and extending moving from process to impact evaluations as well as extending the number of sectors on which evaluations are typically done.

Based on this background, this KCP will disseminate practical knowledge on how to design and implement impact evaluations, with the objective of producing rigorous impact evaluations as a result of the activities. The underlying assumption is that when interested counterparts contact the IDB requesting support for impact evaluations, the solutions we provide with courses and workshops will transfer them useful knowledge that will result in the actual design and implementation of rigorous evaluations. During the period of execution of this KCP impact evaluations will not be finalized, however solid designs and initial stages of implementation will take place and we will monitor their completion.

This is the first systematic effort of the IDB to provide practical knowledge in impact evaluation to partners in the region. PRODEV through its training on Management for Results provides very broad elements of Monitoring and Evaluation, without emphasizing on impact evaluation and its implementation. Also, governments have expressed PRODEV the need for further training in impact evaluation design and implementation.

Given that the nature of this Outreach / Dissemination KCP is precisely to transfer practical tools regarding impact evaluation (tools that have been developed by SPD and transferred to IDB professional staff in VPS successfully) to stakeholders in the region, SPD believes that the main activities of this KCP fit the considerations set forth in par. 2.11 of the Bank´s Policy on Technical Cooperation (GN-2470-2), namely that they are Non Financial Products that “are focused externally and are designed to directly benefit borrowing countries”. The IDB has developed an applied course on impact evaluation that has been tailored to the needs of borrowing countries, and as such we are uniquely positioned in the region to carry out the activities described in the KCP. The high demand that we have from borrowing countries that trust the IDB as a technical partner that understands the implementation difficulties that they face in the field supports the need for the Bank to act as Executing Agency of this KCP.

**Components, Activities and Methodological Framework:**

Provide a description of the main components and activities expected to be carried out:

This KCP has two components.

Component 1: Capacity building on impact evaluation. The activities include training workshops, seminars and policy dialogues demanded by the stakeholders described above. Both training materials and instructors will support/deliver courses in the language of the beneficiary country.

Component 2: Publications. As part of this KCP, we will generate two publications. One will be a practical impact evaluation guideline targeted to executing agencies on how to design and implement impact evaluations. It will be based on the core lectures of the evaluation courses, with a non-technical language and emphasizing practical issues. We have not found such a publication available and have perceived the need for one (in particular there is a great need for a rigorous yet non-technical impact evaluation guideline in Spanish for policy-makers). A second publication will be geared to central ministries and those interested in how to set up monitoring and evaluation systems, at the national and/or sub national level. It will present the key elements of an M&E system and discuss the practical alternatives that governments have to set it up. Both publications will be developed in Spanish and translated to English, Portuguese and French.

4.2 Year One

In 2010 we plan to organize at least six events under Component 1: Five impact evaluation courses: Ministry of Agriculture in Dominican Republic, Ministry of Agriculture in Mexico (other CA countries will be invited, TBD), CORFO (Industry Promotion Agency in Chile), SEBRAS in Brazil, Ministry of Health and President´s Office in Honduras, National Training Institution and Ministry of Labor in Panama, and a regional policy dialogue for MIDEPLAN in Chile with the participation of experts from Canada, Mexico, Brazil and Colombia. These activities have been requested by key stakeholders in the region and are being organized in coordination with the relevant sector divisions within the IDB. We anticipate further demand for these activities, and we could provide between two and four additional workshops or seminars in 2010.

In 2010 we plan to start with the production of the publications described above under Component 2.1. The practical evaluation guideline will be developed by SDV staff during the preparation of the courses, so we only consider hiring a part time research assistant to put together the notes. The second will be carried out by a consultant under close supervision by SPD, so in 2010 we will develop the Terms of Reference and select the consultant.

4.3 Subsequent Years

In 2011, based on the demand we have faced so far, we expect to organize at least six additional courses. In 2011 both publications will be finalized.

4.4 If project execution spans more than one year, briefly describe how current year activities feed into the plan of activities for subsequent years:

In component 1, the different activities are largely independent from each other, so the courses in 2010 will not affect directly the courses of 2011. In component 2, the publications will be defined in 2010 and produced continuously through 2011, so the activities in the first year will determine the work to be completed in 2011. This holds in particular for the Guide Implementation of M&E systems, as the other publication will largely follow the structure of the courses.

4.5 When warranted, describe the methodological approach to be used in the development of the activities and the type of data sources which might be u-sed.

**V. KCPs RESULTS FRAMEWORK.** Main Deliverables (outputs) by component.When warranted, describe dissemination strategy:

List main deliverables 1) publications; 2) conferences, workshops, seminars; 3) training courses; 4) databases; 5) surveys; 6) other (specify); and dates for final completion.

5.1 For publication deliverables: Based on the taxonomy of the Bank’s publication protocol (books, monographs, working papers, policy briefs, technical notes, newsletters, discussion papers and presentations or studies for conferences and technical meetings), list the specific types of publications as the deliverables.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverables Year 1 | Intermediate Milestone (if applicable) | Milestone Date (if applicable) | Expected Completion Date |
| Impact Evaluation Training to Executing Agency and Government Agency Mexico, Agriculture |  |  | September 2010 |
| Impact Evaluation Training to Executing Agency and Government Agency Dominican Republic Agriculture |  |  | September 2010 |
| Impact Evaluation Training to Executing Agency and Government Agency in Honduras, Health and Social Protection |  |  | October 2010 |
| Impact Evaluation Training to Executing Agency and Government Agency Chile Clusters-Competitiveness |  |  | October 2010 |
| Impact Evaluation Training to Executing Agency and Government Agency in Mexico, Agricultural Policy (PROCAMPO) |  |  | October 2010 |
| Impact Evaluation Training to two additional executing agencies or ministries. |  |  | Dec 2010 |
| Seminar – Policy Dialogue in Chile on Evaluation System for Social Policies |  |  | December 2010 |
| Concept Note on Alternatives for Implementation of M&E systems |  |  | November 2010 |
| Deliverables Subsequent Years | Intermediate Milestone | Milestone Date | Expected Completion Date |
| 6 Impact Evaluation Training Activities to Executing Agencies and/or Government Ministries |  |  | Nov 2011 |
| Publication on Alternatives for Implementation of M&E systems |  |  | July 2011 |
| Publication of Practical Guide for the Design and Implementation of Impact Evaluations |  |  | July 2011 |
| 1 Policy Seminar |  |  | Nov 2011 |
| 2 Dissemination Seminars to Present Publications in the Region |  |  | October 2011 |

5.2 Dissemination plan: when warranted briefly describe dissemination plan of expected deliverables / results with a timeline for key activities, person/institution responsible for implementation:

Activities in component 1 are in themselves dissemination of knowledge, specially the training and workshops. We will organize two dissemination seminars in 2011 in order to present the publications as well as the lessons learned from the capacity building activities financed in component 1, including impact evaluations designed or conceptualized in the courses.

5.3 Results Matrix:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicators | Baseline | Intermediate Targets | | Final Target | Expected Completion Date |
| Year 1 | Year 2 | Subseq. years |
| Outcome Indicator | | | | | |
| Number of rigorous impact evaluations designed and implemented as a result of the courses | 0 | 3 | 3 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Percentage of participants that increase their understanding of impact evaluations (measured with pre-post test) | 0 | 75 | 75 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Number of institution counterparts that use the guideline on impact evaluation as a work instrument |  |  |  | 8 | Dec 2012 |
| Percentage of participants in workshops that consider the course relevant and useful | 0 | 80 | 80 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Percentage of counterparts that report that the solution (course, workshop or training) provided met or exceeded their expectations | 0 | 100 | 100 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Deliverables (outputs) Indicators | | | | | |
| Number of training workshops on Impact Evaluation Design and Implementation | 0 | 6 | 8 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Number of Practical Guidelines on Impact Evaluation Design and Implementation (Spanish) | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Publication on Alternatives to Implement M&E Systems | 0 | 0 | 1 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Policy Seminars | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | Dec 2011 |
| Dissemination Seminars | 0 | 0 | 2 |  | Dec 2011 |

**VI. BUDGET:**

6.1 Budget should be presented by deliverable (outputs) or groups of deliverables (for example: three publications, three conferences, seminars or workshops; one database; one survey; two training courses).Total available funds from counterpart sources should be reported. Use whole numbers only.



1. Consultant's travel only

The project cost is equal to the total request plus the counterpart resources for those components where counterpart resources will be available. These counterpart resources will account for logistics for the events, as in general those that request the courses cover these expenses. The figures were estimated based on KNL quotes for conference rooms in the Region. Part of the counter-part resources will be provided in-kind, mainly in terms of contributing with the facilities where the workshops and seminars take place. Some counter-part contributions will involve financial resources, where borrowing countries might hire an additional speaker or consultant to complement the seminars, or pay for an external facility (such as a conference room at a hotel). For each activity a brief report will be produced and will include a description of counterpart contributions (in-kind and financial).

6.2 Bank staff participation in KCP:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Staff Name** | **Bank Unit** | **FTEs** |
| Carola Alvarez | SPD/SDV | .0146 |
| Alessandro Maffioli | SPD/SDV | .0728 |
| Pablo Ibarraran | SPD/SDV | .0728 |
| Yyannú Cruz | SPD/SDV | .0728 |
| Cesar Rodriguez | SPD/SDV | .0728 |
| Susana Sitja | SPD/SDV | .0364 |
| Rosina de Souza | LEG/SGO | .0146 |

6.3 Types of Consultants: Firms or individuals and main activities/deliverables:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Type: Individual or Firm (if available)** | **Nationality (if available)** | **Estimated Cost** | **Main Activities / Deliverables** |
| Individuals |  | 58,000 | Lectures in Courses and seminars |
| Individual |  | 25,000 | Guide on Alternatives on Implementation of M&E systems |
| Individual |  | 25,000 | Draft on Practical Guide on Design and Implementation of Impact Evaluations |
| **Total** |  | 108,000 |  |

These expenses do not reflect travel costs for consultants.

6.4 Proposed administrative budget estimation required for the execution stages by year of execution (specify consulting, travel and other expenses)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Type** | **Year 1** | **Subsequent Years** |
| Consultants |  |  |
| Travel | 21,000 | 28,000 |
| Other | 2,000 | 2,000 |
| **Total** | **23,000** | **30,000** |
|  |  |  |

SDV staff travel related to the execution of the KCP –participating in training activities, workshops and seminars—will be covered by SDV’s budget.

**VII. Risks and Coordination with other MDBs:**

7.1 Implementation Risks:

Given that these activities are based on demand by stakeholders in the region, there is little risk that the implementation of training workshops and seminars will not provide the intended products. There is the risk that outcomes (impact evaluations actually designed and implemented) are not materialized if knowledge was not the only binding constraint. Counterparts may lack resources and/or political support to carry out impact evaluations. This risk will be mitigated by carefully screening requests and by coordinating with IDB staff from VPS and VPC on the potential of working with particular stakeholders.

7.2 Summarized collaboration or coordination with other MDBs and donors (if any):

Some of the courses we have given have been done in coordination with the World Bank (Salvador) and UNDP (Costa Rica). We always work based on stakeholders request, and they may request participation of other donors or MDBs and we coordinate based on the core structure of our product (impact evaluation course) and the needs in each particular circumstance.

**VIII. Monitoring and evaluation plan**.

Fill-out the KCP’s Development Effectiveness Matrix (DEM) using this link to the [DEM template](http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getDocument.aspx?docnum=35140493). On Section *4.II Quality Measurements at Completion*, fill-out only the portion that corresponds to the KCP type selected. Then save it in IDBDOCS and record its number immediately after the “equal” sign on the link below:

<http://idbdocs.iadb.org/wsdocs/getDocument.aspx?docnum=35155246>

8.1 Summarize the basic elements of the Monitoring and Evaluation plan, including key activities and associated budget:

In each training event we will provide a questionnaire to participants similar as the one used by KNL for our courses to Bank Staff to evaluate the course. An innovation is that we will test participants for their understanding on core concepts of impact evaluation (such as counterfactual, identification strategy, minimum detectable impact) before and after the course to verify that knowledge is being actually transferred. We will also send a survey to our counterpart to verify if our product met their expectation in a timely manner and was relevant to their needs (this includes seminars). Six months after each event we will contact the counterpart again to verify the reach, influence and usefulness of the training events, and whether we can document any demonstration effects of our seminars (for example that impact evaluations were designed and implemented by other agencies that did not attend the course, or that other agencies requested the course). With these mechanisms we will be able to gather the information to report on the indicators reported for outcomes in the Results Matrix. We will work with KNL in order to send each participant a personalized link for the evaluation to be completed online, and the same for counterparts that requested the course. Paper copies will be available for the cases where online completion is considered not practical ($3,000 allocated for expenses related to the surveys and before/after tests to measure learning). For the publications, we will hire two external peer reviewers for each product to verify its quality ($500 each).

SPD will monitor that the outputs are produced in a timely and according to the budget. SPD will maintain documentation of all the activities organized and will monitor the work of consultants in terms of adequate lecture preparation and participation in courses, as well as their work in the production of the two publications considered in this KCP.