



Consejo Nacional de Evaluación
de la Política de Desarrollo Social

IMPACT EVALUATION IN MEXICO

Gonzalo Hernández Licona

JANUARY 2008



Facts supporting evaluation in Mexico 1997-2007

- Democracy / Transparency
- Progresa Evaluation (support from IDB)
- Academics: Evaluators and policy makers
- Institutional changes:
 - 2000 Congress' Decree: annual external evaluations to all programs
 - 2004 Law of Transparency and Public Access to Information
 - 2004 Social Development Law: National Council for the Evaluation of Social Policy (CONEVAL)
 - 2006 Budget Law: Performance Evaluation System
 - 2007 Evaluation Guidelines

Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System

Monitoring and Indicators

Evaluation

Strategic goals:
Ministries

Results

Annual Evaluation Program

Consistency
Evaluation

Impact Evaluation

Strategic Evaluation

Process Evaluation

Evaluation of
New Programs

Program indicators (Results):
Logical Framework

Follow up on evaluation results

Progres-Oportunidades 1997-2000

- **Method:** Randomization
- **Evaluator:** IFPRI
- **Key elements:** Program and evaluation directed by the Ministry of Finance; Academics behind the program; Centralized program; Evaluation designed along with the program;
- **Challenges:** Political pressure to include control localities; now it's difficult to find control groups
- **Demand:** From those designing the program (help from IDB)
- **Financial support:** From the Ministry of Finance!
- **Results:** Increase in nutrition, school enrollment and health
- **Use:** The program is still alive!; the program expanded to urban areas and to high school; the formulae of the food supplement changed due to the evaluation results

Milk Program 2003-2004

- **Intervention:** Milk with iron, Zinc and vitamin C offered to poor families. Normal milk was offered to poor families since 1945.
- **Method:** Randomization. Fortified milk was not offered at the same time in all States
- **Evaluator:** INSP (Mexico)
- **Key elements:** The director of the program favoured the evaluation; Academics at Sedesol decided to have an impact evaluation; Centralized program;
- **Challenges:** None
- **Demand:** From the director of the program; from Sedesol authorities; “we want to show that the program is working”
- **Financial support:** From Sedesol and from the program
- **Results:** 25% reduction of anemia in 0-2 years old children
- **Use:** Now the fortified milk is used in other programs;

Food Program 2004-2006

- **Intervention:** Food support to poor families in rural areas (poorer families than Progresa families)
- **Method:** Randomization of localities: controls, food basket and nutritional training, food basket without training, cash transfers
- **Evaluator:** INSP (Mexico)
- **Key elements:** Evaluation decided by Sedesol authorities, before the arrival of program operators; Academics behind the program; Centralized program; Evaluation designed along with the program;
- **Challenges:** Political pressure to include control localities; difficult, but not impossible, to convince program operators afterwards
- **Demand:** From those designing the program (Sedesol authorities)
- **Financial support:** From Sedesol
- **Results:** positive impact on growth, on dietary quality, and on household consumption; dietary quality was most improved in the Food Basket groups; costs were lower using cash.
- **Use:** Cash transfers in remote localities; food baskets improved (with fortified milk)

Cement Floor Program 2004-2006

- **Intervention:** The State of Coahuila replaced dirt floors with cement in almost all poor families' houses.
- **Method:** Regression discontinuity and matching methods. The urban area of La Laguna is shared between the State of Coahuila and the State of Durango (almost a natural experiment)
- **Evaluator:** Berkeley University
- **Key elements:** The State Governor wanted to show that his main program was a success; Sedesol was doing another evaluation in the same areas;
- **Challenges:** Finding good data from both States
- **Demand:** Directly from the State Governor; from Sedesol authorities;
- **Financial support:** From the State and partially by Sedesol
- **Results:** On child health: reduced parasites, diarrhea, anemia, increased cognitive ability; on mothers: increased satisfaction with quality of life;
- **Use:** Federal government and other states are increasing the budget for this type of programs

Micro-regions program 2004-2006

- **Intervention:** Basic infrastructure in poor municipalities
- **Method:** Regression discontinuity.
- **Evaluator:** Tecnológico de Monterrey (Mexico)
- **Key elements:** Support from good academics from abroad (Mathematica/Boston) and from Mexico
- **Challenges:** Finding good controls; Directors and operators of the program did not want the evaluation
- **Demand:** Sedesol (Undersecretary for Planning and Evaluation) wanted to know if this important program had any impact;
- **Financial support:** Sedesol and Conacyt
- **Results:** Almost no impact
- **Use:** The program is over, replaced now by other territorial approach

Challenges

- Still don't have enough good evaluators
- Financial support
- Evaluation of policies
- Tension between having good evaluations (reliable, independent) and the press
- Which programs should have an impact evaluation?
 - Now, mainly those whose directors wanted to have an evaluation
- Better understanding from decision makers (and from many evaluators!) what impact evaluation is about
- Moving from no monitoring at all to.....impact evaluation is a big challenge
- M&E at the local level (States and municipalities)