



Consejo Nacional de Evaluación
de la Política de Desarrollo Social

Mexico's Monitoring & Evaluation System

Graciela Teruel
Coneval / U. Iberoamericana 2014



Context

- ❑ **2000 Congress' Decree: annual external evaluations to all federal programs (mistrust: the executive may use social programs for the electorate campaign)**

 - ❑ **2004-5 Social Development Law**
 - ❑ **CONEVAL. National Council for the Evaluation of Social Policy (mistrust: Congress did not believe on the executive way of measuring poverty and doing objective evaluations)**
-

CONEVAL

□ Mandate:

- Measurement of **Poverty** at the National, State and Municipality level
- **Evaluation** of social programs and policies

□ Governance

- It's part of the Executive
 - The Board has 8 seats. The majority of Board members (6) are **academic researchers elected** by all the States, representatives from Municipalities, Congress and the Executive (44 votes)
-

Evaluation guidelines for all institutions, together with the Ministry of Finance

Planning

National Development Plan

Logical Framework: Programs

Results

Evaluation

Annual Evaluation Plan

Consistency & Results Evaluation

Policy Evaluation

Impact Evaluation

Recommendations' follow-up



Annual Performance Report







GOAL 5: Reduce extreme poverty and assure equal opportunities.

CORE: Equal Opportunities

THEME: Poverty Alleviation

GOAL	Improve the nutritional level of poor children and pregnant women.
PURPOSE	Beneficiaries have access to fortified milk.

EVALUATION / RESULTS

Topic	Design	Strategic Planning	Target Population and Coverage	Operation	Final Results	
					Results are being documented	Type of Results
%	100%	71%	50%	100%		
Score						

Secretaría de Desarrollo Social

No.	Programa	Presupuesto 2008	Diseño	Planeación	Cobertura	Operación	Resultados Finales	
							Documenta Resultados	Tipo Resultados
1	Programa De Abasto Social De Leche (LICONSA)	1,941.5	100%	71%	50%	100%		
2	Programa De Desarrollo Humano (OPORTUNIDADES)	37,211.0	100%	27%	75%	100%		
3	Programa De Apoyo Alimentario (DICONSA)	336.0	100%	29%	50%	100%		
4	Programa Hábitat	1,886.1	72%	14%	25%	100%		
5	Programa De Ahorro, Subsidio Y Crédito Para La Vivienda Progresiva, Tu Casa	1,635.2	72%	29%	0%	75%		
6	Programa De Abasto Rural (DICONSA)	2,004.3	100%	57%	0%	100%		
7	Programa De Atención A Jornaleros Agrícolas	171.9	72%	14%	0%	100%		
8	Programa De Coinversión Social (INDESOL)	206.2	100%	43%	0%	100%		
9	Programa De Opciones Productivas	1,170.0	100%	14%	0%	100%		
10	Programas Del Fondo Nacional De Fomento A Las Artesanías (FONART)	78.6	100%	29%	0%	75%		
11	Programa Para El Desarrollo Local	2,043.4	72%	14%	50%	63%		
12	Programa 3 X 1 Para Migrantes	503.5	72%	14%	25%	88%		
13	Programa De Empleo Temporal	1,630.7	72%	14%	0%	100%		
14	Programa De Vivienda Rural (FONHAPO)	320.0	44%	14%	0%	38%		

Evaluation: Programs' Performance Summary

Program	RESULTS FROM THE SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (EED) 2010-2011 (External evaluation coordinated by CONEVAL and elaborated with information from the Performance Evaluation System of the Ministry of Finance and Public Credit)							Distributional Impact	2010 Budget Compliance
	Results Related to the Program's Objectives		Improvements on the Delivery of Goods and Services	Improvements on Indicators and Goals Analysis	Coverage	Coverage Efficiency	% of Achievement on Following the Recommendations from External Evaluations	Progressivity Level	Spent Budget/ Modified Budget
	Impact of the Program	Improvements on the Achievement of its Objectives							
	Valuation								
Programa de Empleo Temporal (PET)	NA	Moderate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	379.59%	92.5%	The program is VERY PROGRESSIVE	99.5%
Programa IMSS-Oportunidades	NA	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Moderate	SD	90.0%	The program is VERY PROGRESSIVE	100.0%
Seguro Popular (SP)	Adequate	NA	Adequate	Adequate	Outstanding	88.54%	100.0%	The program is VERY PROGRESSIVE	100.0%
Programa Comunidades Saludables	NA	Adequate	Moderate	Moderate	Opportunity for Improvement	SD	80.0%	Without Information	100.0%
Programa Caravanas de la Salud (PCS)	NA	Moderate	Adequate	Adequate	Moderate	SD	100.0%	Without Information	100.0%
Reducción de Enfermedades Prevenibles por Vacunación	NA	Opportunity for Improvement	Opportunity for Improvement	Outstanding	Opportunity for Improvement	SD	NA	Without Information	100.0%
PROCAMPO para Vivir Mejor	NA	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	Adequate	99.43%	75.0%	The program is VERY REGRESSIVE	100.0%
Fondo de Apoyo para la Micro, Pequeña y Mediana Empresa (Fondo PYME)	Adequate	NA	Outstanding	Outstanding	Outstanding	150.30%	69.0%	Without Information	100.0%

Results

- ❑ Now we have **poverty** figures at a national, state and municipality level
 - ❑ Almost **520** programs have **Logical Frameworks**
 - ❑ 20% of all indicators are **Results** indicators
 - ❑ **140** programs are **evaluated** every year
 - ❑ We can find on the **internet**:
 - All the **evaluations**
 - The **program's point of view** about its evaluation
 - Each program's **Work Plan**
 - ❑ The **media and NGOs** constantly use the evaluations
 - ❑ Programs are under pressure now to show results
 - ❑ For the **budget sin 2010**, **Coneval's information** has been used by many **players (Press, Congress, Presidency)**
 - ❑ In **2014 buget** favored programs which showed **proved good anti poverty tool**
-

Changes in policy and programs:

- ❑ **The Ministry of Finance has used evaluations for the 2011 and 2012 Budget Process**
- ❑ **The Presidency redefined the public policies intended to tackle maternal mortality, based on the diagnosis of the Logical Framework.**
- ❑ **Due to the results of the poverty estimations in 2008, the Federal Government announced an increase in social programs spending to support its Poverty Fighting Strategy.**
- ❑ **The program *Primer Empleo* (First Job) was cancelled. This was meant to increase youth employment.**
- ❑ **The design of *Progres-Oportunidades* was modified to increase child school attendance and increase nutrition.**
- ❑ **The budget for the program *Piso Firme* (Solid Floor) was increased.**
~~Children's health improves with cement floors.~~

Impact Evaluation (IE) in Mexico: Two Stages

I. “Isolated” Impact Evaluations

- ❑ Show good results for important programs
- ❑ Academic support (inside and outside Government)
- ❑ Support from programs managers

II. IE within a M&E system

- ❑ IEs as part of a bigger M&E system
 - ❑ Complementarities between IE, Indicators and other type of evaluations
 - ❑ M&E as a tool to make better decisions (budget), improve public policy and Accountability
-

Progres-a-Oportunidades 1997-2000

- **Method:** Randomization
 - **Evaluator:** IFPRI
 - **Key elements:** Program and evaluation designed 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 favored 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.
-

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 area; ability to find the right method
- **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

Today? Hunger Crusade 2013

- New Government
 - Respect for CONEVAL and its members
 - We are working together evaluate its new anti-poverty strategy, called the “Crusade for Hunger”
 - Objective is to reduce extreme poverty by 2018
 - Monitoring and Evaluations
 - Impact evaluation
-

An M&E system has to emerge from changes in the rules of the game (institutions)....plus proper technical and planning methods

- **Institutional:** It's almost impossible to have a public M&E system without changing the institutions: set an evaluation mandate, create an evaluation unit, feedback procedures for policy improvements, norms about transparency.
 - **Technical:** The appropriate **methodology** for measuring impacts and **trained evaluators are important.**
 - **Planning:** Improve planning within programs and ministries (**logical framework**) and produce **good indicators**
 - **Information** (administrative records, surveys, beneficiary lists, ..)
-

Recommendations: General Mechanism

- ❑ Take into account program managers
 - Evaluations are there to improve programs
 - Evaluations can be used also to get more resources
 - Show that improvements can come follow from evaluations
 - ❑ Program managers should be heard
 - ❑ Programs and external evaluators have permanent meetings throughout the evaluation process
 - ❑ Final recommendations are analyzed by programs
 - ❑ Programs can propose or substitute recommendations
 - ❑ Programs have an action plan to improve performance. This action plan is public
 - ❑ The program makes a public statement about the external evaluation
-

Recomendations

- ❑ Show methodologies in the most transparent way
 - ❑ Clear and understandable publications are important.
Translate technical results to the general public
 - ❑ **Improve the capacity building of local researchers**
-