



## Annex 1

### POLICY INFLUENCE PLAN

The plan outlines the context for, and approach to, policy influence to be adopted for the study. The plan includes identification of three key policy makers who have the potential to influence policy on the basis of the evaluation findings. The plan outlines the nature of the planned interaction between the principal investigators and other project staff and these policy makers. The plan also includes a description for your broader communication plans to reach other stakeholders, such as media, professional associations or trade unions, religious groups and so on.

**The policy-stakeholder engagement plan must be submitted for first tranche payment.**

#### CONTEXT

**What is the political/social/cultural/economic environment that could affect both the timing and design of your evaluation and the opportunities for the findings to influence policy?**

In Mexico, impact evaluations have played a significant role in influencing the policy directions of social programs (e.g. *Oportunidades*, perhaps the best studied social program in the world). This experience has brought a substantial shift in the perceptions of government officials on the importance of conducting evaluations. In this case, there is high demand from the implementing agency for generating scientific evidence on the effectiveness of their intervention.

Knowledge on ECD interventions in Latin America and in Mexico specifically are just beginning to grow. There is an ongoing evaluation of higher cost centers (Estancias Infantiles), to which this evaluation is an important complement. In Latin America, this will complement an evaluation of a parent training program in Chile which is just beginning. To our knowledge, there is no other evaluation of

#### GUIDELINES

What is the current use of evidence in policy making in the country in general, and in the sector of your study, and the concerned implementing agency, in particular. This section should consider political economy and other social or cultural factors which may affect the chance to influence policy.

**Possible resources include:**

OECD Political Economy Analysis, [www.oecd.org/dac/governance/politicaconomy](http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance/politicaconomy); Governance and Social Development Resource Centre, <http://www.gsdrc.org/go/topic-guides/political-economy-analysis>; ODI, <http://www.odi.org.uk/programmes/politics-governance/work-political-economy-analysis.asp>

center-based low-cost stimulation programs in Latin America or elsewhere.

## RISKS

**Are there any expected risks associated with the dissemination and policy influence of your evaluation?** (e.g. screening of findings and recommendations to suit political purposes, high political turnover, limited freedom of press etc..)

The risks associated with the policy influence are low. The team within the implementing agency is very professional, as is the larger policy formulation community in Mexico. Although a political transition is expected during the lifetime of this evaluation, it is expected that this will present an opportunity to influence a new government early on its mandate, rather than as a risk.

As always, with impact evaluations, there is the risk that the evaluation will not result as positive as hoped for by the government agency.

Mitigation: The political transition will occur over one year into the evaluation. Thus, we expect to have completed the baseline and one round of data collection, so the risk to contamination is relatively low. We will work with the outgoing and incoming policymakers to familiarize them with the impact evaluation. In addition, our ongoing lending with the government indicates a high likelihood of continued dialogue.

To mitigate the risk that the government would dislike results and shut down the evaluation, we intend to frame the evaluation not as an evaluation of success or failure, but rather as an evaluation of what is working and what could be improved. We expect some results to be stronger than others and to use those in constructive dialogue.

## STAKEHOLDER AND POLICY-MAKER ANALYSIS

**Which individuals or groups must you reach to influence policy? Which are the most influential?**

## GUIDELINES

Describe, assess the level of risks and identify mitigation strategies

## GUIDELINES

There are many tools available to help choose who the best audiences might be. The most obvious audiences might not be the most

The target audience for the policy influence depends on the desired outcomes sought. For instance, with respect to the technical design of the intervention and trying to improve or adjust the selected approach, the main stakeholders are located within CONAFE. The agency is autonomous in the drafting of the operational manual for the program, with the Director of Early Childhood Development having the authority to suggest adjustments and improvements to the program. The Director of Community Education is also a key figure, influential with the Director-General, and the upper management of CONAFE (Finance Director and Planning Director, specifically). Together, this management team is influential in that they submit the CONAFE's annual work program to the institution's governing council, which signs off on the document. At a secondary level, it would be also important to target high level officials in the Secretary of Education, such as the Under-Secretary for Basic Education.

Should the policy decisions we seek to influence relate to bringing the project to scale, implying a substantial budgetary increase for CONAFE, the target policy makers are within the Secretary of the Treasury (Hacienda). Specifically, the Director International Organizations, and the members of the budget council, hold sway over financing decisions. This is especially true for projects which receive international financing from agencies such as the World Bank.

strategic. Try to highlight around six key primary audiences where attention can be focused.

Think about who may influence policy, considering professional associations and trade unions, other CSOs, opposition parties, religious groups and the media, in addition to 'official' policy makers in the areas of interest.

Avoid broad categories such as the "general public" or "Policy-makers" and try to highlight around six key primary audiences where more attention can be focused, even if you have a longer list. Whenever possible identify individuals or key influencers.

#### **Possible resources/tools listed**

#### **Possible resources include**

Stakeholder analysis (World Bank, <http://www1.worldbank.org/publicsector/anticorrupt/PoliticalEconomy/PDFVersion.pdf>)

Social network analysis (ODI-FAO, [http://www.foodsec.org/DL/course/shortcourseFK/en/pdf/trainerresources/PG\\_SNA.pdf](http://www.foodsec.org/DL/course/shortcourseFK/en/pdf/trainerresources/PG_SNA.pdf))

Alignment Interest Influence Matrix (ODI, [www.odi.org.uk/.../428-presentation-4-method-alignment-interest-influence-matrix.ppt](http://www.odi.org.uk/.../428-presentation-4-method-alignment-interest-influence-matrix.ppt)).

## KEY POLICY MAKERS

Identify three policy makers with the potential to influence policy in the area addressed by your evaluation and justify your selection. You may add additional policy makers if you wish.

<p><b>1. Name:</b> Arturo Saenz</p> <p><b>Position:</b> Director-General</p> <p><b>Contacts:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Type of organization:</b> Government agency - Federal</p>	<p><b>Name of organization:</b> CONAFE</p> <p><b>Website:</b> www.conafe.gob.mx</p>
<p><b>Relevance/Level of influence:</b> Dr. Saenz is the primary decision-maker over future policy directions for CONAFE's interventions. His perceived interest is to generate further evidence as to the effectiveness of his organization's interventions, in order to continue to expand and bring the experience to other poor communities throughout Mexico.</p>	
<p>Have your organization had previous experiences with this policy maker. If so, please describe.</p> <p>Yes. We have worked closely with Dr. Saenz for the last 5 years.</p>	
<p><b>2. Name:</b> Lucero Nava Bolanos</p> <p><b>Position:</b> Director of Community Education</p> <p><b>Contacts:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Type of organization:</b> Government agency - Federal</p>	<p><b>Name of organization:</b> CONAFE</p> <p><b>Website:</b> www.conafe.gob.mx</p>
<p><b>Relevance/Level of influence:</b> Ms. Lucero Nava is the link between the technical teams working to implement ECD programs, and the upper management which decides on the future directions for policy, as outlined in the institution's operational manual and annual workplans. Her perceive interest is in better understanding the true effects of the current intervention.</p>	
<p>Have your organization had previous experiences with this policy maker. If so, please describe.</p>	

Yes. We have worked closely with Ms. Nava for the last 5 years.	
<b>3. Name:</b> Carlos Raul Delgado  <b>Position:</b> Director of International Organizations  <b>Contacts:</b> N/A  <b>Type of organization:</b> Government agency - Federal	<b>Name of organization:</b> Secretary of Treasury (Hacienda)  <b>Website:</b> www.shcp.gob.mx
<b>Relevance/Level of influence:</b> Mr. Delgado is the person responsible for overseeing all operations in Mexico that are financed through the state by the international organizations, including bilateral and multilateral partners. Should this investment prove to generate relatively high returns as compared with similar areas where the Secretary of Treasury is invested, he would prove an essential actor in convincing the budget committee and in authorizing the additional financing to bring the interventions to national scale. His perceived interest would be to have a better sense of the relative cost-effectiveness of this interventions as compared to other programs.	
Have your organization had previous experiences with this policy maker. If so, please describe.  Yes, the Secretary of the Treasury is the World Bank's main counterpart in Mexico.	
<b>4. Name:</b> Alicia Marin  <b>Position:</b> Deputy Director  <b>Contacts:</b> N/A  <b>Type of organization:</b> –Civil Society	<b>Name of organization:</b> ALAS Foundation  <b>Website:</b> www.alas.com
<b>Relevance/Level of influence:</b> Ms. Marin handles all of ALAS' strategic programming. She represents the organization in the identification and formation of strategic partnership, and designs the communication campaigns around key priority areas. Her perceived interest would be in identifying effective ECD policies that can be promoted and disseminated throughout Latin America and beyond.	

<p>Have your organization had previous experiences with this policy maker. If so, please describe.</p> <p>Yes, ALAS and the World Bank have a formal partnership on ECD.</p>	
<p><b>5. Name:</b> Fernando Gonzalez Sanchez</p> <p><b>Position:</b> Under-Secretary for Basic Education</p> <p><b>Contacts:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Type of organization:</b> Government agency - Federal</p>	<p><b>Name of organization:</b> Secretary of Education</p> <p><b>Website:</b> <a href="http://www.sep.gob.mx">www.sep.gob.mx</a></p>
<p><b>Relevance/Level of influence:</b> Mr. Gonzalez is the person responsible for overseeing all basic education programs, including those relating to early childhood development. Should this investment prove to generate relatively high returns as compared with similar areas where the Secretary of Education is invested, he would prove an essential actor in convincing the Secretary of Education to provide the additional financing to bring the interventions to national scale. His perceived interest would be to have a better sense of the effectiveness of this intervention as compared to other education programs.</p>	
<p>Have your organization had previous experiences with this policy maker. If so, please describe.</p> <p>Yes, the Under-Secretary for Basic Education is one of the World Bank's main counterparts in education in Mexico.</p>	

## STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT PLAN

Please provide a detailed plan for engaging relevant stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Stakeholders include the policy makers identified above, but also other representatives of civil society organizations, the media and so on. The plan should clearly identify the roles of each stakeholder in policymaking or influencing, action plan for specific activities, as well as expected results and long-term outcomes.

Stage in evaluation	Objectives and dimension of the engagement	Channels and Frequency	Stakeholders	Focal Point	Monitoring/ Learning and influencing indicators
	<p><i>Highlight the kind of engagements and policy influence objectives (Awareness raising/Knowledge sharing/Policy influencing)</i></p> <p><i>What are the specific drivers?</i> <i>What are the expected benefits?</i></p>	<p><i>Specify the channels used, e.g. Meeting, Design workshop, Training workshop, Dissemination workshop, Partnership with key intermediaries/allies, Participation / contribution to discussion (online forums/ working groups, Media interviews/briefings/opinion pieces, Focus group/town hall meeting, Presentation at national and international conferences. Providing study outputs such as briefing notes and videos</i></p> <p><i>Frequency: (monthly/quarterly/annually or once/twice etc.)</i></p>	<p><i>This should include but not be limited to the three policy-makers identified above</i></p>	<p><i>Name the person or people in the team responsible to carry out this engagement</i></p>	<p><i>Identify key indicators and measuring tools (see guidelines for section on evaluation below)</i></p>

<b>Study design</b>	<p>Awareness raising</p> <p>Drivers: Need for buy-in on technical design on evaluation and coordination across ECD work</p> <p>Benefits: Improved questionnaires and stratification model for sampling. Coordinated instruments across ECD evaluations in Mexico.</p>	<p>Technical workshop (design), consulting with key local actors in D.F. and other parts of Mexico</p> <p>[July 2011]</p>	<p>Lucero Nava Bolanos</p> <p>Local academics</p>	David Evans	<p># of people involved</p> <p>Feedback ratings and qualitative feedback collected through form</p>
<b>Implementation</b>	<p>Awareness raising</p> <p>Drivers: Participants in communities where the new intervention has already rolled out will have important qualitative insights for improving the quality of the intervention.</p> <p>Benefits: Improved quality of the</p>	<p>Training workshop</p> <p>Baseline survey results presentation</p> <p>[November 2011]</p>	<p>Lucero Nava Bolanos</p> <p>Local volunteer ECD workers</p>	<p>José Carlos Rocha</p> <p>and</p> <p>David Evans</p>	<p># of media clippings (covering roll-out and results of baseline)</p> <p>Feedback ratings and qualitative feedback collected through form</p>

	intervention.				
<b>Preliminary findings</b>	<p>Knowledge sharing/Policy influencing</p> <p>Drivers: Desire on the part of policymakers to understand intermediate results</p> <p>Benefits: Key questions identified to be incorporated in the second round of follow-up data collection. Potential intermediate impacts on ECD designs around Mexico.</p>	<p>Technical workshop in D.F.</p> <p>Technical workshop in one state in southern Mexico (e.g. Oaxaca)</p> <p>High level meeting with new government officials in D.F. (hosted by World Bank Country Director)</p> <p>Web-based videoconference with 3ie-funded Save the Children ECD program in Mozambique</p> <p>[November 2012]</p>	<p>Dr. Saenz (CONAFE)</p> <p>Lic. Delgado (Treasury)</p> <p>Lic. Gonzalez and other officials in Secretary of Education and other social sectors</p> <p>Mozambican ECD policymakers</p>	David Evans	<p># of media clippings</p> <p># of high level policy makers engaged</p> <p># of people reached</p> <p>Feedback ratings and qualitative feedback collected through form</p>
<b>Dissemination</b>	<p>Knowledge sharing/Policy influencing</p> <p>Drivers: This will be the first results under the new political administration, so significant interest</p>	<p>[Some of these activities, such as dissemination through ALAS and presentation at an ECD conference, will incorporate qualitative instruments such as children's art work, case studies of children, and interviews with parents. Other activities, such as presentation in an academic paper, will focus more on</p>	<p>Technical staff in Secretary of Education, CONAFE and other social sectors in Mexico, at federal and state levels</p> <p>Private sector service providers in Mexico</p>	David Evans	<p># of media clippings</p> <p># of citations</p> <p># of high level policy makers engaged</p>

	<p>will be expected. The government will also be making decisions on how best to expand ECD.</p> <p>Benefits: Final results will contribute to budding international research on parent and especially father training. Also expected to inform decisions about scale up in Mexico and decisions about which kinds of programs to support in the World Bank LAC portfolio.</p>	<p>the quantitative results. Some forums will include both.]</p> <p>Dissemination through existing partnership with ALAS Foundation (Shakira Mebarak and other Latin American artists and advocates for ECD) – from November 2013</p> <p>Presentation to 800+ members of Regional ECD Learning Community through webinar (<a href="http://www.comunidadprimerainfancia.com">www.comunidadprimerainfancia.com</a>) – from November 2013</p> <p>Presentation at national conference in Monterrey, Mexico in October 2013</p> <p>Presentation in international ECD conference – from November 2013</p> <p>Publication of results in both policy form and as academic paper – from November 2013</p>			<p>Clear program changes as a result of the evaluation</p> <p>Funding shifts to program as a result of evaluation</p>
<b>Adoption of recommendations</b>	<p>Knowledge sharing/Policy influencing</p> <p>Drivers: Administration will desire to know the</p>	Media piece (e.g. op-ed in Mexican paper by Director-General of CONAFE) – from November 2013	<p>Dr. Saenz (CONAFE)</p> <p>Lic. Delgado (Treasury)</p> <p>Officials in Secretary of Education</p>	Peter Holland	<p># of media clippings</p> <p># of citations</p> <p># of high level policy</p>

	<p>implications of the results.</p> <p>Benefits: Practical application of results</p>				<p>makers engaged</p> <p>Clear program changes as a result of the evaluation</p> <p>Funding shifts to program as a result of evaluation</p>
--	---	--	--	--	---

## BUDGET

### How much time, financial and human resources are expected to be allocated for the implementation of the engagement plan?

We currently plan, from our budget, the following for the engagement plan:

\$20K - technical design workshop

\$15K - time of various staff members

\$10K – travel costs (portions of several trips)

\$5K - misc document preparation for dissemination

\$50 K – TOTAL

We expect that the engagement plan will require one month of time from the principal investigator for preparation of workshops, presentations, etc. We also expect a similar amount of time from the project assistant in organizing said events.

## EVALUATION AND LEARNING

### How will you measure the influence of your evaluation?

We will use various metrics to measure the influence of our evaluation. Throughout the process, we will monitor the number of events and – through them – the number of people reached. At early and intermediate stages of planning, we will use qualitative feedback and feedback ratings at workshops. With the baseline survey report, we expect modest media coverage. With the first round of follow-up results, we will measure the number of high level policy makers engaged, the number of media clippings. With the final results, we will observe the number of high level policy makers engaged, media clippings, citations of the policy and academic write-up, number of people reached through dissemination events, and – perhaps most importantly – changes in program design and funding linked to the evaluation.

## GUIDELINES

The main budget items to consider are: staff time; travel costs for presentations/dissemination events; editing, design, production, translation and dissemination costs. We encourage you to think medium to long-term for your engagement plan.

## GUIDELINES

Note 3ie requires that you submit information on the number of people reached by different dissemination activities, and documentation of adoption of study recommendations.

The team should identify:

- Specific intermediate outcome indicators such as: # of media clippings, # of citations, web metrics data, # of knowledge sharing/dissemination events, # of people reached, # of high level policy makers engaged, feedback ratings.

- Final outcome and impact indicators such as: policy/programme design demonstrably changed as a result of the evaluation finding; legislation has been adopted; funding has been increased or cut; # of policy makers and practitioners reporting having been influenced by the study.

-Qualitative data such as: feedback, stories, quotes.

***Possible resources listed below***

### **Possible resources include**

*Intelligent Measurement* <http://intelligentmeasurement.wordpress.com/category/campaign-evaluation/>; Communications Consortium Media Center (CCMC) guidelines for evaluating non-profit communications efforts <http://www.buildinitiative.org/files/evaluatingcommunications.pdf>; Outcome Mapping [http://www.outcomemapping.ca/download.php?file=/resource/files/admin\\_en\\_OMLC\\_Brochure.pdf](http://www.outcomemapping.ca/download.php?file=/resource/files/admin_en_OMLC_Brochure.pdf); and <http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/download/1751.pdf>. Most Significant Change <http://www.mande.co.uk/docs/MSCGuide.pdf>