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Why are we here?

■ Evidence-informed policy making (EIPM)
  - *Specific conditions, processes and capacities are required* to ensure appropriate use of scientific (research-based) evidence to inform policy decisions

■ Objective of PEP-supported projects:
  - To *produce new evidence* that will serve to *inform decisions* related to a specific policy issue
  - To *strengthen capacities and practices* involved in the process

■ Capacities targeted?
  - Traditionally: *Policy analysis* (expertise, engagement of researchers)
  - Now extended to: *(government) institutional practices for EIPM*
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1. What is EIPM: **Standard issues in the science-policy nexus**

- Research/science VS policy making processes
- Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem
- What is evidence for policymaking
- Addressing challenges: Potential solutions for each side (science & policy)
What is EIPM?

- **Principles behind idea (prescription) of EIPM**
  - Virtually every challenge governments face has a **scientific dimension** (which may or may not be recognised)
  - Policy is rarely **determined** by evidence alone, but can and should be **informed** by evidence, more "systematically"

- **Typical challenges:**
  - Requires **political will** (also determined by various constraints – cultural, economic..)
  - Defining “what is evidence” (or the best knowledge available)
  - How to **contextualize, and prioritize**, scientific evidence vs other societal values/knowledge
  - Science and policy = 2 different worlds = **communication problem**
Standard issues in EIPM processes: On the SCIENCE side

Identify/define problem
Design research/gather data
Apply method to produce/analyze data
Produce new evidence
Assess validity/robustness
Communicate results/conclusions

Based on the scientific perspective:
• Research questions ≠ policy questions
• Monodisciplinary, no consultations of stakeholders
• Focused on a very specific (isolated) issue, i.e.:
  ➢ lack of “contextualization”
  ➢ Incomplete view of situation

Miscommunication:
• Language too technical, too “objective” (no values)
• Out of context: No considerations of policy constraints
  ➢ E.g. costs, feasibility, societal values, alternative policy options, political risks, etc..

Other constraints of science, with policy implications:
• Availability of data, resources, etc.
• How much evidence can be considered “reliable”? 
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

On the POLICY side

Policymaking ≠ a linear process

“There is no general theory of policymaking” -

Paul Cairney: Politics and Public Policy (Sept 2018).
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

On the POLICY side

Policymaking ≠ a linear process

The “policy cycle” often described as…

1. Problem Definition/Agenda Setting
2. Constructing the Policy Alternatives/Policy Formulation
3. Choice of Solution/Selection of Preferred Policy Option
4. Policy Design
5. Policy Implementation and Monitoring
6. Evaluation
Standard issues in EIPM processes:
On the POLICY side

Policymaking ≠ a linear process

The reality of policy making

Source: Sir Peter Gluckman (CSPDS, INGSA, ISC), Vilnius June 2019
Policymaking = multiple sources of influence/inputs
• Public opinion, interest groups, belief systems (religion, culture, etc.)
• Political ideology and commitments, electoral contract
• Fiscal objectives / obligations, punctual crises
• International obligations / context
• Scientific/technical knowledge..

Policymaking = mixed (and not always clear) objectives

Policymaking = making choices, between different options
➢ which will affect different stakeholders in different ways
**Standard issues in EIPM processes: On the POLICY side**

Policymaking = **core considerations are usually related to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintended</td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>effects</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency**
- What are the effects of the policy on the desired outcomes?

**Unintended effects**
- Other, non-intended effects that should be considered?

**Equity**
- What are the effects for different population groups?
- How do they affect equity?

**Cost**
- What are the financial costs/budget implications of this policy?

**Feasibility**
- Is this policy technically viable/feasible?

**Acceptability**
- How is this policy perceived by stakeholders?

All of which are weighed against scientific knowledge in decision-making.
Standard issues in EIPM processes:
On the POLICY side

Policymaking processes are also linked with complex organizational structures

Scientific inputs = limited (sectors), filtered

Decisional

Advisory

Technical/operational
Standard issues in EIPM processes:
Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

Potential uses of scientific evidence to inform policy:

• To **determine** “priorities” of policy strategies/interventions
  ➢ Understand complex problems & systems

• To **design** new policy interventions
  ➢ Define options to achieve specific outcomes
  ➢ Explore implications of options (ex-ante assessment)

• To **evaluate** existing policy interventions
  ➢ Address/assess a specific implementation issue
  ➢ Assess effectiveness, impact, efficiency, unintended effects, etc.
## Standard issues in EIPM processes:

### Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Knowledge generators</th>
<th>Knowledge synthesizers</th>
<th>Knowledge brokers</th>
<th>Policy Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual academics</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic societies/professional bodies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government employed practicing scientists</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientist within regulatory agency</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent think tanks</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What works units etc</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National academies</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government advisory boards/science councils</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science advisors to executive of government</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science advice to legislators</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td></td>
<td>±</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Sir Peter Gluckman (CSPDS, INGSA, ISC), Vilnius June 2019
Standard issues in EIPM processes:
Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

What is your role?

- Policy evaluation
- Knowledge broker
- Knowledge synthesizer
- Knowledge generator

Decisional
Advisory
Technical/operational
Standard issues in EIPM processes:
Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

What is your role?

- Policy evaluation
- Knowledge broker
- Knowledge synthesizer
- Knowledge generator
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

- Knowledge broker
- Knowledge synthesizer
- Knowledge generator

Decisional
Advisory
Technical/operational
Policy evaluation
Standard issues in EIPM processes: Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

“Technical/expert” VS “Political/partisan”

- **Political/partisan**
  - Technical/expert (generalist)
    - More long term, stable...
  - Decisional
    - Advisory
    - Technical/operational

- **Technical/expert** (operational level)
  - Key role to assimilate scientific knowledge/views into policy advisory process
    - Influence through “implementation”

++

++

++

++
Standard issues in EIPM processes: Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

“Technical/expert” VS “Political/partisan”

“POLITICAL” ADVISORS

- Greater potential of (more direct) influence, for consideration (+/-) of scientific evidence in decision
- But from a “policy/partisan” perspective = importance of science is relative (vs other considerations)

More short term, but influential
Standard issues in EIPM processes: Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

“Technical/expert” VS “Political/partisan”

These two types of “advisors” have different...

- Fields of expertise
- Technical knowledge base,
- Experiences of research/science processes
- Sets of priorities and values

= different approaches to EIPM
Standard issues in EIPM processes:
Different roles in a science advisory ecosystem

Policymaking process

- Decisional
- Advisory
- Technical/operational

Political/partisan

Expert/specialist

(generalist) (non-partisan) ++

Implementation → Evaluation

Decision (policy selection)

Weigh/assess different policy options VS other values & considerations

Weigh information + Define/advise policy option(s)

Synthesize data/information + produce brief

Gather evidence (information) on given policy issue/problem

Gather evidence (information)

Synthesize data/information
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

**science**
- Identify/define problem
- Design research/gather data
- Apply method to produce/analyze data
- Produce new evidence
- Assess validity/robustness
- Communicate results/conclusions

**to**

**policy**
- Implementation
- Evaluation
- Decision (policy selection)
- Weigh/assess different policy options
- Weigh information + Define/advise policy option(s)
- Synthesize data/information + produce brief

**CHALLENGES:**
- Research problem ≠ policy problem
- Science = objectivity (minimizing values)
- Policy = representation (must reflect public values)

**WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY??**

Gather evidence (information) on given policy issue/problem
WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?

Main sources of evidence used by government staff to advise policy:

- **People** – i.e. experience
  - Consulting professional network or external experts (populations? Intersectoral?)

- **“Raw data”** – i.e. statistical, etc.
  - E.g. national surveys, administrative data, meteorological data, etc.

- **Grey literature**
  - Mostly documents published by known organizations, especially governmental
  - Can also include scientific literature, but usually “filtered/adapted” to organization’s mission/position

- **Also**: newsletters, medias, local knowledge, observation, Mr Google/Wikipedia..
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?

Main sources of evidence used by government staff to advise policy:

In general, scientific literature doesn’t make the list. (Morestin, 2017) +/- depending on sector

Scientific evidence vs other sources of evidence

- Produced via a specific methodological process (field-specific)
- Including validation – “peer-review” (through publication)
- Published in specific formats/journals/platforms (vs grey literature)
  - i.e. access problem
  - Field-specific (each field has specific databases, journals, etc.)
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

**WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?**

*Main sources of evidence* used by government staff to advise policy:

In general, *scientific literature doesn’t make the list.*

(Morestin, 2017) +/- depending on sector

---

**Scientific evidence** from “natural sciences”…

EIPM started with medicine/health sector (Evidence-BASED policy)

- Different “levels” of evidence (reliable? rigor?)
  - Hierarchy in the types of methods/sources (e.g. RCTs)
  - Importance of “repeatability” of findings (e.g. systematic reviews, meta-analyses)
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

**WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?**

*Main sources of evidence* used by government staff to advise policy:

In general, *scientific literature doesn’t make the list..* (Morestin, 2017)

+/- depending on sector

**Scientific evidence** ...to “social” sciences

- But *“science” is produced in nearly all aspects of “social life”*
  - Education, sociology, urban planning, economics.. (not all “lab” sc.)

- EIPM = increasingly promoted for *“development interventions”*
  - Donor requirement

- Need to *“broaden” the definition of evidence*
  - In terms of sources/methods/repeatability
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?

Main sources of evidence used by government staff to advise policy:

In general, scientific literature doesn’t make the list.. (+/- depending on sector) (Morestin, 2017)

Scientific evidence - vs other sources of evidence

Increasingly acknowledged that “evidence-informed” decisions =

- Using the best knowledge available, from all relevant sources (context)

This includes:

- People: Consultation of experts and stakeholders/beneficiaries
- Raw data: Importance to produce quality/timely data & make available
- Grey literature: Importance of existing institutional knowledge
- Scientific literature:
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?

Main sources of evidence used by government staff to advise policy:

In general, scientific literature doesn’t make the list.. (+/- depending on sector) (Morestin, 2017)

Scientific evidence - vs other sources of evidence

Increasingly acknowledged that “evidence-informed” decisions =

- Using the best knowledge available, from all relevant sources (context)

But it also means...

- People: Consultation of experts and stakeholders/beneficiaries)
- Raw data: Importance to produce quality/timely data & make available
- Grey literature: Importance of existing institutional knowledge
- Scientific literature:
WHAT IS EVIDENCE FOR POLICY?

In general, scientific literature doesn’t make the list.. +/- depending on sector

WHY? Key issues listed in literature are:

1. Political will – institutional culture (no requirements from the top)

2. Problems with access, availability & applicability of scientific evidence

3. “Lack of capacity/expertise to seek, understand and appraise scientific knowledge”
   = main reason cited in Morestin study (Canada, Australia, US, UK..)

4. Lack of structures/procedures to support/enforce/supervise practice
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

- **Science** to **Policy**

Key challenges:

- Contextualization
- Communication
- Interest (incentives)?
- Access, availability & applicability
- Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence
- Structures & procedures
- Political will
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

Addressing challenges with the SCIENCE side

**Key challenges**

- **Contextualization**
  - Support locally-led science/research endeavors that are designed in consultation with direct stakeholders/users

- **Communication**
  - Provide training to scientists – but communication is hard to teach...
    - More like "policy awareness" – how to "position" evidence into broader policy considerations
      - E.g. Cost-benefit analysis

Both solutions begin at the ONSET of research, and require **INCENTIVES** to favor policy vs academic objectives.
Standard issues in EIPM processes: Addressing challenges with the POLICY side

Political will

Key challenges

Possible solutions/interventions

Access, availability & applicability

Senior government-level workshops
Engaging those who can influence institutional culture/practices, to:
- identify context-specific solutions, and
- lead their implementation

Finance ($$) “institutional access” to relevant literature/databases

Support ($$) more locally-led research

Facilitate networks of experts also with neighboring countries
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

Addressing challenges with the POLICY side

Key challenges

**Capacity to assimilate scientific evidence**

Possible solutions/interventions

Provide how-to guidelines, tools and related training for government staff to help find, analyze and synthesize scientific literature/evidence

Mandatory as part of recruitment?

**Structures and procedures**

Develop and institutionalize procedures to ensure systematic use of scientific evidence/advice

Create specific structures/positions with mandate to supervise (and train?)
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

What can “scientists” do?

- Improving
- Contextualization
- Communication
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

What can “scientists” do?

Improving

Contextualization

Communication

Will contribute to improve..

Political will

Access, availability & applicability

Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence

Structures & procedures
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

What can “policy” do?

- Contextualization
  - Will contribute to improve..

- Communication
  - Will contribute to improve..

Supporting local research/expertise

- Access, availability & applicability
  - Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence

Political will

- Will contribute to improve
  - + $$
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

What can “policy” do?

- Development of structures/procedures
  - To train, supervise, enforce...
  - Will contribute to improve

Capacity to assimilate sc evidence

Political will + $$
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

**What can “policy” do?**

- **Institutionalization of evaluation (EIPM) processes**
  - Click here for example of Benin

- **Development of structures/procedures**
  - To train, supervise, enforce..

- **Capacity to assimilate sc evidence**

**Political will**

- Will contribute to improve

+ $$
Our intervention: PEP
To strengthen local research capacity/position

Supporting locally-led research projects
While building related scientific expertise

- Requirement to consult research users (policy needs)
- Provide policy engagement/communication workshop
- Provide mentorship to advise on “policy messaging”

Working with “science side” to improve contextualization and communication

NEW: Requirement to produce a policy paper

DAY 2
Our intervention: PEP-UNESCO program

To strengthen science advice in governments

Senior government-level workshops (political will)
Overview of general issues and needs to achieve EIPM

Objective: Engage those who can influence institutional culture/practices, to:

- identify context-specific solutions, and
- lead their implementation
Our intervention: PEP-UNESCO program

To strengthen science advice in governments

Senior government-level workshops (political will)

Overview of general issues and needs to achieve EIPM

- Processes, structures, actors, constraints/enablers
- Find/appraise/synthesize existing scientific evidence
  - Suggesting tools to assist in practice
- Produce new/own evidence
  - Reviewing methods & requirements for rigorous policy analysis/evaluation
- Translate/communicate evidence for policy influence

Field/context-dependent
- Need to customize
Our intervention: PEP-UNESCO program

To strengthen science advice in governments

Senior government-level workshops (political will)
Overview of general issues and needs to achieve EIPM

Can lead to (phase 2 of program):

Advisory support (institutional level) to develop new structures/processes

Practical training courses for govmnt staff in:
- Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence
- Methods of policy evaluation/analysis (avail.)
- Policy brokerage/communication (influence)

Identify/select participants for:
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

- Contextualization
- Communication
- Interest (incentives)?
- What does YOUR institution need??
- Political will
- Access, availability & applicability
- Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence
- Structures & procedures

DAY 3
2. Positioning findings into policy contexts

- Knowledge translation & policy brokerage
- Role and rules of the knowledge broker
- Writing a policy paper:
  - Defining policy problem, options + cost implications
  - Recommendations
- Getting ready to brief
Knowledge translation & policy brokerage

Science vs policy = Very distinct cultures, methods and epistemologies:

- Science is defined by processes designed to enhance objectivity by minimizing values
- Policymaking is bound to reflect societal values

- Challenge: find a way to link these cultures
  - Idea of structures/roles to assume “boundary function”?

Source: Sir Peter Gluckman (CSPDS, INGSA, ISC), Vilnius June 2019
Knowledge translation & policy brokerage

Boundary function – dilemma:
• Knowledge brokerage or policy advocacy?
• Evidence-informed policy, or policy-informed evidence?

Scientist’s dilemma:
• Is there room for “values” in the communication of science?
• “Issue advocate” or “honest broker”?

Source: Sir Peter Gluckman (CSPDS, INGSA, ISC), Vilnius June 2019
Role of the knowledge broker

➢ To make sure the scientific advice is understood by non-scientists, and in policy terms
### Role of the knowledge broker

- To make sure the scientific advice is understood by non-scientists, and **in policy terms**

| EFFECTS | Efficiency | Unintended effects | Longevity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are the effects of the policy on the desired outcomes?</td>
<td>Other, non-intended effects that should be considered?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>What are the effects for different population groups? How do they affect equity?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>What are the financial costs/budget implications of this policy?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feasibility</td>
<td>Is this policy technically viable/feasible?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>How is this policy perceived by stakeholders?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Role of the knowledge broker

Questions that a policy audience will always have:

• Why do we have to do something now?
• Why is it a priority?
• Have we got the **OPTION** that meets our **broader needs**?
  ➢ Who will it benefit, who won’t it benefit?
  ➢ Does it benefit priority stakeholders?
  ➢ What are the risks and to whom?
  ➢ What is the political risk of doing or not doing?
• What will it cost?

And so these are the questions that your **POLICY PAPER** should answer
What is a policy paper? Vs a traditional research paper

Research findings used to **argue for a specific set of recommendations** for policy action

- Targeting decision-makers and the design of specific policies
  - «Collaborative» - within the client-adviser relationship
  - I.e., the client will heavily influence the nature of the paper and its content.

In other words:
- To act as a **decision-making tool** and a **call to action** for the target audience.
What is a policy paper?
Vs a traditional research paper

Research findings used to **argue for a specific set of recommendations** for policy action

**REMEMBER:** Ultimate aim of your PEP project:

- to gather and analyze data about a policy problem
- to develop a set of recommendations based on the research findings
What is a policy paper?

Vs a traditional research paper

Research findings used to **argue for a specific set of recommendations** for policy action

- **Problem-oriented** (offering a solution to a specific issue)
- **Value-driven** (vs scientific objectivity)
  - Must reflect the public values and other policy considerations
  - However, argument must be developed so that the recommendation is seen as “objectively” the best option
- **Persuasive**: intention is to convince audience of your position
What is a policy paper?

Vs a traditional research paper

Research findings used to argue for a specific set of recommendations for policy action

- Focused on being persuasive:
  - Intention is to convince audience of your position
  - Evidence to support your position is CRITICAL

- Written efficiently – CLEAR, CONCISE
  - Policy audience as NO TIME – only want “necessary info”
  - Often accompanied by 1-page briefs
What is a policy paper?

Vs a traditional research paper

Research findings used to **argue for a specific set of recommendations** for policy action

- Goes beyond research findings/evidence to
  1) **CONSIDER** and assess/weigh:
     - All relevant policy options (alternatives to recommendation)
     - Related cost implications/effectiveness – e.g. cost-benefit analysis
     - Other criteria for judging policy choices: legality, political acceptability (i.e. public values), etc.
  2) **COMPARE OPTIONS**
Writing your policy paper

Key elements/features of a policy paper:

- Defining and detailing an urgent policy issue/problem within the current policy framework which needs to be addressed;

- Outlining the possible ways (policy alternatives/options) in which this issue can be addressed;

- Providing an evaluation of these options based on:
  - A policy-oriented framework of analysis (policy criteria)
    - Including cost implications
  - The new evidence from your analysis/project;

- Recommending a preferred alternative (policy option), with strong argument as to why it is the best possible course of action.
Writing your policy paper

Key elements/features of a policy paper:

- Define problem
- Present policy options
- Evaluate options
  - Based on POLICY CONSIDERATIONS (+ using evidence to support)
- Recommend the best option
  - Based on your evaluation
Writing your policy paper

Must balance between 2 competing factors:

Need to present:

• **A COMPREHENSIVE description/discussion of problem + available policy options** within the current policy framework, including research results, to:
  - Allow informed evaluation
  - Strengthen credibility of your position/recommendation;

• **ONLY the relevant knowledge and data necessary** as evidence to support the argument, to
  - Maintain reader’s focus and interest

Most common error in policy papers

- Try to include all the data and knowledge produced in the research process.
Writing your policy paper

Report-like format

- Many sub-divisions and headings (numbered sub-sections),
- Data presented in tables and/or graphs,
- Bullet-pointed information

Before you begin writing, start by **outlining your paper**

➢ Will help you to plan the overall focus and logic of your paper.

NO LONGER THAN
10 pages (5000 words)
Writing your policy paper

Structure of your PEP policy paper

• Title
• Table of contents
• Executive summary
• Introduction
• Problem description
• Policy options
• Evaluation of options
• Conclusion = recommendation
• Bibliography
• Appendices

10 pages

VS research paper

• Title + abstract
• Table of contents
• Executive summary
• Introduction
• Literature review
• Methodology and data
• Application and results
• Conclusions
• Bibliography
• Appendices

40 pages
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

Description of the **CONTEXT and IMPORTANCE** of the problem

**FIRST** – you must **BE CLEAR ABOUT**:  

- The **POLICY PROCESS** that you are trying to inform:  
  - Underway or anticipated?  
  - Desired outcome/result?  
  - Actors involved?  

- The **TARGET AUDIENCE** of your policy paper/ideas  
  - Who must be informed? Primary and secondary audiences
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

Description of the **CONTEXT and IMPORTANCE** of the problem

Two main structural features:

1. **Background of the problem**

2. **Problem within its policy context**

**SOURCES:**

- Literature review (scientific AND grey - evaluation report)
- Raw data
- People **CONSULT!!**
  - Experts
  - Policy actors
  - Stakeholders/beneficiaries
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

Description of the **CONTEXT** and **IMPORTANCE** of the problem

The problem description – two main features/parts:

1. **Background of the problem**
   - History and causes
   - Group(s) of people affected
   - Past policies implemented to address + outcomes (what worked/didn’t work)
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

Description of the **CONTEXT and IMPORTANCE** of the problem

The problem description – two main features/parts:

2. **Problem within its CURRENT policy context**
   - Current status/extent/severity of the problem
     (size of popul. affected, costs, short-term risks, etc.)
   - Current legal, social, economic, political implications
   - Current approach/policy being implemented + outcomes
     (successes & failures known to date)
   - Factors that can inhibit/facilitate related policy interventions

At the ONSET/INCEPTION of project

Situation analysis?
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

Description of the **CONTEXT** and **IMPORTANCE** of the problem

The problem description:

- **Defines** the nature of the problem/issue focused on
- **Convinces** reader that the issue requires government action.
- **Outlines** the problem within its **specific POLICY environment** (vs general)
- **Builds** a framework for the argumentation of the policy options and their evaluation

**N.B.** Including a variety of sources builds credibility of the argument
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

IMPORTANT
Must differentiate **RESEARCH QUESTION** vs **POLICY QUESTION** = not the same!

- **Policy question:** answer provides concrete **policy recommendation**
- **Research question:** answer provides an **assessment of the situation**
  - which can be used to answer policy question
Writing your policy paper

Defining problem

IMPORTANT
Must differentiate RESEARCH QUESTION vs POLICY QUESTION = not the same!

Example: Assessing impact of new labor policy for informal workers

Policy questions: ➢ Recommendation
• Has the new policy contributed to improving informal workers’ conditions/welfare?
• If not, what can be done to rectify?

Research questions: ➢ Assessment
• What impact(s) do the new policy measures have on informal workers' wages, employment, and formalization?
• How do these impacts differ between different population subgroups?
Writing your policy paper

Presenting and evaluating policy options

Three main structural features:

1. Outline/summary of policy options**:
2. Framework of analysis
3. Evaluation of policy options

SOURCES:
- Literature review (scientific AND grey - evaluation report)
- Raw data
- People **CONSULT!!**
  - Experts
  - Policy actors
  - Stakeholders/beneficiaries
Writing your policy paper

Presenting and evaluating policy options

Three main structural features:

1. **Outline/summary of policy options**: 
   - Introducing the various ways in which policy can address the issue
   - Only options “applicable” in the current context/stage of policy cycle
     - E.g. Formulation/design, implementation, evaluation, reform..

2. **Framework of analysis**
   - Presenting the criteria (guiding principles) used to assess/compare options
   - Based on POLICY considerations (efficiency, fairness, costs..) + evidence

3. **Evaluation of policy options**
   - Assess each option based on selected criteria
Writing your policy paper

Evaluation of policy options - criteria

Core considerations from the “policy perspective”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
<th>EFFICIENCY</th>
<th>What are the effects of the policy on the desired outcomes?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unintended effects</td>
<td>Other, non-intended effects that should be considered?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EQUITY</td>
<td>What are the effects for different population groups?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION</td>
<td>COST</td>
<td>What are the financial costs/budget implications of this policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FEASIBILITY</td>
<td>Is this policy technically viable/feasible?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACCEPTABILITY</td>
<td>How is this policy perceived by stakeholders?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of which are weighed against scientific knowledge in decision-making
Writing your policy paper

Evaluation of policy options - criteria

- **Effectiveness:** To what extent does it produce the desired outcomes, i.e. solve the problem?

- **Efficiency:** How will it affect the target groups? Both monetary & social impact
  - **Cost-benefit analysis:** quantify as many aspects of option as possible

- **Equity/fairness:** Distribution of costs/benefits amongst population groups?

- **Feasibility/Implementability:** Suitable political, administrative/technical and legal framework in place to allow for effective implementation?

- **Acceptability:** (Relative) perception of target population viz each policy intervention? Current public mindset/debate (media), cultural constraints, etc.
Writing your policy paper

Evaluation of policy options - criteria

Core of the argument is the cost-benefit analysis

Allows to:

- **Quantify** various dimensions/effects of the policy
- **Compare** different options based on idea of “return on investment”
- **Illustrate argument**: resulting table = visual tool, quick/easy to read
Writing your policy paper
Cost-benefit analysis

WHAT DOES IT DO?

Compare cost of program/intervention VS value ($$) of outcomes/benefits

• Quantify (common value) various dimensions/effects of policy

• To evaluate the “return on investment” (RoI) ➢ i.e rationalize resources/use of budget

• To COMPARE several programs/interventions and ILLUSTRATE your argument ➢ resulting table = visual tool, quick/easy to read

N.B. Expected outcomes (efficiency) should be determined by rigorous EVIDENCE (literature, impact analysis/evaluation…)

The cost “alone” may be misleading.. Should explain it as an “investment”
Cost-benefit analysis

WHY IMPORTANT?

Cost or program ≠ its value (i.e. benefits)

• Can show that the most expensive program/intervention does not necessarily have the highest RoI

• **Also SHOW IMPORTANCE OF RESEARCH:**
  • Ex-ante evaluation, or even good literature review, can inform about expected outcomes/benefits

• The Planning/Finance department will always ask: “Show me the money” - Also to confirm “feasibility”

• Money is always a powerful argument:
  ➢ E.g. 1$ invested in disaster preparedness = 7$ saved in crisis response…
Writing your policy paper

Cost-benefit analysis

HOW IS IT DONE?

1. Use research evidence (or scientific literature) to effects/impacts

2. Estimate economic/monetary value of various effects/aspects

3. Use data/information about cost & population to calculate to project value of total costs/benefits, for each intervention

4. Apply “DISCOUNT RATE” = investments’ value of future cash flows
   Usually 10-12% (UNDP)

Results are reported as a cost-benefit “ratio”
- E.g. A ratio of 1:4 = for 1$ invested, generates $4 in value/ benefits
Writing your policy paper

Cost-benefit analysis - example

**Floods in Senegal** – effects/costs per year:
- 360 000 people affected
- 64 M€ en losses/damages

**Three options/alternatives** to mitigate effects:
- Relocation of population
- Urban/housing & land planning (adaptation)
- Or, do nothing
## Writing your policy paper

**Cost-benefit analysis - example**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No action</th>
<th>Relocation</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population with reduced effect</td>
<td>0 pers</td>
<td>200 000 pers (55%)</td>
<td>260 000 pers (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of intervention (first year)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35M€</td>
<td>-50M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross benefits / per year (Reductions in losses/damages)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+35.2M€ (55%)</td>
<td>+46.1M€ (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (indirect) costs / per year</td>
<td>-10M€</td>
<td>-10M€</td>
<td>-13M€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No action: 50€/pers (victim assistance)
- Relocation: 50€/pers (income losses for population)
- Adaptation: 13M€ (infrastructure maintenance - gov)

| Net benefits – after 1 year | -10M€     | -9.8M€          | -17M€            |
| Gross benefits – after 5 years | 0         | +176M€          | +230.5M€         |
| Other cost – after 5 years | -50M€     | -50M€           | -85M€            |
| Net benefits – after 5 years | -250M€    | +126M€          | +155M€           |
## Writing your policy paper

### Cost-benefit analysis - example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No action</th>
<th>Relocation</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population with reduced effect</strong></td>
<td>0 pers</td>
<td>200,000 pers (55%)</td>
<td>260,000 pers (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost of intervention (first year)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35M€</td>
<td>-50M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross benefits / per year</strong> (Reductions in losses/damages)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+35.2M€ (55%)</td>
<td>+46.1M€ (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other (indirect) costs / per year</strong></td>
<td>-10M€</td>
<td>-10M€</td>
<td>-13M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No action: 50€/pers (victim assistance)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Relocation: 50€/pers (income losses for population)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Adaptation: 13M€ (infrastructure maintenance - gov)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net benefits – after 1 year</strong></td>
<td>-10M€</td>
<td>-9.8M€</td>
<td>-17M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gross benefits – after 5 years (Discount 10%)</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+193.6M€</td>
<td>+253M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other cost – after 5 years (Discount 10%)</strong></td>
<td>-55M€</td>
<td>-55M€</td>
<td>-93.5M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net benefits – after 5 years (Discount 10%)</strong></td>
<td>-275M€</td>
<td>+138.6M€</td>
<td>+170.5M€</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Writing your policy paper

### Cost-benefit analysis - example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No action</th>
<th>Relocation</th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost of intervention (first year)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-35M€</td>
<td>-50M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net benefits – after 5 years</td>
<td>-275M€</td>
<td>+138.6M€</td>
<td>+170.5M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-benefit ratio, over 5 years</td>
<td>1 : 4</td>
<td>1 : 3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other major considerations for policy:

- Acceptability?
- Technical feasibility?

Must complete evaluation of policy options with OTHER considerations
Writing your policy paper

Cost-benefit analysis

Main challenges

Availability of evidence/information on “expected outcomes/effects” of an intervention

- EVALUATION
- Literature – other countries’ experience?

Not all types of (social, political, etc.) costs/benefits can be “monetarized”

- These should still be part of evaluation, beyond CBA

Must complete evaluation of policy options with OTHER considerations
### How to reduce effects of floods on population?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1: Effectiveness</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 2: Unintended effects</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unknown - probably</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 3: Equity</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 2: Cost-effectiveness/Return on investment</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1: Feasibility</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 2: Acceptability</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Recommend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Option 1 No action</th>
<th>Option 2 Relocation</th>
<th>Option 3 Adaptation/infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 1: Effectiveness</td>
<td>Option 1</td>
<td>Option 2</td>
<td>Option 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1: Equity</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 2: Cost-effectiveness/Return on investment</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 1: Feasibility</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria 2: Acceptability</th>
<th>Option 1</th>
<th>Option 2</th>
<th>Option 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommend? | No | No | Yes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adaptation</th>
<th>Relocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td>260,000 people spared</td>
<td>200,000 people spared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reducing flood-prone area by 72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Reducing vulnerability of target/area population (economic, health, infrastructure)</td>
<td>New/safer housing for relocated population, but loss of livelihood/assets and heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>-50 M€</td>
<td>-35 M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benef 5 yrs (CBA ratio)</td>
<td>+170.5 M€ (1 : 3.4)</td>
<td>+138.6 M€ (1 : 4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faisability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure: building + maintenance Coordination with communities</td>
<td>New housing development Assistance to displaced (1 year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Question: What should our town do to improve voter participation?</td>
<td>Policy Choice A: Pay people to vote</td>
<td>Policy Choice B: Schedule local elections on days when few people work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 1: Legality</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 2: Cost effectiveness</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Cost neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria 3: Inclusiveness (policy affects the broadest range of voters possible)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Probably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conclusion: policy recommendation

The conclusion of your policy paper = policy recommendation

Overall, your policy recommendation should:

• flow from the **logical application of your criteria** to your policy options
• be **“actionable”** (road map – steps to design, implement..)
• be **“realistic”**, both in terms of:
  • affordability (cost within available means/resources)
  • practicality and acceptability
• be **scalable**..
Writing your policy paper

Conclusion: policy recommendation

Three structural elements:

1. **Concise synthesis of major findings**

2. **Set of policy recommendations**
   The practical solution to a policy problem is usually a **strategy, not a single recommendation**
   - Divide recommendations into separate proposals
     - With each addressing one aspect of the problem and solution
   - Outline practical steps to implement the chosen policy option
     - Must be clear, practical, persuasive, logical and comprehensive

3. **Concluding remarks**
From paper to brief

Your policy paper answers **key questions for policy audience**

**Problem definition:**

- Why do we have to do something now?
- Why is it a priority?

**Evaluation of policy options**

- Have we got the OPTION that meets our broader needs?
  - Who will it benefit, who won’t it benefit?
  - Does it benefit priority stakeholders?
  - What are the risks and to whom?
  - What is the political risk of doing or not doing?

- What will it cost?
From paper to brief

When completed, your policy paper (10 pages) will be synthesized to become a (1-2 page) policy brief.

Same structure:
- Problem definition
- Policy options and evaluation
- Policy recommendation

Challenge is SYNTHESIS

And good synthesis is the KEY to effective policy briefing!!
Getting ready to brief..

To be effective, **dissemination should start EARLY**

- Earlier the better, to ensure “ownership” by target audience
- Onset + periodic consultations = most effective type of dissemination

So you should **be ready to brief about your project** (now/anytime)

- The problem and related policy options
- Your project’s expected contribution - objective: to inform policy choice
- The “method”? – if interested, for credibility
- The progress so far – update periodically
Getting ready to brief..

**RULES of “policy briefing”:**

- **Be CLEAR/DIRECT** on your key message/goal
  - No “beating about the bush”

- **KNOW your AUDIENCE** – their values, interests, priorities, background..
  - And align your argument with what “speaks to them”

- **Be VISUAL**: i.e. use illustrations – e.g. graphs, real-life cases, etc.

- **Provide PRACTICAL solutions/options**
  - Policymakers won’t pick up a problem without a solution

- **Be BRIEF!!** Your audience as NO TIME
RULES of “policy briefing”
Golden rules of written communication

1. Deconstruct your text
   - Hierarchy of ideas - Main vs sub-ideas - and SHORT PARAGRAPHS
   - Sections – grouping of ideas (e.g. problem, causes, effects, options/solutions)

2. Select and highlight KEY WORDS/IDEAS – use bold, CAPITAL, SIZES, colors

3. Create SPACE around your key words/ideas

4. Use lines that start with stats/numbers

5. Use images/visual illustrations (e.g. infographics, pictures..)
Golden rules in written communication

FULL PARAGRAPHS ARE THE ENEMY!!

A “problem definition”, or situation, can either be described like this...

La banlieue de Dakar demeure la région la plus touchée par les inondations récurrentes au Sénégal. Ainsi, en 2009 c’est quelque 360 000 personnes qui ont été directement affectées par les inondations à Pikine et 22 000 personnes à Guédiawaye ; soit respectivement 44% et 7,2% de la population dans ces deux villes. Au total dans la région de Dakar, ce sont quelques 30 000 maisons et 130 écoles qui ont été touchées par les inondations. Les inondations de 2009 ont coûté environ 42 milliards de F.CFA dont 24 milliards de dommages et 20 milliards de pertes. Les dommages les plus importants concernent le logement (61%), suivi du transport (11%) et de la santé (10%). Quant aux pertes, elles concernent surtout le commerce (23%, notamment commerce informel), le logement (18%), les infrastructures urbaines communautaires (18%), l’énergie (17%) et le transport (16%) (République du Sénégal, 2010 : 44 - 53). Les inondations de 2012 pourraient battre les records en termes de populations sinistrées, de maisons et d’infrastructures inondées, de dommages et de pertes occasionnées.
Or like this...

2009 FLOODS - Senegal (Pikine)

EFFECTS/COSTS

42 billions F.CFA

Losses - 20 billions
- Autres 26%
- Commerce 23%
- Logement 18%
- Transport 16%
- Énergie 17%

Damages -24 billions
- Autres 18%
- Health 10%
- Transport 11%
- Housing 61%

POPULATION
- 380 000+ affected
- 44% pop. Pikine
- 30 000 houses
- 130 schools

World Bank estimates at 20 trillion fcfa (2xPIB) the value of economic assets vulnerable to floodings in Pikine.
Subventionner le capital agricole des femmes pour réduire les inégalités et favoriser l'économie du Burkina Faso

Par Patrice Bléméédé Zidaouba, Semassane Remadial Kinda, Poukhali Diroa Nikhama et Daba Baka Hien

Messages

Une politique de subvention du capital agricole en faveur des femmes pourrait non seulement aider à redresser les inégalités de genre au Burkina Faso, mais elle serait aussi favorable à l’Économie et l’Emploi de l’Échelle nationale. Les modèles de financement à privilégier pour réaliser cette politique sont l’aide publique au développement et la fiscalité indirecte.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

La productivité agricole des femmes limitée par l’accès inégal aux ressources

L’implication des femmes dans les activités agricoles au Burkina Faso est très importante ; elles constituent l’espèce donnée de l’Économie nationale, et nous considérons, c’est l’Économie donnée nationale. On estime qu’elles, 35,6% des femmes exercent des activités économiques travaillent dans les campagnes, principalement dans le production rizière, bien que cela se fasse souvent dans des conditions précaires (OCP/M, 2004). Elles s’impliquent également dans le stockage et le traitement des aliments, et sont responsables de 40% de la commercialisation des produits agricoles ; tout cela en plus de leurs tâches domestiques quotidienne (cuisine, ménage, soins des enfants...). En dehors de cette force prédominante dans l’agriculture, la proportion des femmes en ressources productives : terre que le travail, les outils, le capital matériel, financement et négociation - est faible (A.S.O, 2011). Cet accès inégal aux ressources productives entraine leur productivité, et diminue dans conséquence leur contribution au développement du secteur agricole et à l’atteinte des objectifs du développement économique et social.

Le rôle des politiques

Bien que la volonté de favoriser l’accès à la terre et aux matières agricoles soit inscrite dans les politiques nationales (par exemple dans le programme présidentiel 2015-2020), les femmes continuent de rencontrer des difficultés importantes pour accéder aux ressources et aux biens, ces défis généraux, au capital peut-il être résolu. En fait, y de cette situation est souvent que les tractations dans les politiques sont faibles.

Or, si l’accès à la terre et aux matières agricoles est fondamental pour constituer une base de production, l’accroissement de la productivité agricole des exploitations des femmes requiert une intensification de leurs activités. Une meilleure durabilité du capital physique agricole permettant également aux femmes d’investir dans le temps, du temps pour coûter à des activités productives.

L’analyse

Cette étude vise à analyser les potentialités d’une politique de subvention du capital physique agricole des femmes – notamment les impacts de l’emploi et les revenus, sur les inégalités de genre, ainsi que sur la croissance économique au Burkina Faso.

Pour ce faire, les auteurs ont recours à un modèle d’équilibre général calculable (HEC), calibré avec une marche de compatibilité sociale (MCS) orientée sur le genre. Cette démarche a été construite en 20 par l’Institut National de la Statistique et de la Démographie (INS). Le modèle a donc été utilisé pour simuler différents scénarios, afin d’en ressortir les effets sur les dimensions dimensionnées (par rapport aux données de référence de 2015).

Scénarios et financement de subventions

Afin de fournir des recommandations non seulement précises mais utiles pour la décision, les auteurs considèrent cinq types de politique de subvention du capital agricole, dont ils ont également examiné la valeur en termes de coûts/dépenses budgétaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Politique de subvention du capital agricole</th>
<th>Écart en milliers F CFA (appareils)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Femmes -30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Femmes -50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Femmes -70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Femmes -90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Résultats

De façon générale, la faiblesse des variations (%) citée ci-dessous s’explique par la très faible intensité capitale et l’agriculture.

Scénario de référence : le cas des femmes

Un premier scénario – une subvention de 30% sur le capital des femmes (2,2 milliards F CFA), financée grâce à une taxe directe - a été analysé en détails, afin d’identifier et comprendre les mécanismes de transmission par lesquels le genre d’intervention peut se répercuter sur différents aspects (macro, micro) de l’économie du Burkina Faso.

Il survient ensuite les impacts à l’échelle microéconomique, tels que sur l’emploi et les revenus de ménages.

L’analyse des résultats du scénario de référence suggère, entre autres, que la modernisation de l’agriculture tire la main-d’œuvre féminine de l’agriculture au profit de l’agriculture et les activités agricoles, tels que l’agro-industrie, la restauration et la textilie.

Cela entraîne son resserrer une hausse de revenus réels des femmes provenant des secteurs agricoles mais aussi de la quasi-totalité des secteurs de l’agriculture notamment :
- induire une baisse du chômage plus élevée chez les femmes (-0.34%) que chez les hommes (-0.16%);
- accroître davantage les revenus des femmes (+3.3%) que ceux des hommes (+0.62%);

En effet, les revenus réels des hommes très des secteurs agricoles diminuent du fait de la substitution entre le capital fixe et masculin. Ils sont toutefois en hausse dans tous les secteurs non agricoles.

Conclusion

La combinaison des résultats des différents scénarios simulés permet de tirer certains conclusions suivants :
- L’impact sur la croissance du PIB réel est plus élevé lorsque la subvention est accordée aux hommes, puisque cette mesure a un impact sur le capital non plus seulement à l’agriculture, mais aussi dans la production rizière. Toutefois, cette politique risque de s’accompagner d’une forte hausse des inégalités de revenus entre les hommes et les femmes.
- Les plus fortes croissances du PIB se réalisent lorsque la subvention sont accordées aux hommes et femmes.

Les résultats montrent pour le Burkina Faso à la fois la plus significative, tant au niveau de l’impact économique que pour la réduction des inégalités, que l’octroi et la distribution d’une subvention directe, mais discriminatoire – i.e. de 50% pour les femmes et 30% pour les hommes (SI) – et lorsque celle-ci est financée soit par une partie de l’aide publique au développement, ou, à défaut, par la fiscalité indirecte.
- Outre l’augmentation du PIB réel (+0.28%), cette politique permet une hausse plus importante du revenu réel des femmes (+1.05%) que des hommes (+1.42%), ainsi qu’une hausse plus importante du chômage pour les femmes (+0.18%) que les hommes (+0.83%)

Financement

La figure 1 présente les multiplicateurs de subvention correspondant une variation du PIB réel et le montant de subvention pour l’ensemble des 20 scénarios. Il apparaît que la subvention de l’aide publique au développement se multiplier le plus faible, suivi de la taxe indirecte (c.a.d. TVA). Un autre avantage de cette dernière, par rapport à la taxe directe sur les salaires (qui arrive au 3e rang des catégories d’efficacité), est sa « touche » - en ce sens qu’elle ne touche que les consommateurs finals. Le choix ultime, et d’influence sur la détermination des distributions et des profils financiers. Enfin, le financement par déficit public présente non seulement le multiplicateur le plus faible, mais aussi transmettre l’accroissement du déficit public (ou éliminer l’épargne publique), entraînant ainsi une sorte d’exclusion de l’investissement public.

Recommandations de politique

Sur la base des résultats de l’analyse, les auteurs ont envisagé que la surcroît budgétaire serait davantage axés sur la mise en œuvre d’une politique de subvention du capital agricole pour tous (hommes et femmes), mais dans l’une elle, soit plus axée sur les femmes. Et celle-ci devrait être financée soit en utilisant une partie de l’aide publique au développement, ou, à défaut, par la fiscalité indirecte.

Ce genre d’intervention permet non seulement de favoriser la croissance économique, mais aussi de réduire les inégalités de revenus entre les hommes et les femmes. Politiiquement, cela contribuerait aussi à l’accroissement des objectifs du Programme National de Développement Économique et Social (PNDES) et de la politique générale du Burkina Faso, tel que consigné dans le Document de Politique Nationale (PNG).
Une solution en accord avec les besoins des populations de Pikine

RÉSUMÉ
1. Les inondations coûtent environ 42 milliards F.CFA en dommages et pertes à chaque année, affectant près de 380 000 personnes au pays
2. Deux voies possibles pour atténuer ces effets: le regroupement, ou l'adaptation du territoire
3. L’adaptation du territoire est recommandée car plus efficace et mieux adaptée aux besoins de la population
4. La littérature démontre que le regroupement résulte souvent dans le retour des populations dans les zones inondables

SITUATION

INONDATIONS 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EFFETS/COUTS</th>
<th>PERTES 20 milliards</th>
<th>DOMMAGES 22 milliards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commerces</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logements</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autres</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

42 milliards F.CFA

POPULATION
- 380 000+ affectés
- 44% pop. Pikine
- 30 000 maisons
- 130 écoles

CAUSES

Changements climatiques
Effet croissant – on peut anticiper l’augmentation des pluies au fil des ans

Occupation des dépressions inondables – surtout Pikine
Nécessités économiques des occupants

Vulnérabilité des populations occupantes
Habitations informelles, peu d’équipements publics

ALTERNATIVES

ADAPTATION
Aménager le territoire de Pikine afin de réduire sa vulnérabilité aux inondations et eaux stagnantes insalubres, notamment en construisant de nouvelles infrastructures.

Coût d’investissement de 500 M€ et coût d’entretien annuel de 13 M€

RELOGEMENT
Dédommager et reloger les personnes vivant dans la zone affectée

Coût d’investissement de 35 M€

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptation territoire</th>
<th>Relogement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Efficacité</strong></td>
<td>260 000 personnes hors de l’eau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Équité</td>
<td>Réduction vulnérabilité (économique, santé, infrastructure) de pop. dans la zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coût</td>
<td>-20 M€</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bénéf 5 ans (ratio ACB)</td>
<td>+155 M€ (1 : 3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faisabilité</td>
<td>Oui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faisabilité</td>
<td>Oui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptabilité</td>
<td>Oui – en accord avec stratégies des populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMANDATION

L’adaptation/aménagement du territoire de Pikine est le scénario le plus efficace pour réduire les pertes, coûts et dommages considérables, tant économiques que sociales, des inondations annuelles.

Cette intervention impliquerait les étapes suivantes:
- Construction d’une autoroute entre Dakar et Diennadié
  - Déjà préfinancé – réduction de 57% de la zone inondable
- Campagne de sensibilisation et coordination avec les communautés locales
- Construction d’infrastructures de drainage des eaux pluviales
  - Réduction de +13% (72% total) de la zone inondable
- Mise en place des réseaux de collecte des eaux usées
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Improving cognitive skills for non-farm entrepreneurial productivity and growth in Indonesia

By Niken Kusumawati, Daniel Sunyadarma, Lucia Tiberli, Veto Tyes Indrio

Key messages
- Investments to improve long-term health outcomes may be more valuable than training programs in boosting the cognitive skills needed for non-farm entrepreneurial success.
- Measures to improve skills-sector matching could help competitiveness and productivity in the non-farm sector.
- Inadequate problem solving skills and being able to quickly adapt to change are linked to lower non-farm profits and business value.

Indonesia’s SME sector key to national development

Indonesia’s 60 million Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) contribute 60% of GDP and occupy 97% of the workforce.

Improving SME competitiveness and productivity is key to the government’s Mid-Term Development Plan.

The plan includes training programs, providing start-up capital for entrepreneurs and an educational curriculum to foster entrepreneurship.

Targeted support needed for entrepreneurs

However, self-employment in Indonesia is often unnecessarily restrained due to a lack of skills and opportunities for employment in the wage sector.

The abundance of SMEs in Indonesia has increased the importance of being able to identify and support entrepreneurs that have a high growth potential as an engine for development.

Understanding the skills and characteristics that are important for success among entrepreneurs is necessary to improve programs that aim to encourage and support entrepreneurs.

Additionally, understanding entrepreneurs more generally is useful for developing national strategies for poverty reduction and growth.

The analysis

A team of local researchers set out to investigate what types of intelligence lead to entrepreneurial success. To do so, the team analyzed the returns of different cognitive skills on the profits and value of (non-farm) household businesses. Using data from the most recent waves of the Indonesian Family Life Survey (2007 and 2014), the team compared the returns on crystallized intelligence with those on fluid intelligence.

- Fluid intelligence: the ability to think logically and solve problems in novel situations.
- Crystallized intelligence: the ability to use skills, knowledge and experience.

The analysis

A team of local researchers set out to investigate what types of intelligence lead to entrepreneurial success. To do so, the team analyzed the returns of different cognitive skills on the profits and value of (non-farm) household businesses. Using data from the most recent waves of the Indonesian Family Life Survey (2007 and 2014), the team compared the returns on crystallized intelligence with those on fluid intelligence.

- Fluid intelligence: the ability to think logically and solve problems in novel situations.
- Crystallized intelligence: the ability to use skills, knowledge and experience.

Fluid intelligence was only found to have a positive effect on business performance when the entrepreneur is engaged in the sector that is the most appropriate for his or her skills.

Crystallized intelligence does not provide significant benefits in this sector.

The research team found little evidence of skills sorting into specific sectors, i.e., that individuals with specialized intelligence, educational attainment or skills choose the sectors where their specific abilities would prompt the highest returns.

This could be driven by local economic environment and labor market constraints that prevent perfect (or quasi-perfect) matching between skills and sectors. For example, the majority of workers have low levels of education, making it difficult for them to find employers with the desired skill and education levels.

Non-farm household businesses were found to:
- Have an average value of 23 million Rupiah.
- Have small but healthy profits (11.9 million Rupiah/year).
- Have little to no investment in technology or land.
- Inevitably in equipment.

Conclusions and policy messages

The findings suggest that a developing country setting like Indonesia, where economic environments change rapidly and rules and regulations on businesses are still relatively incomplete, the ability to quickly adapt to change and to solve problems (fluid intelligence) is more useful than a high level of technical skills (crystallized intelligence).

Additionally, because the majority of household businesses in Indonesia are labor-intensive and use low capital and simple technology, high levels of crystallized intelligence may not provide a significant advantage.

Given that fluid intelligence is something that an individual is born with, rather than taught, it appears that training programs are not the most useful way to increase the cognitive abilities needed to support non-farm entrepreneurs in Indonesia, contrary to current policy.

The findings of this project instead point to a need for policymakers to invest in improving long-term health outcomes, including maternal and environmental conditions.

In addition, policies that support entrepreneurs with high levels of crystallized intelligence to find a job as a wage worker or operate a business in the brain-intensive sector would increase returns to these skills.

As setting up a specific sector is not dependent on the type of intelligence most suited to that sector, it is likely that the returns to each type of intelligence are instead limited, improved skills-sector matching would help increase returns to skills.

Policymakers should also aim to reduce existing constraints facing entrepreneurs in Indonesia.

Further research is needed to establish the most effective ways to achieve these recommendations.

This brief summarizes outcomes from 79HAPI-32026 supported under the FAO-GI initiative (2016-2018). To find out more about the research methods and findings, read the full paper, published as part of the PPF working papers series.
Or like this!

PEP research in action
Easing school to work transitions in Benin

INSAE. 2014: School-to-Work Transition Survey (SWTS)
- Can take up to 4 years for young people to find 1st job after leaving school
- In 2014, only 11% of youth aged 15-29 had completed their transition to the labour market
- Main obstacles to youth employment are lack of:
  - vocational and technical education
  - professional experience
  - job search assistance

Since 2007, several government initiatives (programs, agencies) introduced to reduce youth unemployment
Focus mostly on providing entrepreneurship education and work experience, but to high school graduates

Local PEP researchers investigate whether working before leaving school can help youth transition more easily into Benin’s labour market

**Method:**
Multi-equation model within the counterfactual framework to evaluate data from the SWTS for 15 to 29 year-olds in Benin
“Working while studying” defined as work undertaken by students during and/or outside of the school season (evenings/weekends and holidays, respectively).

**Findings**

Working while studying eases and reduces the school-to-work transition
Especially:
- When working experiences are combined with apprenticeships.
- For youth who left school with at least a secondary education.
- For men. It was not found to make a difference to the duration of women’s transition periods.
- If the work is undertaken only during the summer break or holidays (not evenings and weekends during the school year).

**School-to-work transition durations for youth in Benin (months)**

**Recommendations for policy making**
- Youth employment interventions should be reoriented to promote labour market experience alongside education, rather than after high school graduation.
- Additional measures are needed to support young women who wish to enter the labour market.

**Informing national policy processes**

- 2016-2018: Team consults with government ministries/agencies related to employment and education.
- October 2017: After discussions with the PEP team, the Minister of SMEs and Promotion of Employment (MPMEPE) sets up a policy discussion group
  - For PEP team to share/discuss findings with experts/advisors from:
    - Ministry of SMEs and Promotion of Employment (MPMEPE)
    - Ministry of Secondary, Technical and Vocational Education (MTFAS)
    - Fund for Continuing Professional Development & Apprenticeship (FODEFCA)
  - Discussions (ongoing) have already led to the findings informing the revision of the “Technical Education and Vocational Training” policy (FODEFCA)
- August 2018: The Bureau of Analysis & Investigation of the Presidency invites team to share findings during a special advisory meeting with high-level officials from FODEFCA, MPMEPE, and the National Agency for Promotion of Employment (ANPE)
- February 2019: Team organizes PEP national policy conference
  - Attended by: ANPE, FODEFCA, MPMEPE, MTFAS, Observatory of Employment and Training (ONIEF), but also private sector, CSOs, NGOs and academia.
  - Resulted in: collective statement of the need and will to improve synergies between various state structures for employment, and with academia.

---

Research team:
- Sotomari Am OSCADE
- Mireille M'boh Mmange
- Judith Basso
- sessou Soro
- Gboba Houeivo
- Montsiara Mafy

PEP scientific mentor:
- This project was supported under the PEP initiative for Policy Analysis on Growth and Employment. 2016-2020 (PAGE) II

Funded by:
- OECD
- British Council
- DFID
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Improving Cognitive Skills for Entrepreneurial Productivity and Growth in Indonesia

**Background**
Indonesia, with 60 million Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), contributes 60% to GDP and employs 97% of the workforce. Improving SMEs' competitiveness and productivity is a key element in the government's Mid-Term Development Plan.

**Research Objective:** Investigate the returns of two types of cognitive skills (fluid intelligence and crystallized intelligence) of Indonesian non-farm household enterprises on the performance of their businesses.

**The Analysis**

**Fluid Intelligence**
- Capacity to think logically and solve problems in novel situations.
- Highly influenced by genetics and biological factors.
- Measured by Raven’s Progressive Matrices test (shape-matching test) from the PFLS.

**Crystallized Intelligence**
- Ability to use skills, knowledge, and experience.
- Acquired through education, experience, and interaction with an environment.
- Measured by mathematic test score in PFLS.*

**Key Findings**
- A one standard deviation increase in fluid intelligence leads to a 5.7% increase in profit and a 7% increase in business value.
- We do not find evidence that crystallized intelligence, once fluid intelligence and education attainment are controlled, has any effect on business performance.
- Crystallized intelligence leads to higher profits only when an entrepreneur is engaged in the sector that is most appropriate given her or his skills.
- We find no evidence of entrepreneurs sorting into sectors based on intelligence or education, presumably due to labor market constraints.

**Conclusions**

**Policy Messages**
Need to invest in improving long-term health outcomes.
• “The results suggest that although women entrepreneurs appear to be credit constrained overall and at different firm sizes, the difference in credit constraint between male and female entrepreneurs is not statistically significant.

• The effect of age on the probability that a firm will be credit constrained is statistically significant and the results show that firms with ageing owners overall, are 12.5% more likely to be credit constrained.

• Firms with experienced managers are significantly less likely to be credit constrained, other things being equal. This is true for all firm sizes. Managers with experience can manage the firm’s financial and credit policies better than inexperienced ones.

• Firms whose top owner is also CEO are 10.4 percent more likely to be credit constrained. This may be related to risk-averse policies the owner may adopt or skepticism of the loaning financial institution.”
“Results suggest:

- even if women entrepreneurs appear to be more credit constrained:
- the difference between male vs female entrepreneurs is not significant.

Are more likely to be credit constrained:

- Firms with ageing owners - 12.5% more likely
- Firms whose top owner is also CEO - 10.4% more likely
  - may be related to adoption of risk-averse policies or skepticism of the loaning financial institution.

Are less likely to be credit constrained:

- Firms with experienced managers (true for all firm sizes)
Visual tools are important...
But SYNTHESES is the KEY!!!

From..

The results suggest that although women entrepreneurs appear to be credit constrained overall and at different firm sizes, the difference in credit constraint between male and female entrepreneurs is not statistically significant.

To..

“Results suggest:

- if women entrepreneurs appear to be more credit constrained:
  - the difference between male vs female entrepreneurs is not significant
And SYNTHESIS means...

#1 - IDENTIFY your KEY WORDS

#2 - REMOVE all info that is not essential

#3 – DECONSTRUCT your ideas
- main, secondary, etc..
- Idea 1, idea 2, ...
Other rules of policy brokerage

- **Understand the policy process**
  - In your specific context/area – who are the key players

- **Timing is everything**
  - Avoid “bad timings”, and “seize opportunities”

- **Remember all the stakeholders**
  - Relative influence, differing impact, different priorities, etc..

- **Be inclusive of other disciplines**
  - Policy makers look at issues through more than one angle

Source: Sir Peter Gluckman (CSPDS, INGSA, ISC), Vilnius June 2019
Other rules of policy brokerage

- **Acknowledge uncertainties** – e.g. when evidence is not conclusive
  - Admitting to evidence gaps is not a sign of weakness
  - Policy makers are used to dealing with uncertainty

- **Don’t surprise your key/target audience**
  - **ENGAGE THEM EARLY!!!**
  - Keep them informed: consultation + periodic updates
  - LISTEN to their feedback, questions, concerns..

- **Writing a report is NOT informing policy**
  - Must follow up – ensure key audience understands
  - Is there need for further PR/convincing? Information?

Source: Sir Peter Gluckman (CSPDS, INGSA, ISC), Vilnius June 2019
More on communication next year...
#1 - GETTING READY TO BRIEF

With your own team:

Distinguish/write down your project’s research question vs policy question

Summarize each of the following topic in **2-3 sentences max**

- The problem and related (current) policymaking process/need
- The different policy options (if you know)
- Your project’s expected contribution (objective)
- Your progress so far

Pair up (2 teams)

Present your “brief” (**3 minutes max** – check time) and assess/advise each other

- Was it clear enough? Brief enough? “Policy” enough?
#2 - EVALUATION OF POLICY OPTIONS

Same 2 teams – help each other to identify the lists/categories of:

- **“CRITERIA”** (or “policy considerations”) that specifically apply to the type of policy interventions relevant to your project/issue
  - E.g. feasibility, equity, acceptability... AND BEYOND

- **COSTS & BENEFITS** that could be estimated in your cost-benefit analysis
  - And the economists should assess whether they can be “monetarized”
3. Addressing your institution’s needs

- Summary of challenges and potential solutions envisaged within the PEP & PEP-UNESCO programs
- Examples of solutions implemented by others
- Identifying gaps in practices and processes within YOUR institutions + related potential solutions

➢ DISCUSSION
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

**Science** to **Policy**

- **Key challenges**
  - Contextualization
  - Communication
  - Interest (incentives)?

**Political will**
- Access, availability & applicability
- Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence
- Structures & procedures
Standard issues in EIPM processes: Addressing challenges with the POLICY side

Key challenges

Access, availability & applicability

Political will

Senior government-level workshops
Engaging those who can influence institutional culture/practices, to:
- identify context-specific solutions, and
- lead their implementation

Possible solutions/interventions

Finance ($$) “institutional access” to relevant literature/databases

Support ($$) more locally-led research

Facilitate networks of experts also with neighboring countries
Standard issues in EIPM processes:

Addressing challenges with the POLICY side

Key challenges

Capacity to assimilate scientific evidence

Possible solutions/interventions

Structures and procedures

Provide how-to guidelines, tools and related training for government staff to help find, analyze and synthesize scientific literature/evidence

Mandatory as part of recruitment?

Develop and institutionalize procedures to ensure systematic use of scientific evidence/advice

Create specific structures/positions with mandate to supervise (and train?)
Our intervention: PEP-UNESCO program

To strengthen science advice in governments

Senior government-level workshops (political will)
Overview of general issues and needs to achieve EIPM

Can lead to (phase 2 of program):

- Advisory support (institutional level) to develop new structures/processes
- Practical training courses for govmt staff in:
  - Capacity to assimilate sc. evidence
  - Methods of policy evaluation/analysis (avail.)
  - Policy brokerage/communication (influence)
Examples of solutions implemented by others

- Services of evidence reviews/synthesis in Africa

- Example of Benin for successful institutionalization of evaluation (EIPM) processes
Services of evidence reviews/synthesis in Africa

Burkina Faso Ministry of Health: Rapid response services

Africa Evidence Network: Networking and learning exchanges

Africa Centre for Rapid Evidence Synthesis, Makerere: Rapid response services

Africa Centre for Evidence, Johannesburg: Evidence maps
Example of successful institutionalization of evaluation processes

Government of Benin

Abdoulaye Gounou

PEP 2019 Annual Conference
Cape Town, South Africa - June 1, 2019
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL</th>
<th>COMPONANT1</th>
<th>COMPONANT2</th>
<th>COMPONANT3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MACRO (Strategic/Institutional/National)</td>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Reglementory Frame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MESO (Tactical/Organizational/Actors)</td>
<td>Evaluation Function</td>
<td>Budget allocation</td>
<td>Technical Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MICRO (Operational/Technical Tools)</td>
<td>Professional Skills</td>
<td>Specific Training</td>
<td>Hight Quality Evaluation report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Weak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benin - Methodological approach

**Level**

**Approach**

**Role**

- Put in place an institutional frame that regulate and promote evaluation practice
- Integrate evaluation practice within the public sector
- Evaluate and enable conditions for high quality evaluations

**Technical**

**organizational**

**institutional**

**Micro**

**Méso**

**Macro**
BENIN EVALUATION INSTITUTIONNALIZATION PROCESS

1. CONTEXT ANALYSIS
   - Global diagnosis
   - Actors mapping
   - Method definition

2. TECHNICAL APPROACH
   - National Evaluation System
   - National Evaluation Policy
   - Evaluation Strategic Plan

3. SYSTEM IMPLEMENTATION
   - National Evaluation Council
   - Developing tools
   - Implementing Evaluations
   - Benin biennial Evaluation Days (5)
   - Implementing Specific studies
   - Budget allocation
   - Rolling

4. EVIDENCE PRODUCTION
   - National Statistics
   - Evaluation reports
   - Specific studies
   - Academia/VOPEs
   - Board of Ministries
   - On ligne data base

5. EVALUATION CULTURE
   - Parliament
   - Government
   - Local Governments
   - Academia/Researchers
   - RebSEv / VOPEs
   - Donors
   - Civil Society Organizations

EVIDENCE-BASED DECISION-MAKING
OTHER POTENTIAL STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE EIPM?

Create an advisory structure/position…

• **ALL SECTORS** – esp. least “scientific”

• **SEVERAL LEVELS** – which ones are more “strategic”?:
  ➢ Directorate/Departement, Ministry, High Councils, Permanent Secretary, Parlement, PM/President

➢ Permanent/stable or rolling? Both?
  
  ➢ **Permanent**: What is the “highest” permanent position/structure that could be mandated?
    • Within or beyond Ministry level?

➢ **Rolling**: How can we ensure to sensitize (EIPM) upon arrival?
OTHER POTENTIAL STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE EIPM?

…EIPM "champion" (broker, but also "supervisor")…

Profile: Scientist first, but communicator/’’teaching skills’’ – training?

Mandate: Two types/levels:

- **Top level** (chief scientific advisor – PM/Presidence, Ministry?)
  - Reviews/validate advice (supported by evidence?)
  - Specialisation does not count (general scientific perspective)

- **Operationnal level** - new position? Or new mandate of existing position?
  - Maintain awareness, supervise practice, update procedures, etc.
  - Specialized – reviews all advisory briefs + maintains network with
  - Training in comm + as a trainer himself (TOT) in relevant EIPM practices
OTHER POTENTIAL STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE EIPM?

...or should a “structure” fill this role?

- **MANDATE**: To channel science advice in each (all?) sectors – i.e. all advisory briefs must go through this structure before reaching top

  - Strategically, should be “independent” (prospective, veille):
    - Parallel?
    - How independent?
    - Permanent? (constitutionalized?)
OTHER POTENTIAL STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE EIPM?

Complementary training for institution’s staff (internal)
- To seek/appraise sector-related scientific evidence (including guiding tools)
- Communication of scientific advice
- Manager tools – e.g. Cost-benefit tools
- Others?

Help institutions improve recruitment practices/processes

Strengthen documentation centers
Identifying gaps in YOUR institutions

**Discussion...**

- Leadership to require/enforce/supervise EIPM practices
- Accessing and/or finding/gathering sources of scientific evidence
- Appraising and/or synthesizing science-based knowledge
- Means to consult population (gather primary data)
- Internalizing research/analysis/evaluation (evidence-producing) activities
  - E.g. Need to outsource evaluation (and/or assess their quality)
- Communicating science-based advice and policy brokerage (influence)
- Lack of intersectoral consultation/coordination/collaboration
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