

Experience in Implementing “Impact Evaluation”

Unpacking “Impact Evaluation”

- Impact Evaluation/Outcome Evaluation/
Process Evaluation/Documentation
- Shared Understanding of Impact Evaluation
- Capacities in Design/Executing “Impact
Evaluation”

Challenges

- Perception : “Impact Evaluation are expensive”
- Ensuring Pre-condition such as Randomisation/Baseline
- Timeliness of Result
- Impact evaluation in “isolation”
- Challenge in communicating the USE
- Building the evidence-decision-policy continuum

Key Learning

- Impact Evaluation Design-Right Fit
- Built in as part of Implementation Design
- Stakeholder on Board
- Flexible/Adaptive
- Optimum Use of Resources : “Power Calculation”
- Employing Mix-Method as story line
- Using Technology ; PDA
- Impact evaluation in sync with Process/CEA/Monitoring data

Impact Evaluation Approach

Design	When to use	Advantages	Disadvantages
Randomization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Whenever feasible □ When there is variation at the individual or community level 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Gold standard □ Most powerful 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Not always feasible □ Not always ethical
Randomized Encouragement Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ When an intervention is universally implemented 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Provides exogenous variation for a subset of beneficiaries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Only looks at sub-group of sample □ Power of encouragement design only known ex post
Regression Discontinuity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ If an intervention has a clear, sharp assignment rule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Project beneficiaries often must qualify through established criteria 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Only look at sub-group of sample □ Assignment rule in practice often not implemented strictly
Difference-in-Differences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ If two groups are growing at similar rates □ Baseline and follow-up data are available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Eliminates fixed differences not related to treatment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Can be biased if trends change □ Ideally have 2 pre-intervention periods of data
Matching	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ When other methods are not possible 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Overcomes observed differences between treatment and comparison 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> □ Assumes no unobserved differences (often implausible)

RCT : Learning

- Stakeholder On-Board
- Change in “Implementation” Design
- Scaling UP of Intervention
- Implementation Pressure : Contamination of “Control Areas”

Impact Evaluation using RD

- Based on Regression Discontinuity Design
- Centered around BPL criteria
- Regression Discontinuity Design problem :
Constitution of BPL Bright line
- Design had flexibility ; Adopted a Difference
in Difference Design

Impact Evaluation using DID

- Quality of Baseline Data
- Matching of “Control” on secondary data
- Sampling Design and Size; “Control vs treatment Area”
- Lack of timely availability of

Impact Evaluation using PSM

- Importance of Apriori matching
- Lack of data for matching
- Sample loss : Need for right sample
- Only for Key Indicators

“Impact Evaluation” Use

- Uptake of results
 - Research & policy briefs
- Knowledge synthesis for
 - Necessary & sufficient conditions for evidence to decision
- Learning & Dissemination
 - Close coordination with Govt./Policy Makers