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Why evaluate?

- **Are we doing the right thing?**
  - Are the results we see due to our intervention?
  - What would have happened in the absence of our intervention?

- **Are we doing it right?**
  - Can we do things more effectively and efficiently?
  - What are the constraints to efficient production?
Monitoring and evaluation

**IMPACT**
- Effect on living standards
  - infant and child mortality,
  - prevalence of specific disease

**OUTCOMES**
- Access, usage and satisfaction of users
  - number of children vaccinated,
  - percentage within 5 km of health center

**OUTPUTS**
- Goods and services generated
  - number of nurses
  - availability of medicine

**INPUTS**
- Financial and physical resources
  - spending in primary health care
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Focus on outcomes and impact

- What is effect of a specific program on specific outcomes?
- How much better off are beneficiaries because of the intervention?
- How would outcomes differ under alternative program designs?
- Does the program affect different people differently?
Efficiency?

- What are the costs associated with the program / alternative program designs?

- Is this “technology” the best alternative we have to achieve the desire results?
Why evaluate?

From Betcherman’s youth labour review (14 of 289)

From WDR review of youth HIV evaluations (6 of 300+)

positive impact and cost-effective

positive, objectively-measured impact

positive impact
Basic ingredients

• To start:
  - a clear goal,
  - a diagnosis of the problem, and
  - a solid theory of change.

• Then use whatever tools necessary to solve the fundamental evaluation problem:

How can we know that differences in outcome are due to our intervention?
Choosing the right method

• Methodological issues
  - Can you identify control group?
  - What are your outcome/impact indicators?
  - Can you get the necessary data?
  - Can you get a large enough sample?

• Choose the most robust strategy that fits the operational context
  - Make sure that you have budget to support evaluation.
  - Do not deny anyone benefits merely to suit the evaluation.
Measuring costs appropriately

• Adding a cost component to the evaluation does not represent a significant additional burden
  - Most of the information already exists
  - Additional information needed can be collected through the instruments used for the impact evaluation (community, facility, household)

• Adding a cost component allows to discuss efficiency issues, in addition to effectiveness issues
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Production efficiency

- If an economy (public sector) is not efficient in producing a given service (outcome), it can produce more without reducing the production of other services.
- It’s about producing using available resources the best way possible.
- In the context of public services, it means reaching more people.
Production frontier

\[ y = f(x) \]
Technical efficiency

\[ y = f(x) \]
Input allocative efficiency

\[ \text{output} = f(k, l) \]
Output allocative efficiency

\[ \text{total output} = f(v, ep) \]

\[ \frac{p_v}{p_{ep}} \]
Distance from perfect efficiency

\[ y = f(x) \]

Output distance

Input distance
What do we need to do efficiency analysis?  Measuring efficiency

• We have a few options:
  - CEA
  - CBA
  - Technical Efficiency Analysis (production/cost functions)

• All of them imply different approaches to deal with the question of efficiency

• All of them need basically the same type of information:
  - Production of outputs / outcomes
  - Costs
Why should we measure efficiency?

- Resources are limited:
- How do we know it is worthwhile to spend scarce tax resources on a particular strategy or program?
- How can we choose among alternatives?
- Is any intervention always better than none?
- Strong equity and ethical implications...
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What is the difference between them?

- **CBA**: What is the next social benefit achieved with intervention/program A?
- **CEA**: What is the cost per unit of output/impact that can be bought by intervention A?
  - Cost per youth trained
  - Cost per life saved
  - Cost per children without nutrition problems
How?

- **CBA:**
  - Measure impact
  - Value impact in monetary terms
  - Measure costs
  - Take difference

- **CEA:**
  - Measure incremental impact(s)
  - Measure incremental costs
  - Take CE ratio: costs/impacts
Costs

• Which costs should you measure?
  ▶ Everything the program purchases
  ▶ Any other resources the program uses, even things the program gets for free:
    • Volunteer labour
    • Donated equipment and supplies

• Why measure the cost of free stuff? Isn’t it free?

NO. FREE INPUTS ARE NOT FREE.
Costs

• Why are free things not really free?
• Because they have an *opportunity cost*:
  - Each free thing can be used for a different purpose
  - Free things make resources available that would otherwise have been used to obtain them
    - free labour means lower wage payments;
    - free medicines means lower expenditure on medicines
Costs

- So how can you measure the cost of free things?
  - The *financial* or *accounting cost* method:
    - Get estimates of similar inputs.
      - What does input X cost, on average, in this place?
      - What does someone with these skills and experience usually earn?
Costs

- So how can you measure the cost of free things?
  - The *economic* or *shadow cost* method:
    Estimate a production function

\[ Y = \alpha + X'\beta + Z'\gamma + \varepsilon \]

- where \( Y \) = output, and \( \beta \) and \( \gamma \) are the returns to paid and unpaid inputs (\( X \) and \( Z \)), respectively, in terms of physical output.
- These estimates can be denominated in value terms.
Costs

• What difference does it make which method I use?
  - The accounting method gives estimates of the *average cost*.
  - The economic method gives estimates of the *marginal cost*.

• Marginal cost estimates are preferred for programming.
Costs

• Marginal costs vs Average costs:
  - What is the average cost of the input, or what does an average amount of expenditure (dollar, euro) buy?
  - What will be the cost of the next unit of input, or how much of the input can I get for the next amount I spend?
  - How much will it cost to scale up from A to B?
Estimating the value of benefits

- **First, why would you even want to?**
  - To understand whether the value of the benefits exceeds the cost of producing them.
  - A program can be cost-effective but not cost-beneficial.
  - Denominating outcomes and impact in similar terms allows us to compare across diverse interventions, not just different ways to produce one outcome.

- **Surely not everything can be expressed in monetary terms....**

- **So how can you translate physical outcomes or impacts into monetary terms?**
Outcomes and impact

• Which outcomes? What impact?
  
  - Must be agreed prior to program. (Increase young women’s well-being by enhancing their employability.)
  
  - Choose indicators that accurately measure the desired goals. (Participants are more likely to get employed, and they have higher incomes.)
  
  - Allow for multiple goals across sectors. (An education project will affect employment, health, etc.)
  
  - But don’t change goals in the middle of the project. (I’m afraid my project won’t do what I thought it would do. I’ll conveniently forget my original objectives and focus on some others.)
  
  - And be open to unintended consequences. (Although my program didn’t affect X, it did have an impact on Y and Z.)
Estimating the value of benefits

- Some benefits are relatively easy to value
  - If the benefit has a fair market price, then $B = V \times N$ (benefit = market price times the number of people who get it).
  - For example, greater health leads to greater productivity and higher wages.

- Some benefits are harder to value
  - There’s no market for social exclusion or self-esteem.
  - The benefit has externalities, so the price is not a good measure of the true social value.
  - For example, crime reduction in my neighborhood, and good-quality education for my children, also benefit others.
Estimating the value of benefits

- Where market prices don’t exist or are poor indicators of value
  - **Hedonic pricing** infers values for attributes that make up a composite good or service.
    - Crime reduction changes property values, so you can compare the prices of properties that are similar in every way, but differ in crime rates.
  - **Contingent valuation** asks people what they would be willing to pay to achieve or avoid a certain outcome, or what compensation they would require to put up with it.
    - Common in environmental economics, but are tricky to implement; answers obtained can change depending on the wording or order of questions.
      - “How much would you pay to save the whales?”
      - “How much would I have to pay you so that you wouldn’t object to having all the whales killed?”
Discounting in principle

• Why discount?
  - Acknowledge that resources have a cost (in real terms of borrowing and in terms of alternative investments)

• Which discount rate should you use?
  - Whichever accurately reflects the cost of capital. What would it cost if you had to borrow money to finance your project?

• In general:
  - Higher discount rates give greater value to costs and benefits that occur more quickly.
  - Projects that have delayed benefits relative to costs will have lower net returns.
  - Consider both long-term and short-term costs and benefits. Programs that appear effective in the short term may have long-term negative consequences.
Discounting example

Project costs over time

![Graph showing project costs over time with bars for each year from 1 to 10, with negative values indicating costs and positive values indicating benefits.]
Discounting example

Project costs and benefits over time

At 0% (nominal):
- PV costs = -175
- PV benefits = 200
- Net PV = 25
Discounting example

Project costs and benefits over time

At 3% discount rate:
- PV costs = -161.28
- PV benefits = 175.34
- Net PV = 14.06
Discounting example

Project costs and benefits over time

At 10% discount rate:
PV costs = -137.79
PV benefits = 132.18
Net PV = -5.61
Cost-effectiveness analysis

• What outcomes or impact do you get for each dollar’s worth of program expenditure?
  - The number of HIV cases averted.
  - The number of young people employed.
  - The number of disability-adjusted life-years (DALYs) saved.

(Remember -- these are relative to the number there would have been had the program not been implemented.)

• Can be used to compare alternative methods of achieving a specific objective.
Cost-effectiveness analysis

- Natural units of output/impact
  - Lives saved
  - Vaccinated children
  - Trained teenagers

- Composite units of impact
  - QUALYs and DALYs
  - Useful to compare with other interventions
  - Useful to aggregate different outcomes
## Cost-effectiveness examples

Table 11: Estimated returns to various nutrition investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under-nutrition Interventions</th>
<th>Cost per life saved ($)</th>
<th>Returns to program cost (wages only)</th>
<th>Cost per discounted health life year gained ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Supplements</td>
<td>18,337</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Education</td>
<td>797</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated PHC-N</td>
<td>9,966</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Subsidies</td>
<td>42,552</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Feeding</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementation of pregnant women only</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortification</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iodine Deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementation of reproductive-age women only</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementation (all persons under 60)</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortification</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A Deficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementation (under 5 only)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortification</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Knowles and Behrman 2005, Table 11)
Cost effectiveness examples

• Improving learning outcomes in India

  Test of two alternative interventions:
  • Monetary incentives to groups of teachers and individual teachers conditional on student performance.
  • More inputs to schools (extra teacher, block grant for school supply needs).

  Outcomes:
  • Incentives increased test scores by 0.15 SD.
  • Inputs increased test scores by 0.09 SD.

(Muralidharan and Sundararaman, 2006)
Cost benefit examples

- Vitamin A deficiency in the Philippines
  - Three different interventions in four areas over two years: twice yearly distribution of a mass dosage of vitamin A; vitamin A fortification; and public health intervention using paraprofessionals for an educational, sanitation, immunization and horticulture program
  - Measured benefits include reduced mortality, blindness, morbidity and treatment costs.
  - Costs included private household costs (including the opportunity cost of time).
  - MSG fortification and mass capsule distribution yielded discounted benefits much greater than discounted costs.
  - Interventions yielded higher returns among youth age 7-16 than among children age 1-6 (largely due to the effect of discounting future benefits over a longer period in the case of children).

(Popkin et al. 1980)
Cost benefit examples

• De-worming in rural primary schools in Kenya.
  - Randomized the timing of the introduction of de-worming treatment across 75 schools.
  - The treatment significantly reduced disease prevalence, and increased school attendance by about seven percent.
  - The study estimated discounted lifetime benefits over US$30 per treated child, primarily from gains in lifetime income.
  - Benefits are more than 60 times greater than costs, based on an estimated cost of US$0.49 per treated pupil.

(Miguel and Kremer 2004)
Cost benefit examples

- Scholarships for poor secondary school students in urban Colombia.
  - Randomly-assigned (by lottery) vouchers for children from poor families to attend private secondary schools.
  - After three years, lottery winners had completed more schooling (due to reduced repetition rates), and scored higher on standardized tests than students who had not received the vouchers.
  - Depending on the discount rate used, the benefits of the program are 1.4 to 3.8 times program costs.

(Angrist et al. 2002)
Cost benefit examples

• Girls’ schooling in Pakistan

Rates of return to investment, in terms of wages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit value</th>
<th>Total benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>enable a primary graduate to complete secondary school</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improving primary school quality</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>increasing access to current low-quality primary school</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Behrman, Ross, Sabot 2004)

Returns in terms of other outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effects</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Unit value</th>
<th>Total benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Births averted</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>32,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child deaths averted</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal deaths averted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total undiscounted benefits</td>
<td>87,675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present value of total benefits(^a)</td>
<td>42,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit-cost ratio</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Knowles and Behrman 2004, Table 10)
Efficiency within a program: technical efficiency analysis
The Public Sector...

- Firms are not profit-maximizing
- Firms may not be cost-minimizing
- Firms produce more than one output
  - Aggregation, valuing outputs
  - Jointness in production, economies of scope
- Firms may not know how much demand there is for their services
Production Function and Allocative Efficiency
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X
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Allocative Efficiency

- Cost-effectiveness analyses typically assume:
  - Results are reproducible in different contexts and scales
  - Interventions are implemented at their efficiency frontier

- A “cost-effective” intervention can become very “cost-ineffective” if implemented inefficiently
Production Function and Technical Efficiency

![Graph showing production function and technical efficiency](image_url)
Scale and Average Unit Cost of VCT programs in 5 countries
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- Mexico
Local government services in Britain
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To conclude –

• Why measure efficiency?
  - Budget allocation decisions
  - Fiscal responsibility
  - Facility performance monitoring and management

• How can you measure it?
  - Add a costing component to your IE study
  - Choose an appropriate method – depends on the question you want to answer

• Evaluate technical efficiency
  - Public sector / NGOs are not like for-profit firms
  - Robust methods preferable – DEA or SFA
  - Try to understand why facilities differ