Low Income Housing Programs in Latin America: Evaluation Ex-Post
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Ex post Evaluation

- Ex post Evaluation Relevance: (evidence-based policy making)

- Norms for Evaluation in the UN System (2005):
  - “Purposes of evaluation include understanding why, and the extent to which, intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders.”
    - Source of evidence of the achievement of results and institutional performance.
    - Contribute to building knowledge and to organizational learning.
    - Support accountability

- Millennium Development Goals 2030 demand reshaping:
  - Focus on results, impacts, accountability, transparency of budget allocations
  - New guides for policy decisions
Where are the Results and Impacts?

- Results and Impacts or final results.
  - End the intervention or action, or management of a given period.

**Lesson learned:**
- Deficiencies in project designs for evaluation
- Absence of monitoring
- No planned events
- The electoral cycle risk
- Community intervention
Evaluability of public policies and ex ante evaluation

- Evaluation budget should be used strategically
- Results measure is worthless without baseline data, ex ante information and the availability of contrafactual
- Evaluability assessment is a systematic process that helps identify
  - Justified, feasible, and likely to provide useful information.
  - Likely to contribute to improved program performance and management.
Ex post evaluation main concepts and methods

**Final means**
- Research
- Expanding or replication
- Management

**Level of Analysis**
- Public Policy
- Program
- Project
- Strategy
- Portfolio

**Object of Study**
- Governments
- Organizations
- Communities
- Systems

**Approaches**
- Quantitative
- Qualitative
- Mixed

**Methods**
- Logical Framework
- Evaluation matrix
- Field Studies
- Participatory methods
- Experimental, or Quasiexperimental

**Data Collection**
- Primary
- Secondary

**Report Strategy**
- Evaluation reports
- Executive summaries
- Websites and social media
- Seminars/Workshops

**Ex post Evaluation**
Categories of information and criteria

- Results achieved
  - Logic of intervention (Strategy, activities, outputs, outcomes, goals, impacts)
  - Relevance
  - Efficiency
  - Effectiveness
  - Impact (causal study or analysis of the results attribution)
- Unanticipated outcomes
- Sustainability
- Potential risks
- Institutional performance
Information tools

Primary

- Expert opinion
- Observation
- Public opinion
- Interviews key informants
- Group interviews
- Field observation
- Questionnaire by sample
- Exit interviews

Secondary

- Institutional records
- Official statistics
- Big data
- Base line
- Monitoring data
- Ex ante studies
- Census
- Households surveys
- Others
- Mobile phone apps
- Internet
- Web content
- Social media interactions

Parametric and No Parametric Techniques
Reflexive analysis
Citizen participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participatory Evaluation</th>
<th>Conventional Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on participants’ and local ownership</td>
<td>Donors’ focus and ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad range of stakeholders participate</td>
<td>Stakeholders often do not participate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on learning</td>
<td>Focus on accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible design</td>
<td>Predetermined design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participatory methods</td>
<td>Formal methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended interviews</td>
<td>Structured surveys / questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus group discussions</td>
<td>with closed questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant observation</td>
<td>Measurements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>Statistical data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRA tools (scoring, mapping, ranking, charts)</td>
<td>Documentation review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-completion of questionnaires / records</td>
<td>Direct observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outsiders as facilitators</td>
<td>Outsiders as evaluators</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The Monitoring and Evaluation Manual of the NGOs of the Forum Solint
Reporting

- **Evaluation**
  - **Useless without** the ability to communicate your **results** to others
  - Adapt to audience
  - Engages with stakeholders and beneficiaries throughout the evaluation
  - Creative to build bridges between the specialists and policy makers

This is a nice 200 page comprehensive report.

Now can you cut it down to 2 pages? Maybe just take away the methods, evidence and findings?

@clysy

Source: Freshspectrum.com
Practical case

Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras (2005-2013)

- Source: IDB Inter-American Development Bank

- Honduras faces a substantial housing deficit, (total housing stock and quality of the existing housing stock)
- The country needs a substantial increase in the rate of production and improvement of housing,
- Large majority of families unable to afford credit for even the least expensive dwellings.
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras (2005)

- Honduras is one of the highest population rates in Latin America—2.4% per year.
- One of the least urbanized countries in the region, with barely 49% of the population living in urban areas.
- The urban growth rate has also been very high, at 4.0% per year.
- The populations in urban areas will double in approximately 20 years.
- 80% of families occupy land without proper services, property title.
- The access to financing is inadequate, inequitable and unsustainable (Only 1.9% of Honduran homes apparently had a current mortgage in 2005).
- Around 35,000 new households are formed in the urban areas of the country each year. Most of these households are poor.

Source: IDB Inter-American Development Bank
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras (2005)
Logic of intervention: Objective Tree

To mitigate poverty conditions of low and moderate-income Honduran families

Improvements in the housing
- New homes financed with subsidies, and makeshift housing improved on privately owned lots with the support of subsidies.
- Consolidate the operation of the new individual and collective subsidy programs

Improvements in the habitat
- Neighborhood improvement projects implemented

To better enable the government to meet multiple demands in the housing sector, giving families greater access to formal housing and basic urban services

Objective
- Improvements in the habitat

Means
- Improvements in the housing
- Official agency strengthened to play its role as lead agency in the housing sector
- Neighborhood improvement projects implemented
- New homes financed with subsidies, and makeshift housing improved on privately owned lots with the support of subsidies.
- Consolidate the operation of the new individual and collective subsidy programs

Ends
- Official agency strengthened to play its role as lead agency in the housing sector
- Neighborhood improvement projects implemented
- New homes financed with subsidies, and makeshift housing improved on privately owned lots with the support of subsidies.
- Consolidate the operation of the new individual and collective subsidy programs

Source: IDB Inter-American Development Bank
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras
Evaluation criteria: Relevance example

- 21% of the housing quantitative gap corresponding to the lowest income quintile
- On average:
  - 15% of households had no access to potable piped water;
  - 23% had no connection to the public electricity service;
  - 10% of households had no sewage service;
  - and 10% had some degree of crowding
- To address the housing deficit, Honduras housing production should have been approximately 100,000 housing units annually
- The relevance of the program is true, however the magnitude and scope of its results can not reverse the housing needs of the lowest income quintile, in the short term

Source: IDB Inter-American Development Bank
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras
Evaluation criteria: Effectiveness example

- **Individual and collective subsidy**
  
  **Subsidy and microfinance**
  
  - Trade off between vulnerability households and savings as incentive (microfinance)
    
    - The application system allowed the families to obtain additional points if they preserved the savings
    
    - This feature of the system was designed to encourage individual savings,

  - Negative incentives:
    
    - Rewarding families with ability to immobilize resources and that did not go selected in the first instance
    
    - Since these families are less vulnerable as it is possible that this mechanism is left out of the whole beneficiaries more vulnerable than if households received the subsidy

Source: IDB Inter-American Development Bank
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras
Evaluation criteria: Effectiveness example

- Individual and collective subsidy
  Subsidy and microfinance (Cont.)
  - No parametric exercise
  - Counterfactual: Subtracting from the data all individuals who received extra score for savings
  - Those scores generated a new ranking of counterfactual beneficiaries
  - The distribution of cumulative per capita household income beneficiaries versus counterfactual beneficiaries scenario.
  - The counterfactual scenario is run to the left with respect to which indeed materialized
  - The extra score mechanism with preservation award for saving is harmful for targeting the program.
  - This graphical analysis is corroborated by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test.

This hypothesis is rejected: it is not possible to conclude that the beneficiaries are similar to non-beneficiaries.
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras
Evaluation criteria: Impact example

- Neighborhood improvement projects

**WOMENS ACHIEVEMENTS PERCEIVED BY VILLA FRANCA OF THE PROJECT**

- Training Opportunities: 15%
- Improved relations between neighbors: 15%
- Health Improvements: 10%
- Infrastructure improvements: 60%

**CHANGES GENERATED BY PROJECT IN THE COLONY VILLA FRANCA**

- Beautiful Community: 4%
- Comfort: 13%
- Education: 4%
- Infrastructure: 46%
- Collective welfare: 33%

**HOW DO YOU FEEL IN YOUR COMMUNITY?**

- Happy: 3%
- Safe: 15%
- Proud: 59%
- Motivated: 15%
- Important: 10%
- Not answer: 3%

Source: IDB Inter-American Development Bank

Information tools

- Expert opinion
- Interviews key informants
- Group interviews focus
Practical case
Social Interest Housing Program in Honduras

- Technical conclusions from the examples
  - Institutional data are not independently collected. This is a real limitation for experimental evaluation, such as cross sectional studies of household or individuals.
  - Infrastructure programs brings improvements for general well-being, as long as the community is involved.
  - Microfinance incentives: these mechanisms not address the problem of the extremely poor families and hence more vulnerable.

- Replicable aspects
  - Families are happier with their houses and with their lives, specially with infrastructure improvements (causal effects between improvement in houses and general well-being of extremely poor persons in slums see Galiani, S., P. Et al.)
Other evaluation methods


  http://www.globalurban.org/GUDMag07Vol3Iss1/Abiko.htm