

## **From impact evaluations to paradigm shift**

**A case study of the Buenos Aires Ciudadanía Porteña conditional cash transfer programme**

**Gabriela Agosto, Eduardo Nuñez, Horacio Citarroni, Irma Briasco and Nicolás Garcette**

**August 2012**



**Observatorio Social**  
Comprender mejor para hacer mejor



## About 3ie

**The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)** works to improve the lives of people in the developing world by supporting the production and use of evidence on what works, when, why and for how much. 3ie is a new initiative which responds to demands for better evidence, and will enhance development effectiveness by promoting better-informed policies. 3ie finances high-quality impact evaluations and campaigns to inform better programme and policy design in developing countries.

The **3ie Working Paper series** covers both conceptual issues related to impact evaluation and findings from specific studies or systematic reviews. The views in the papers are those of the authors, and cannot be taken to represent the views of 3ie, its members, or any of its funders.

This Working Paper was written by Gabriela Agosto, Eduardo Nuñez, Horacio Citarroni, Irma Briasco and Nicolás Garcette from the Argentinian think tank, Observatorio Social.

## Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to the government officials, members of the city legislature, all the interviewees and participants in the focus groups who kindly shared their time to contribute to this case study. A special expression of appreciation is extended to the management and technical staff of the Ciudadanía Porteña Programme, Studying is Working and the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit who provided us with most of the data and additional information that were analysed for this paper. Without their patient help, we would have had much less material and would have understood far less about the policy process.

This paper has been edited by Karen Emmons with comments and suggestions from Howard White (3ie), Marie Gaarder (3ie) and Christelle Chapoy (3ie).

Photograph: Ciudadanía Porteña, Argentina

3ie Working Paper Series Production Team: Mukul Soni and Paromita Mukhopadhyay

© 3ie, 2012

## Contact

International Initiative for Impact Evaluation  
c/o Global Development Network

Post Box No. 7510

Vasant Kunj P.O. New Delhi – 110070, India

Tel: +91-11-2613-9494/6885

[www.3ieimpact.org](http://www.3ieimpact.org)

# **From impact evaluations to paradigm shift**

## **A case study of the Buenos Aires Ciudadanía Porteña conditional cash transfer programme**

Gabriela Agosto, Eduardo Nuñez, Horacio Citarroni, Irma Briasco and  
Nicolás Garcette  
Observatorio Social, Argentina

Email: agosto@observatoriosocial.com.ar and osocial@observatoriosocial.org.ar

### **Executive Summary**

Argentina sank into an economic and social crisis in 2001–2002 and into new levels of poverty the crisis rocked the foundations of the country's social welfare policy. In the city of Buenos Aires, which was particularly hard hit, the crisis provoked a search for alternative solutions. Impact evaluations led the city government to institute a cash transfer programme, the Ciudadanía Porteña: Con Todo Derecho, or CPP, in 2005.

Two years later, the city government conducted the first of three impact evaluations to gauge the efficiency and efficacy of the choices it had made in the design of the CPP. This case study looks at those three evaluations and how they were used: two impact evaluations of the cash transfer programme in Buenos Aires, conducted in 2007 and 2009, and an impact evaluation of a new component of the CPP, Studying is Working, which was introduced in 2008 as a result of a recommendation from the first evaluation.

The three impact evaluations had specific policy influence objectives. The evaluations were designed with a dual purpose: i) to determine how the programme could be made more efficient and thus maximise its purpose and ii) to build consensus and legitimacy on the strategy of cash transfers in general. The evidence from the impact evaluations was used to guide structural changes in the programme and to attitudinal changes, affecting the awareness, attitudes and perceptions among the relevant parties, which has crystallised as new discursive commitment and new policy content.

The most significant change resulting from the evaluations was the addition of the Studying is Working component, the result of a recommendation made in the first evaluation report of the CPP. The first evaluation detected large numbers of teenagers and youth not in formal education nor working and a targeted strategy on youth was recommended to help them seek out higher education and thus more productive skills. In addition, cash benefits for children and teenagers in school were increased and more outreach to teenage mothers was added to help them find child care options and thus continue their own studies.

From the design stage and during implementation, the programme managers of both the CPP and the Studying is Working also sought to develop a culture of monitoring and evaluation (M&E) in the Buenos Aires city government. To achieve this goal, they encouraged the institutionalisation of the M&E function and the use of indicators, data and evidence based on studies, research and impact evaluations to provide feedback for the decision-making process.

In the end, the changes to the culture of evaluation within the city government of Buenos Aires may be the most significant outcome of these evaluations. It seems clear that the evaluations drove proximate improvements in the programme and had significant spill over effects in terms of cultivating a new culture of evaluation. In that regard, the evaluations of the CPP and Studying is Working will have impacts well beyond the people reached by the programme.

From this case study, we can discern a few primary lessons in the relationship between the impact evaluations and the CPP policy:

- To maximise the policy influence of impact evaluations, it seems crucial to have a clear communication and dissemination strategy of the results. It is essential to generate forums for discussion and interaction between the evaluation team, the decision-makers and the technical team of the programme being evaluated so that the results can be articulated, promoting ownership and facilitating the adoption of the recommendations.
- In terms of emphasis, the evaluation reports could have better highlighted the negative findings and some recommendations could have better emphasised deficits in CPP, such as the number of teenagers who remain out of the school system and the lack of vacancies to include all poor children in early education. Doing so would perhaps have led to further adjustments to address these problems.
- If an impact evaluation can influence a policy process, such as expanding the practice of evidence-based policymaking and management, that objective may ultimately drive more positive change than the immediate evaluation and its recommendations for the programme under review.

## **Contents**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| 1. Urban cash transfers to improve social inclusion..... | 6  |
| 2. Evaluation findings .....                             | 9  |
| 3. Using evidence to promote change .....                | 12 |
| 4. Lessons on evidence-based policymaking .....          | 18 |
| References .....   | 24 |

## **Annexes**

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Annex 1: The methods of identification and selection of the beneficiaries of the Ciudadanía Porteña Programme..... | 25 |
| References .....   | 31 |
| Annex 2: People interviewed.....   | 32 |
| Annex 3: Questionnaires used in the semi-structured interviews .....   | 33 |
| Annex 4: LEY 1878. Creación del programa "ciudadanía porteña .....   | 36 |

## 1. Urban cash transfers to improve social inclusion

Argentina sank into an economic and social crisis in 2001–2002 that sharply increased of poverty, pulling down newly poor families and pushing others deeper into squalor.<sup>1</sup> The crisis rocked the foundations of Argentinian social welfare policy, and a search for alternative solutions emerged. Partly due to the influence of impact evaluations elsewhere in Latin America, a new perspective on social protection emerged, articulated towards conditional cash transfer programmes.<sup>2</sup> In Buenos Aires, policymakers looked to deepen government assistance and address social inclusion by reducing poverty and inequality.

In November 2005, the Buenos Aires city legislature approved a conditional cash transfer programme, *Ciudadanía Porteña: Con Todo Derecho* (CPP) that would target poor and extremely poor households within the city.<sup>3</sup> The food programmes implemented at that time by the Ministry of Social Development in response to the crisis were not sufficient to cover the complexity of the situation or to meet potential demand. Interviewees emphasise that CPP represented an important advance in terms the social policies by the Buenos Aires city government.

Unlike many conditional cash transfer programmes in Latin America up to that time, the CPP was specifically designed to target urban poverty. The conditionalities required school attendance of children aged 5–18, compliance with health check-ups for pregnant women (prenatal and postnatal) and for children up to age 18 (for vaccinations and nutrition-related measuring) and the prohibition of child labour.

The value of the benefit is determined by the household poverty level and composition and by the value of a basic food basket, using the “adult equivalent” methodology set by the National Institute of Statistics and Censuses (INDEC): in households with incomes up to 25 per cent above the extreme poverty line, the amount of the benefit is equal to 75 per cent of the basic food basket value. In households with incomes that fall between 25

---

<sup>1</sup> By the end of 2001, after more than four years of recession, the country collapsed into a financial meltdown, accompanied by a banking and currency crisis. The peso, the local currency, lost nearly 70 per cent of its value in relation to the American dollar from January to August 2002, and the GDP fall was estimated to be around 12–15 per cent year to year. At the same time, inflation was increasing, real wages were falling and poverty rates were soaring. Cruces et al. (2012) analysed the impact of the crisis on health and education outcomes showing substantial effects on maternal and infant mortality and low birth weight.

<sup>2</sup> There are currently 18 Latin American and Caribbean countries with conditional cash transfer programmes operating in their territories, which benefit more than 25 million families (about 113 million people), representing 19 per cent of the total population in the region (Cecchini and Madariaga, 2011).

<sup>3</sup> According to the Annual Household Survey from 2005, which was used to construct the CPP baseline, 13 per cent of the city’s population was living in poverty and 4 per cent in extreme poverty. Although poverty levels had decreased in comparison with previous years, they remained high.

per cent above the extreme poverty line and the poverty line, the benefit is equal to 50 per cent of the basic food basket value.

When the CPP started in 2006, the first monthly payments to households were higher than payments made in other programmes elsewhere in the region. The average monthly benefit paid to households in December 2006 was 227 pesos (US\$74) per month, ranging from a minimum value of 60 pesos (US\$20) to a maximum of 800 pesos (US\$260). The average size of households was 3.6 members.<sup>4</sup>

The parameters for beneficiaries remain almost the same as they were in the beginning. As with other cash transfer programmes in the region, women (mother, female household head or wife/partner) are entitled to receive the benefit. The entitled person receives a "buying" card, which can only be used in a network of 1,400 authorised small shops and supermarkets to purchase food, school materials, hygiene items, cleaning products and fuel for cooking. Every member of the beneficiary household must have Argentine documentation (permanent or transitory) and a Clave Única de Identificación Laboral (a social security number) from the National Administration of Social Security.

To monitor household compliance with the conditions, the beneficiaries must provide certificates that endorse that these conditions are fulfilled. Additionally, the programme established agreements with educational institutions to regularly provide feedback on students' attendance.

At the time of the first impact evaluation, in January 2007, the programme covered around 66,500 households and 240,000 people.<sup>5</sup>

### **Social policy paradigm shift**

The political decision of Jorge Telerman, vice-chief of the city government at the time the bill for creating the CPP was being debated, was crucial for the design of the programme and its subsequent approval in the city legislature.<sup>6</sup> He convened a team of policy experts in early 2005 to design a social programme to eradicate extreme poverty. This technical team promoted a paradigm shift in social policy and the institutionalisation of monitoring and evaluation functions.

"Debates at the city level, seminars and specific courses were organised to discuss policy proposals and we also participated in various national and international seminars in order to compare different intervention and evaluation strategies along with other programmes of similar characteristics," recalled Irene Novacovsky, Coordinator of the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit, in a case study interview.

---

<sup>4</sup> On January 2011, the average monthly benefit was 455 pesos (US\$114), ranging from a minimum value of 193 pesos (US\$48) to a maximum of 1,259 pesos (US\$315), while the average size of households was 3.7 members. The raise in the benefit reflects both the inflation adjustment and the increases adopted as a result of the recommendations of the evaluation reports.

<sup>5</sup> As of end 2010, the programme covered around 62,000 households and 235,000 people.

<sup>6</sup> The proposed bill was presented by Jorge Telerman, who at the time of the enactment of the Act (2006) had become the chief (mayor) of the Autonomous City of Buenos Aires, as it is formally called.

Broad-ranging participation was paramount in the design of the programme. Different documents on the design of CPP were submitted to a Social Council<sup>7</sup> for discussion. "We gathered a Social Council of the city composed of universities and churches," recalled Sergio Beros, at that time Secretary of Social Development.

With CPP policymakers intended to develop a social protection system independent of past, present or future adult participation in the labour market. The policy rationale was "one of universalism, understood as the objective of reaching those excluded from existing policies and establishing minimum common procedures and benefit levels"<sup>8</sup> (Bastagli, 2009: 4).

When the discussions in the Legislature ended, the largest budget ever for social protection 117 million pesos was approved for initiating the CPP. The significant growth of the budget, however, produced tensions in the political and institutional systems because of the redistribution of resources.

The conjunction of three factors – a post-crisis context, a new generation of social policies and pioneer politicians and policy promoters – made possible the paradigm shift from social assistance policies to a concept based on the notion of rights. As Pablo Pucciarelli, CPP General Director explains, CPP "represents a before and after" in the city government's social policy.

### **This case study as part of a series**

Impact evaluations are fundamental for assessing a project or programme's effectiveness and efficiency, though they are not always conducted or conducted well. If done rigorously, they have the potential to advance the way social initiatives are designed and carried out and thus can make a contribution towards improving people's lives. The case study of the Ciudadanía Porteña: Con Todo Derecho cash transfer programme in Buenos Aires is part of a series of studies to assess the use and influence of impact evaluations in policymaking. The main objective of this series, which is funded by the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), is to help better understand how to translate, disseminate and put into action evidence emerging from impact evaluations to improve the effectiveness of social policies and programmes.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Social Council was created in December 2004 as a permanent collegial body composed of representatives of various civil society organisations gathered to evaluate and suggest policies for Buenos Aires. It convened representatives of the city government and the following organisations: Arquidiócesis de Buenos Aires-Pastoral Social, Federación Evangelista de Iglesias, Centro Islámico de la República Argentina, Asociación Mutual Israelita Argentina, Cámara Argentina de la Construcción, Central de Trabajadores Argentinos, Confederación General del Trabajo, Facultades de Derecho, Ciencias Sociales, Ciencias Económicas y Arquitectura de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales and Sociedad Central de Arquitectos y Unión Industrial Argentina.

<sup>8</sup> Bastagli (2009) identifies at least four underlying motivations for the introduction of conditional cash transfers: i) as a compensatory measure, targeting the poorest who are adversely affected by periods of adjustment (the case of the original PRAF in Honduras and Familias en Acción in Colombia); ii) to assist the very poorest who are falling through an existing safety net, with the aim of integrating them into a national social protection system (the case of Puentes Solidarios in Chile); iii) human capital accumulation (the case of Progresas in México); and iv) universalism (the case of Bolsa Familia in Brazil).



## 2. Evaluation findings

### Technical and political motivations can be positive

The CPP director's office<sup>9</sup> commissioned the impact evaluations; the first in 2007 and nine months after the programme launched, and the second in 2009. According to many observers and stakeholders, the purpose was both technical and political. The director's office wanted reliable evidence of impact to know if the policy parameters were appropriate and as efficient as they could be or how the programme could be improved. Although political motivations can be touchy, or even impede the rigour of the evaluation, the directors also wanted to know how successful the CPP was proving to be to legitimise the programme with the minister and legislators and institutionally. As 2007 was an electoral year, with uncertain electoral results anticipated, having rigorous evidence of positive impacts from the CPP was crucial to guarantee the continuity of the programme in case the minister or the whole administration changed, as in fact, did happen.

The Ciudad Porteno example suggests that political purposes are least likely to interfere when twinned with rigorous technical analysis and if the officials commissioning impact evaluations are also prepared for possible negative results.

The initial design of the CPP contained provisions for periodic monitoring of its performance as well as generic plans for impact evaluations.<sup>10</sup> The policymakers and designers knew they would need to track impact to learn how to better streamline or improve the programme to achieve true reductions in poverty. They wanted coverage to be effective. The monitoring was to focus on coverage, benefits and budget, while the impact evaluations would measure outcomes in terms of achievement of the objectives: reduce inequality, poverty and extreme poverty, increase school attendance and eliminate child labour.

At that time, the city administration had no official monitoring and evaluation unit, but the CPP was created with a small M&E division built in. An Information, Monitoring and Evaluation (IME) Unit<sup>11</sup> eventually was established in 2008 within a newly created Ministry of Social Development.

---

<sup>9</sup> From 2006 to 2008, Pablo Pucciarelli and Irene Novacovsky were Co-Directors of CPP. In 2008, with the new administration, the ministry was restructured; Pucciarelli became General Director of Ciudadanía Porteña (which now includes CPP, Studying is Working and the Ticket Social programmes) and Novacovsky became Coordinator of the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.

<sup>10</sup> In addition to rigorous and robust systems of monitoring and evaluation, systems for identification and selection of beneficiaries are a common feature of the most important conditional cash transfer programmes in the region.

<sup>11</sup> The Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit is part of the Ministry of Social Development of the city government. Its main responsibilities are to assist the Ministry in the design, development, planning, monitoring and evaluation of plans, programmes and social projects and to develop and coordinate social information systems.

## **Independent assessors required**

The impact evaluations were conducted by an external team led by specialists from the Organization of Ibero-American States for the Education, Science and Culture (OEI).<sup>12</sup> The M&E division of the CPP (and later the IME Unit) designed the evaluation and the terms of reference, supervised the consultants hired to conduct the survey and analyse the findings, and then disseminated the results.

OEI conducted its two impact evaluations of CPP using approach quasi-experimental model, with a sample group of beneficiaries and a comparison group that was statistically constructed through propensity score matching to control selection bias. The evaluation design allowed for the comparing of the situations of both groups at the beginning of the programme and again during its implementation (difference-in-difference estimator). Both evaluations also included a qualitative approach, with interviews and focus group discussions with CPP beneficiaries.

Two sources of information were used to establish the baseline, the control and the intervention groups: i) the Annual Household Survey of the City of Buenos Aires and ii) the Beneficiary Households Survey, both conducted by the city's General Department of Statistics and Censuses. The Annual Household Survey has a sample of nearly 7,000 households.<sup>13</sup> The Beneficiary Households Survey is applied to a statistical sample of 1,000 beneficiary households, selected from the CPP administrative records through a simple random sampling, with proportional allocation (this survey was conducted in December 2006 and February 2009).

## **Major impacts on households in poverty**

Both CPP evaluations found reductions in poverty, extreme poverty and inequality (IME, 2008 and 2009). As a result of the cash transfer assistance, the proportion of households living in poverty conditions decreased by 20 per cent and the number of people living below the extreme poverty level decreased by 37 per cent between December 2005 and December 2006. The first report also points out that without the CPP, the difference between the income of the richest and poorest households top and bottom decile would have increased nearly twenty-three-fold. Instead, the difference decreased twenty-fold. As well, without the CPP, the proportion of children living under the poverty line would have increased by 10 per cent in that first year.

---

<sup>12</sup> The Organization of Ibero-American States for the Education, Science and Culture (OEI) is an international organisation for inter-governmental cooperation between the Latin American countries in the field of education, science, technology and culture in the context of the integral development, democracy and regional integration. The seat of its General Secretariat is in Madrid, Spain, and it maintains regional offices in Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, El Salvador, Spain, Mexico and Peru, with field offices in Chile, Honduras, Nicaragua and Paraguay.

<sup>13</sup> The first control group (T0) was constructed with information from the 2005 Annual Household Survey and the control groups after the implementation of the programme used the 2006 (T1) and 2008 (T2) household surveys.

Health checks for pregnant women and children, especially those younger than 5 years, increased. When compared with the control group, there were clear increases among CPP beneficiaries in terms of school attendance, which were strongest in the age groups of 3–5 years and 15–17 years – ages considered most difficult to incorporate into the school system in poor sectors of society. The increase of early education among children aged 3–4, though not a conditionality, is one of the CPP objectives and thus impact on that age group was specifically included in the evaluation. Drop-out rates tend to increase in poor teenagers due to entry into the labour market or pregnancy.

According to the second evaluation report, if the CPP had not existed, the incidence of extreme poverty would have been seven times higher and there would be almost twice as many households living in poverty. From 2006 to 2008, the proportion of children and teenagers in extreme poverty was reduced by 91 and 57 per cent, respectively.

The second report that children aged between 3 and 4 years attending early education increased by 16 per cent from 2005 to 2008; for 5-year-olds, attendance reached 100 per cent. The attendance rate was also universal among children aged 6–14 years. School drop-outs among teenagers decreased by 38 per cent in the same period, reaching values similar to non-poor households. Due to the CPP, the number of working children aged 5–17 years decreased by 20 per cent.

The evidence also showed that the programme's targeting system, applying a combination of three mechanisms described in annex 1, minimised inclusion and exclusion errors, which proved to be lower than in other conditional cash transfer programmes in the region.

### **3. Using evidence to promote change**

#### **Channelling the details**

The evaluations reviewed had different objectives, principally: i) to promote accountability; ii) to measure the impact on of expected and unexpected outcomes; iii) to produce information that could be useful for decision-making about adjustments and new courses of action to improve programme impact; iv) to disseminate the achievements accomplished; v) to elaborate and defend the budget in the city legislature; and vi) to obtain legitimacy and consensus to guarantee the continuity of the programme.

To gain policy influence and achieve those objectives, different channels and means for distributing the evaluation findings (Jones, 2011), which focused on different audiences, were used Jones, 2011.

To publicise the findings on how the CPP is making impact and to gain support for the programme, the M&E technical team organised formal and informal meetings with legislators, executive officials and experts at various opportune times, such as budget discussions in the city legislature and after changes of local authorities.

Multiple seminars were organised for technical staff from different departments in the city government to expand their awareness on a wide range of issues related to poverty and the improvement of social policies.

Various communication activities were conducted to make the results of the impact evaluations available to the general public, enhancing the downward accountability<sup>14</sup> of the programme. These activities included sending electronic newsletters to technical staff and executive officials of the city government and social policy experts and the posting of the evaluation findings on the city government's official website.

#### **The instrumental use of the findings**

According to Sandinson's (2005) typology, evaluations can have different uses. In the case of the CPP, the impact evaluation findings were used for instrumental, legitimising and conceptualising purposes. An instrumental use is one that "involves direct implementation of findings and recommendations to, for example, i) help decide whether to continue or terminate particular policy initiatives; ii) expand and institutionalise successful programmes and policies and cut back unsuccessful ones; and iii) figure out which programmes to modify and which components of the programme were in need of modification" (Sandinson, 2005 quoted in CIPPEC, 2011b, p.12).

---

<sup>14</sup> According to Bird (2002, in Jones et al., 2009), in some cases accountability to donors (upward) might be the priority while in other cases accountability to beneficiaries (downward) may be prioritised.

Commenting on the instrumental value of the evaluations, Irene Novacovsky, the IME Unit Coordinator, found the strategy for disseminating the results “was effective because it was always an important means of support when the budget had to be discussed and when there were debates in the legislature. And it was important in order to support changes in the programme.”

The city’s Social Development Minister, Maria Eugenia Vidal, echoed her view: “The evaluation results...are still primarily a useful tool for the teams that work on the programme; for those who make decisions...for the resolution of the budget, when you have to ask for more funds.... During budget discussions in the legislature, I have also brought the evaluation findings so as to show what we are doing.”

Additionally, a system of planning, information, monitoring and evaluation has been institutionalised since the creation of the programme, leading to adjustments in its design and implementation based on the evidence found through the monitoring studies and/or impact evaluations.

### **What became of the recommendations?**

The first CPP evaluation report contained numerous recommendations, including: i) the need for updating the amount of the benefit bi-annually in order to avoid the loss of its purchasing power, ii) a minimum payment for all children younger than 18 and particularly for youth aged 15–18 years to better help keep them in school and foster high completion; and iii) the creation of a component to promote higher education among youth. These and other suggestions were adopted. The Studying is Working component, for example, was launched a year after the first evaluation and is considered a significant achievement of the impact evaluation.

### **Evaluation leads to new component targeting youth**

As a result of the recommendations included in the first impact evaluation report, CPP was expanded in 2008 to include a component called Studying is Working to promote the inclusion and retention in the formal education system of youth aged 18–25, later raised to 29. By December 2010, Studying is Working reached nearly 6,000 youth, providing them a monthly income of 275 pesos (US\$69). To remain in the programme, the beneficiaries have to attend and pass the level where they are studying. Few cash transfer programmes globally target such a population with the purpose of supporting higher education. Through this new component, the policymakers wanted to create conditions that encourage social mobility and inclusion to break the intergenerational transmission of poverty and inequality.

OEI also conducted an impact evaluation of Studying is Working, again using a quasi-experimental design and combined with a qualitative approach with interviews and focus group discussions with beneficiaries.

The Studying is Working impact evaluation found significant impact on the retention and

reintegration of young people aged 18–25 years into formal education.<sup>15</sup> In 2006, 22 per cent of young people living in CPP beneficiary households participated in the formal educational system; that proportion increased to 35 per cent in 2008, representing an incremental increase of 64 per cent. In 2006, 45 per cent of young people in CPP households had finished high school or had gone on to higher education; that proportion increased by 16 per cent in 2008. The number of young people who returned to school – after at least one year away – increased by 50 per cent.

### **Programme strategy adjusted**

According to officials interviewed, the CPP director followed up on the recommendation for increasing the payment for each school-aged household member. However, the results presented in the second evaluation report show that the increase was insufficient to fully cover the opportunity cost of entering the job market for adolescents aged 15–17 years, even though the incidence of school drop-outs has decreased by 38 per cent since 2005, reaching similar values to those of children and teenagers from non-poor sectors.<sup>16</sup> It could be argued that because the recommendations did not put enough emphasis on this deficit, the benefit increase was subsequently inadequate to retain a larger proportion of adolescents in education.

Additionally following from the recommendations, a system for monitoring children and teenagers of school age was developed to better prevent them from dropping out of school and/or to improve their return to the educational system. As well through the institutional coordination with the Ministry of Education, a network was established to obtain information on vacancies in primary and secondary schools that would help beneficiaries access education opportunities.

Increasing access to educational vacancies for preschool children, a recommendation in the first report, also was not sufficiently considered. The supply was insufficient to include all poor children in early schooling. In the same vein, the second report indicated the need to increase the supply of early education opportunities for CPP beneficiaries. Although the Ministry of Social Development eventually set up 20 early childhood centres for children aged 45 days to 4 years between 2010 and 2011, supply remains insufficient to meet demand. In addition, there are no established mechanisms to prioritise the entrance of CPP beneficiaries to the early childhood centres and other nursery schools financed and/or administered by the city government, even though the poorest children are the ones who face greater problems in accessing early education.

A system for detecting domestic violence was established so that cases are referred to the services provided by the General Division of Women, within the Ministry of Social Development.

---

<sup>15</sup> The Studying is Working component initially was aimed at the population aged 18–25 years. In mid-2010, it was extended to youth up to age 29 years.

<sup>16</sup> IME, 2009.

Another issue raised by the evaluation was the problem of pregnancy and early motherhood among teenagers and young beneficiaries of the programme. Considering how this factor contributes to the intergenerational transmission of poverty, a system of monitoring and support was implemented to better help these beneficiaries continue their education. This system also includes referrals to specific programmes and assistance in the search for vacancies in nurseries and kindergartens, although as noted, the supply of vacancies was insufficient.

### **Instrumental shortcomings**

Given the supply shortfalls that the second evaluation picked up, it seems safe to say that the evaluation reports did not emphasise enough the need to increase educational opportunities for the poor. They should have also emphasised the lack of coordination between the city's Ministry of Social Development and the Ministry of Education to establish mechanisms to prioritise access to early education for the poorest children in Buenos Aires. The lack of sufficient emphasis seems to have downplayed the urgency or the seriousness of the gap.

### **The legitimising use of the findings**

Beyond the instrumental handling of the findings, there was also a legitimising use, which according to Sandinson (2005 quoted in CIPPEC, 2011, p. 12) is the intent that "corroborates a decision or understanding that the organisation already holds providing an independent reference". As previously noted, at different stages, formal and informal meetings with the city legislators, executive officials and experts were organised with the objective of publicising the impact of the programme.

In an interview for the case study, Pablo Pucciarelli, CPP General Director, extolled the importance of having that reliable evidence of impact to obtain legitimacy and consensus for the adopted strategy of intervention. "In all areas, from academic to more political, I used the information of the evaluations to legitimise my point of view ... And of course, it brings solidity and consistency to the arguments that would have been impossible if there had not been evaluation reports," he explained.

The legitimacy obtained manifested itself in the support given to the programme by the consecutive ministers and government officials and also by the new city administration that assumed power in 2008. There was a sustained increase in the CPP budget of around 212 per cent from 2006 through 2010.

Maria Eugenia Vidal, the Minister of Social Development, recognised that the CPP evaluations strengthened its legitimacy: "Subsequent evaluations showed that CPP had an impact on poverty and extreme poverty in the city of Buenos Aires, on the decrease of child labour, the increase in the rate of school attendance ... All this ends up strengthening [the programme]".

## **The conceptual use of the findings**

The evaluations also had a conceptual use in that the results had consequences “in the form of new ideas and concepts – creating debate and dialogue, generating increased clarity and new solutions in the longer run” (Sandinson, 2005, quoted in CIPPEC, 2011b: 12).

In the seminars for city government staff to discuss the impact evaluation findings, for example, the programme’s design and how it contributes towards improving the quality of social policies was dissected, including the relevance of mechanisms to identify and select beneficiaries and the need to make periodic evaluations, to make diagnoses and to build beneficiary records.

Perhaps the single greatest policy uptake of the evidence was the creation of the Studying is Working component, based on a recommendation in the first evaluation report. The programme’s technical team promoted the new benefit addressed to teenagers and youth who were studying or wanted to resume their studies. The initiative aimed to assist a critical population universe, identified through the first impact evaluation as one of the key stages of intervention to interrupt the intergenerational reproduction of poverty.

Irene Novacovsky, the IME Unit Coordinator, highlighted how the first evaluation made apparent a dangerous interruption in the cycle that allows the completion of the secondary education. It also indicated, she explained, that a very large percentage of youth neither studied nor worked.

The technical coordinator of Studying is Working, Naomi Wermus, reinforced the importance of the impact evaluation. The first evaluation, she recalled, showed a high level of school drop-outs, a rising number of youth who had not completed high school due to joining the labour market, which was characterised as precarious, poor-quality jobs and frequent perils of unemployment.

“As a result of this evaluation, the Studying is Working proposal was made,” Irene Novacovsky explained. The separate evaluation of Studying is Working in 2009 confirmed the success of the strategy, she added, but emphasised needed changes: increasing the amount of benefit, extending the age up to 29 years, replacing the buying card for a debit card so that the youth have access to cash, expanding outreach activities and recruiting potential beneficiaries, increasing support for educational paths for young mothers by guaranteeing nursery, child care centre or kindergarten places for their children and prioritizing them in the early childhood centres.

In a focus group discussion, teenager and youth beneficiaries of the Studying is Working component applauded the programme for helping them continue their studies, especially the adjustment that allowed them to withdraw their benefit in cash, one of the changes made after the separate evaluation of the component. Some of the group participants



said they didn't know that the age limit to receive the transfer had been raised. Their comment reiterated a weakness that the evaluation had detected. In fact, the report's recommendations noted the need to improve the communication strategy and prompted the use of new channels, such as email and Facebook. Access changes were also incorporated based on the report's recommendations. As of 2011, registration for the programme is done independently of the CPP and includes online registration. Additionally, the report recommended tightening the controls concerning the conditions of school attendance. To monitor the compliance with the conditions, beneficiaries must provide certificates that endorse that these conditions are fulfilled. Moreover, the programme established agreements with the educational institutions to regularly provide feedback on students' attendance.

Qualitative studies that complemented the impact evaluation of Studying is Working led to recommendations for more preventive efforts targeting family violence among youth. In response, printed materials were distributed among the beneficiary population and a cooperation agreement with the General Division of the Women, within the Ministry of Social Development, for advice and referrals for victims of violence was established.

Despite these important and significant advances through Studying is Working, coverage has not yet reached the total target population. There is still a proportion of youth not studying or working. The recommendation regarding the need to increase the benefit periodically has not been considered.

In summary, the evaluations provided information that was used to adjust policy and programme implementation. New courses of action were outlined. Achievements were well documented and used effectively to gain legitimacy and consensus of the programme and thus guarantee its continuity. But not all the recommendations have been incorporated, such as the school support strategies and inter-institution collaboration to increase access to nurseries, day-care centres and kindergartens. Other recommendations that have been incorporated have not been sufficiently emphasised, including the increase needed in the cash benefit and follow-up activities. Even though the results were publicised in different mediums, it would have been better to highlight other important issues, primarily the large number of teenagers who remain out of the school system and in the labour market.

#### **4. Lessons on evidence-based policymaking**

Three elements were critical in the creation of CPP: an initial context of national economic crisis and social unrest; the emergence of new forms of intervention in the social policy field; and the existence of policy promoters or political pioneers, who played a key role in proposing and designing innovative social policies and programmes.

First, the crisis of 2001–2002 resulted in high levels of poverty and significant growth of inequality. In this context, decision-makers were open to the evidence from research studies and impact evaluations of policies that could provide solutions to the policy issues to be addressed.

Second, impact evaluations from other countries, including those of Oportunidades in Mexico and Bolsa Família in Brazil, demonstrated that conditional cash transfers could have a significant role in alleviating poverty. While this case study is an examination of the impact of the evaluations of CPP and Studying is Working, evidence from elsewhere actually set the stage for the adoption of the programme. The findings from other evaluations helped make the case for CPP in meetings between academics and policymakers. The adoption of rigorous targeting systems – a distinguishing feature of conditional cash transfer programmes – offered the possibility of breaking with the logic of patronage embedded in social programmes of the Buenos Aires city government.

Finally, the existence of pioneer politicians or policy promoters, such as Jorge Telerman, deputy head of government at the time, was crucial for the design of the programme and its subsequent approval in the city legislature. Pablo Pucciarelli, CPP General Director, praised Jorge Telerman (the city government vice-chief) for convening the team of policy experts in early 2005 to design a social programme to eradicate extreme poverty. The evidence collected shows that the programme's technical team had, since inception, an instrumental role as policy promoters and managers of knowledge.

The organisation of events, international seminars and meetings between academics and policymakers were channels chosen by the technical team specifically to promote change and raise awareness among the political actors and representatives of civil society organisations and academia in Buenos Aires. This included an international seminar organised in the Argentine capital prior to the creation of the programme in which the successful experiences of Brazil's and Mexico's conditional cash transfer programmes were presented.

From the beginning, the technical team promoted a paradigm shift in social policy and the institutionalisation of the monitoring and evaluation functions. According to Irene Novacovsky, "debates at the city level, seminars and specific courses were organised to discuss policy proposals and we also participated in various national and international seminars in order to compare different intervention and evaluation strategies along with other programmes of similar characteristics."

An equally important landmark was that, the impact evaluations have created an ever-hungry appetite for evidence. The city government has moved towards the institutionalisation of a monitoring and evaluation function and the demands for its services are increasing steadily.

Annual discussions of the CPP budget in the city legislature provide a regular and continuing opportunity for the use of evidence in policymaking. Indeed, the ongoing organisation of training workshops and seminars, the publication and dissemination of the impact evaluation reports and other studies on the welfare of CPP and Studying is Working beneficiaries and the ongoing response to information requests suggest a constructive dialogue between the programme's managers and both policymakers and the general public.

During the 2011 budget discussion, the evidence provided by the impact evaluations of the CPP and Studying is Working (as well as other studies on the potential demand and the update of the benefit amount according to estimates of inflation) were used to obtain an increased budget allocation.

Finally, the continual use of the findings in training seminars for government staff has not only boosted support for progressive social policies but also the importance of and skills for monitoring and evaluation. Since 2008, the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit has organised 13 training seminars for city government staff. Additionally, the monitoring and evaluation system contributed to changes with the CPP and to the creation of the Studying is Working component. The results of the impact evaluations, the publication of reports on the social situation of Buenos Aires and the characterisation of vulnerable groups, as well as the ongoing response to requests for specific information, are critical inputs for making decisions regarding CPP and the programmes of the Social Development Ministry in general.

Lessons for policy influence from the impact evaluation experience in Buenos Aires centre around four issues: i) trustworthiness of the findings; ii) legitimising; iii) strengthening the M&E system; and iv) institutionalising evaluations. Expanding the base of support for evidence-based policymaking may have been beyond the scope of the evaluations of the CPP and Studying is Working. However, it is clear that the establishment and entrenchment of the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit is a spillover effect that will have significant benefit far beyond the CPP programme itself.

### **Trustworthiness of the findings**

Evidence arising from the three evaluations was reliably supported by the use of rigorous methodologies, which include the double difference analysis (over time and across beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries). The evaluation design used a methodology capable of neutralising: i) confounding or misleading factors; ii) selection bias; iii) spillover effects; iv) contamination of control groups; and v) impact heterogeneity of the intervention, beneficiary type and context.

However, the evaluation reports of the CPP do not sufficiently explain the methodology used to assess the impact on poverty. The case study interviews helped to clarify that, to estimate CPP impact on poverty and extreme poverty, simulations were performed without the income provided by CPP, according to methodology proposed by Baker (2000). This detail should have been spelled out in the reports.

Also unclear initially was the use of a quasi-experimental evaluation design instead of a "pure" experimental design, with control groups randomly selected before the intervention. According to the experts interviewed, the quasi-experimental design reflected the fact that the law that created the CPP required that all people living in poverty in Buenos Aires were to be included. Thus, to have used an experimental design with random allocation would have violated the law, denying access to a portion of the target population.

Additionally, the qualitative information gathered in the evaluations has not been sufficiently disclosed. It would be advisable to: i) triangulate the information provided by qualitative and quantitative methods to capture in the evaluation reports the unintended consequences of the programme and deepen some of the issues that were revealed and of great importance (for example, the case of young people who do not study or work and the difficulty of their inclusion in Studying is Working); ii) use the channels through which the results of quantitative information was published to also disseminate the results from the qualitative approaches; and iii) conduct a qualitative evaluation of the CPP impact on women's empowerment and to identify if there have been undesirable effects on gender relations within the beneficiary households.

This process reinforces that a political purpose for an impact evaluation is least likely to interfere when combined with rigorous technical analysis, when the evaluation is conducted by an external agency, and if the officials commissioning impact evaluations are prepared for possible negative results.

### **Legitimisation**

The results of the CPP and Studying is Working evaluations have been a crucial element in terms of legitimising the programme and the new direction for social policies in the Argentine context. From the presentation of empirical evidence about the outcomes and impacts of the programme, the three evaluations contributed to building consensus around the intervention strategy.

Certainly the communication strategy designed and implemented proved to be successful towards legitimising the programme. This included participation in international seminars both in Argentina and elsewhere, training seminars, formal and informal meetings with the various actors and the dissemination of the evaluation findings through electronic newsletters and the city government website, among others. The continuity of the programme after the change of authorities and the sustained increase in the CPP budget support this observation.

Additionally, a series of meetings between the evaluation team and the authorities and technical staff of the CPP and Studying is Working enabled deep discussion of the evaluation results, including potential changes that could optimise the achieved impacts. For this purpose, different feasibility scenarios were constructed. The interaction between the two teams was critical in terms of policy influence, facilitating the instrumental use of the evidence provided by the evaluation reports. As a result of these meetings, the CPP director's office in conjunction with Ministry of Social Development took up many of the recommendations in the three reports.

There was tremendous interest and openness among the CPP technical team to explore, in collaboration with the evaluation team, alternatives that might improve the programme's impact. This, in turn, helped to reinforce ownership of the evaluation findings.

One important lesson that emerged from the case study analysis is that, to maximise the policy influence of impact evaluations, it seems crucial to have a clear communication and dissemination strategy of the results.

Likewise, it is essential to generate forums for discussion and interaction between the evaluation team, the decision-makers and the technical team of the programme being evaluated so that the results could be articulated, promoting ownership and facilitating the adoption of the recommendations.

### **Strengthening the M&E system**

A clear consensus among interviewees is apparent on the importance of having in place an M&E system to improve the management and decision-making process, to promote transparency and accountability and, ultimately, to build consensus and legitimacy.

Since its inception, CPP set up an M&E system that included impact evaluations. The technical team that designed the programme had a solid experience in conducting M&E activities and led from the start; those who commissioned the impact evaluations had expertise in the field and promoted their use.

The dissemination of the impact evaluation reports among governmental authorities, ministry technical staff and other areas of the city government, legislators, civil society organisations and social policy experts promoted the use of the M&E function. In turn, such use created new demands, and to meet those demands it was necessary to strengthen the M&E system. Thus, the use of information provided by the M&E system generated new demand for information, which in turn strengthened the system.

The important conclusions on the M&E system are: i) the existence of technical flexibility on the part of the IME Unit to guarantee participation and inclusiveness of many actors who are not experts in the field; ii) the ability to positively mobilise people who are users of the system by organising seminars and events, awakening the interest of learning

from the rigorous and systematic observation of reality and its evidence-based interpretation; iii) a strong emphasis on the use of evaluation for management purposes and programme development input and, to a lesser extent, as an instrument of accountability.

In terms of lessons for policy influence, the greatest achievement of the CPP and Studying is Working impact evaluations has been to promote a new culture of results-based management and use of evaluation findings in the management process. The challenge ahead is to institutionalise a system of monitoring and evaluation of social policies and programmes through an Act of the city legislature.

### **Institutionalising evaluation**

The initiatives to institutionalise the M&E functions have been successful and moved up to the ministry level, through the creation of the IME Unit. María Eugenia Vidal, Minister of Social Development, pointed out that the institutionalisation of the M&E system within the Ministry, through the creation of the unit, "had a healthy contagious effect in other areas." In fact, "the creation of the monitoring and evaluation area within the Ministry is an initiative of this administration, based on the need to have a much closer and accurate overview about what's going on with Ciudadanía Porteña, given its magnitude; then it extends to Studying is Working as a component and also to the evaluation of other areas and other programmes."

However, the IME Unit is still a body whose continuity depends on the Minister of Social Development, a situation that makes it very vulnerable to a change of authorities in the Ministry. Thus, although the creation of the unit represents a breakthrough in terms of the institutionalisation of the role of M&E, there is still a long way to go.

The main obstacle that the M&E function must face is the lack of a results-based management system integrated into the city government structure that allow these functions to provide feedback to the planning system. There are different M&E systems operating at the local and national levels, but they lack coordination and are fragmented. Nonetheless, they all seek to improve the levels of efficiency, effectiveness and quality of the social policies, thus seeking to improve services for those living in poverty.

In terms of emphasis, the evaluation reports could have better highlighted the negative findings, such as the large number of teenagers who remain out of the school system and in the labour market. Some recommendations could have better emphasised the deficits in the CPP so that the adjustments that were made were better suited to address the problem. For example, although there was an increase in the students' benefits, it was not sufficient to maintain its purchasing power. Additionally, the improvement in referrals and outreach for young mothers and children on the importance of early childhood development was not matched with sufficient vacancies in the schools or learning centres.

Nonetheless, CPP and its evaluations contain important lessons for policy influence. The evaluations were important for legitimising the CPP: the evaluations provided information that was strategically used to adjust the policy and the programme's implementation. Also, new courses of action were outlined. Additionally, the evaluations were important to strengthen the M&E system and to institutionalise an evaluations process within the Ministry of Social Development.

## References

- Baker, J., *Evaluating the impact of development projects on poverty: A handbook for Practitioners*, The World Bank, Washington, D.C., 2000.
- Bastagli, F., *From social safety net to social policy? The role of conditional cash transfers in welfare state development in Latin America*, Working Paper No. 60, International Poverty Centre for Inclusive Growth, Brasilia, December 2009.
- Cecchini, S. and A. Madariaga, "Programas de transferencias condicionadas. Balance de la experiencia reciente en América Latina y el Caribe", in *Cuadernos de la CEPAL*, No. 95, CEPAL-ASDI, Naciones Unidas, Santiago de Chile, 2011.
- CIPPEC, "Sound expectations: From impact evaluation to policy change: Guidelines for the production of 3ie's case studies series on policy influence of impact studies", CIPPEC-ODI-3ie, Buenos Aires, 2011a.
- CIPPEC, "Sound expectations: From impact evaluation to policy change: Conceptual Framework for 3ie's Case Studies Series on policy influence of impact studies", CIPPEC-ODI-3ie, Buenos Aires, 2011b.
- Cruces, G., P. Glüzmann and L. López Calva, "Economic crises, maternal and infant mortality, low birth weight and enrollment rates: Evidence from Argentina's downturns", in *World Development*, Vol.40, Issue 2, pp. 303-314, 2012.
- De la Brière, B. and L. Rawlings, *Examining Conditional Cash Transfer Programs: A Role for Increased Social Inclusion?* Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0603, The World Bank, 2006.
- Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (IME), *Grandes Logros del Programa Ciudadanía Porteña: Resultados de la Segunda Evaluación*, Ministry of Social Development, Buenos Aires City Government, 2009. Available at: [http://estatico2.buenosaires.gov.ar/areas/des\\_social/evaluacion\\_programas/informes\\_condiciones\\_vida/Segunda\\_evaluacion\\_CP.pdf](http://estatico2.buenosaires.gov.ar/areas/des_social/evaluacion_programas/informes_condiciones_vida/Segunda_evaluacion_CP.pdf)
- Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (IME), *Programa Ciudadanía Porteña. Con Todo Derecho. Síntesis del informe de la primera evaluación de resultados e impacto*, Ministry of Social Development, Buenos Aires City Government, 2008. Available at: [http://estatico.buenosaires.gov.ar/areas/des\\_social/evaluacion\\_programas/informes\\_condiciones\\_vida/sintesis\\_informe\\_evaluacion.pdf](http://estatico.buenosaires.gov.ar/areas/des_social/evaluacion_programas/informes_condiciones_vida/sintesis_informe_evaluacion.pdf)
- Jones, H., *A guide to monitoring and evaluating policy influence*, Background Note, Overseas Development Institute, London, 2011.
- Jones, N., H. Jones, L. Steer and A. Datta, *Improving impact evaluation production and use*, Working Paper 300, Overseas Development Institute, London, 2009.
- Perez Ribas, R., F. Veras Soares and G. Issamu Hirata, "The impact of CCTs: What we know and what we are not sure about", in *Poverty in Focus*, No. 15, International Poverty Centre, 2008.



## **Annexes**

### **Annex 1: The methods of identification and selection of the beneficiaries of the Ciudadanía Porteña Programme**

Horacio Chitarroni, Irene Novacovsky and Naomi Wermus

The Ciudadanía Porteña Programme (CPP), within the Ministry of Social Development of the Buenos Aires city government, is a conditional cash transfer programme aimed at securing the livelihoods of households living in poverty and interrupting the intergenerational transmission of poverty.

The main goals of CPP are addressing poverty and inequality through income transfers to poor and extremely poor households and guaranteeing the enrolment and retention of children and adolescents in the formal education system. Beneficiary households are required, for the purpose of staying in the programme, school attendance of children aged 5 to 18 and compliance with health check-ups for pregnant women and for children up to age 18.

#### **1. The identification and selection of beneficiaries**

The processes of identification and selection of the target population of all social policies are intended to increase the redistributive effect of social expenditure and achieve greater equity in allocation (Filgueira, 1998).

There are different ways or methods to achieve these objectives. There are household targeting systems that attempt to identify individuals or households in vulnerable situations or actual poverty, taking into account their various types of resources (property, income streams, workforce availability, among others). Categorical targeting methods are aimed at the population included in certain socio-demographic categories, such as children of school age or older. Territorial or geographical targeting methods are applied to the populations residing in a certain geographic area, usually selected locations that contain very high incidence of poverty. Finally, there are other methods through which a potential beneficiary may seek to prove eligibility and inclusion in the programme (they may be subject to a subsequent procedure to verify their conditions before inclusion in the programme). All these procedures have, of course, advantages and disadvantages. And it's not unusual to combine them in order to bring together their strengths and weaknesses (Castañeda and Lindert, 2006).

The individual or household assessment methods or so-called verified means tests may use different registers, such as property, cars or boats ownership records, as well as contributions to the social security system and employment. The latter specifically are used to assess household income: the cost of these controls is low, but their effectiveness is guaranteed in a very general context of formal employment. However, in developing countries, where widespread self-employment or unregistered employment

exists, these tests may be insufficient (Larrañaga, 2003, Coady, and Hodinnott Gras, 2006).

In these cases, information about household income must be obtained through specific surveys in areas of poverty. However, the direct consideration of the income in such surveys is not entirely reliable because international experience suggests that potential beneficiaries often adjust their declarations to the requirements and conditions set by the programmes.

In response to this problem, income can be replaced by an estimate based on a set of observable and non-monetary characteristics of household applicants: This is the so-called proxy means test (Perez Ribas, Hirata and Veras Soares, 2008, Castañeda and Lindert, 2006), which calls for statistical models that allow to arrive at estimates of income. What is usually obtained through such methods is a certain probability that the income of the beneficiary can be placed in a certain range, so estimates are naturally subject to errors of both overestimation and underestimation.

In essence, any procedure used in the targeting of social programmes is necessarily subject to two types of errors. On the one hand, the most important error is the risk of not admitting who really meets the criteria established and therefore should receive benefits: this is the error of exclusion. On the other hand, others may be admitted to the programme who do not really fulfil the required criteria. This is a filtering problem and payments could be made to non-poor households. This is called error of inclusion. The challenge is to find a mechanism that simultaneously reduces both errors.

## **2. The three phases in selecting beneficiaries for the CPP**

To minimise errors of exclusion and inclusion, and with a special emphasis on guarding against the first, the CPP devised a combined selection method involving three simultaneous and complementary processes:

1. Verified means testing
2. Proxy means testing
3. A procedure for correcting systematic errors of exclusion and inclusion.

### **Verified means testing**

CPP's verified means testing uses existing information from various databases. This first procedure has the character of means testing while acting as control filter to ensure compatibility with the standards of the programme. It consists of cross-checking CPP's database of beneficiaries with other government registration databases that provide information on: housing and car registries, social programmes, employment, pensions, unemployment insurance, and deceased, among others.

## **Proxy means testing**

CPP's proxy means testing is carried out indirectly by estimating the household potential income through a statistical model that is applied to the information provided by the Unified Registry of Beneficiary Households of Social Programmes (Registro Único de Hogares Beneficiarios de Programas Sociales-RUB). The RUB applies a socio-economic questionnaire to individuals and households who aspire to be beneficiaries of the social programmes of the Buenos Aires city government. It collects information on household composition and family relationships, marital status, place of birth, health coverage, school attendance and level of educational attainment, employment and income, household assets, housing characteristics and the presence of child labour.

The estimate of household potential income is calculated using the non-monetary features of the household, those directly observable and relatively more structural and stable, while simultaneously related to the ability to earn income. The purpose is to obtain a statistical model that can predict the location of household income from the information provided by the RUB in a high proportion of cases, minimising possible errors of exclusion and inclusion. The following is the model used by CPP, which was also tested on the Annual Household Survey of the City of Buenos Aires, a statistical source that lists the income reported by households and in which this statement can be considered acceptably reliable.

## **The indirect model employed**

Generally, the procedures used to estimate income employ regression models. In this case, it consists of a binary logistic regression model, taking into account that it intends to predict the inclusion of two groups, which are determined by their household income:

- i) Extreme poor households: households with incomes up to 25 per cent above the extreme poverty line.
- ii) Poor households: households with incomes above 25 per cent of the extreme poverty line but not more than up to 25 per cent of the poverty line.

The membership or not in these groups is, for each household, a dichotomous attribute. The selected model should provide a separate classification to indicate whether a given household belonged to one of these groups or not<sup>17</sup>. Logistic regression meets this condition.

Different combinations of independent variables were tested, in which both dependent variables were dichotomous (belonging or not belonging to the two subgroups of the target population of the CPP, determined by the household income). Finally, the two selected models were the ones that demonstrated better predictive ability. Their efficiency was judged by their achievement in reducing errors of inclusion and exclusion.

---

<sup>17</sup> Two separate logistic models were used, which classify households according to their belonging to each group. The decision adopted by the programme to consider up to 25 per cent of the poverty and extreme poverty lines is due to the fluctuating income of these households.

In the first case or "extended extreme poverty", the selected model correctly classified 96 per cent of the extremely poor households -with incomes up to 25 per cent above the extreme poverty line (the error of exclusion was 4 per cent), while 20 per cent of the non-extremely poor households were incorrectly classified as extremely poor (error of inclusion).

In the case of the "poor households", the ones exceeding the extreme poverty line by more than 25 per cent and with incomes up to 25 percent above the poverty line, the efficiency of the model was somewhat lower: the error of exclusion was 8 per cent and the error of inclusion was 20 per cent.

The following table shows the performance of the indirect process employed by the CPP compared with other international experiences:

| <b>Programme</b>                | <b>Country</b>       | <b>Error I<br/>(exclusion)</b> | <b>Error II<br/>(inclusion)</b> |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| SISBEM <sup>1</sup>             | Colombia             | 19%                            | 31%                             |
| PROGRESA <sup>1</sup>           | Mexico               | 25%                            | 40%                             |
| PANES <sup>1</sup>              | Uruguay              | 15%                            | 18%                             |
| BOLSA FAMÍLIA <sup>2</sup>      | Brazil*              | 49%                            | 59%                             |
| OPORTUNIDADES <sup>2</sup>      | Mexico*              | 36%                            | 70%                             |
| CIUDADANIA PORTEÑA <sup>3</sup> | City of Buenos Aires | 4%                             | 20%                             |
| CIUDADANIA PORTEÑA <sup>4</sup> | City of Buenos Aires | 8%                             | 20%                             |

**Notes:** (\*) In the cases of Bolsa Família and Oportunidades , the error of exclusion is not comparable because it is not a selection bias of beneficiaries, but rather a coverage deficit of such programmes in relation to the total poverty. However, the error of inclusion, which is the percentage of non-poor among the beneficiaries, is comparable.

1: Based on data included in Amarante, Arim and Vigorito (2005). Authors' calculations from PNAD 2004 and ENIGH 2004.

2: Base on data included in Veras Soares, Perez Ribas and Guerreiro Osório (2007).

3: Extreme poverty.

4: Poverty.

### **Procedure for correcting systematic errors of exclusion and inclusion**

Given the persistence of errors of inclusion and exclusion, the household selection process was completed through a detailed examination of rejected cases. Based on this evaluation, home visits and in-depth interviews were conducted by expert staff of the programme, with the purpose of verifying applicants' living conditions.

As a result of this review, a need arose to perform certain adjustments to respond to special situations that were aggravating the vulnerability of households and were not reflected among the significant variables in the original model. The main reason was related to the biases inherent in the indirect method.

From this comprehensive analysis of recurrent errors of inclusion and exclusion that could have been incurred, correction factors based on a set of criteria were applied, such as being a one-person household, housing with severe situations of instability, households headed by women with dependent children, and the presence of people with a disability or chronically ill in the household. In general, these situations involved conditions that imply a restriction of resources, either human capital resources (potential workforce) or material assets (housing deficit).

Another factor to be taken into account in the assessment of all potentially eligible households was the ratio of household expenditure share within the total of members.

The smaller homes have a disadvantage in terms of economy of scale.

The inclusion of this more detailed and qualitative procedure was chosen because a statistical model, however efficient it may be, is a "blind" instrument that assigns probabilities based on aggregate data. However, it is more difficult to consider exceptional circumstances because of the degree of vulnerability implied.

The combination of these procedures in the selection process represents an advance over the methods used by other conditional cash transfer programmes in the region, which usually only use direct verified means or proxy means testing. The combined use of multiple assessment procedures enables a compensation for the weaknesses of each method and correct bias.

### **3. Final classification of the stages of selecting aspirants**

The procedure of registering potential beneficiaries and their classification by triangular measurement allowed us to classify potentially eligible households into four groups: i) those correctly excluded, ii) those erroneously excluded, iii) those correctly included and iv) those erroneously included.

The combination of the three procedures described previously allowed considering the total income declared by these households in the RUB survey and those obtained by verified means testing in respect of the classification of the indirect method, reducing significantly errors of inclusion and exclusion.

Any procedure like those previously noted assumes the risks that have been mentioned: to deprive the benefits of the programme to those genuinely entitled to them or provided to those who are not eligible to obtain them. This second error of "permissiveness" is, in principle, less severe than the previous one: it seems preferable to broadly include beneficiaries than exclude anyone erroneously.

As of March 2009, in more than 100,000 enrollees, the classification of the three procedures was completed, as shown in the following table:

### Potential beneficiaries enrolled in the CPP as of March 2009

|                                 |                |               |
|---------------------------------|----------------|---------------|
| Households correctly excluded   | 35.197         | 34,3%         |
| Households erroneously excluded | 765            | 0,7%          |
| Households correctly included   | 56.107         | 54,7%         |
| Households erroneously included | 10.439         | 10,2%         |
| <b>Total</b>                    | <b>102.508</b> | <b>100,0%</b> |

*Source:* General Direction of Ciudadanía Porteña, Ministry of Social Development, Buenos Aires city government

Due to the use of the three selection procedures, the error of exclusion was reduced to less than one per cent; meanwhile, the error of inclusion was reduced by half. These values demonstrate a breakthrough in reducing this type of bias.

The results suggest that the CPP, through the use of converging methods, made a deliberate effort to adjust and calibrate the identification and selection of beneficiaries.

## References

- Amarante, V., R. Arim and A. Vigorito, *Metodología para la selección de participantes en el Plan de Emergencia Social*, Instituto de Economía, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, 2005.
- Brodersohn, V., *Focalización de programas de superación de la pobreza*, Documento de Trabajo No. 3, Centro Interamericano de Estudios Sociales, 1994.
- Castañeda, T. and K. Lindert, "Implementación de mecanismos para los programas usando 'proxy means test'. Experiencias de América Latina", Ponencia presentada en la Tercera Conferencia Internacional sobre transferencias en efectivo condicionadas, Estambul, 2006.
- Coady, D., M. Grosh and J. Hodinnott, *La Focalización de las transferencias en los países en desarrollo: revisión de lecciones y experiencias*, Banco Mundial/IFPRI, Washington, D.C., 2006.
- Filgueira, F., "El nuevo modelo de prestaciones sociales en América Latina: Residualismo, eficiencia y ciudadanía estratificada", in Brian Roberts (ed.): *Ciudadanía y Política Sociales*, FLACSO/SSRC, San José de Costa Rica, 1998.
- Larrañaga, O., *Focalización de programas sociales en Chile. El sistema CAS*, Departamento de Economía, Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile, 2003.
- Perez Ribas, R., G. Hirata and S. Veras Soares, *Debatiendo los métodos de Focalización para las transferencias monetarias: índice multidimensional vs. proxy de ingresos para el programa Tekoporá de Paraguay*, IPC Evaluation Note No. 2, International Poverty Centre/UNDP, Brasilia, 2008.
- Veras Soares, F., R. Perez Ribas and R. Guerreiro Osório, *Evaluating the impact of Brazil's Bolsa Família: cash transfer programmes in comparative perspective*, IPC Evaluation Note No. 1, International Poverty Centre/UNDP, Brasilia, 2007.

## **Annex 2: People interviewed**

1. **María Eugenia Vidal**, Social Development Minister – former legislator
2. **José Luis Acevedo**, Under-Secretary for Family and Community Strengthening
3. **Pablo Pucciarelli**, General Director of Ciudadanía Porteña
4. **Irene Novacovsky**, Coordinator of the Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and Former Co-Director of CPP
5. **María Eva Hadida**, UIMyE Senior Officer – Former Evaluation Officer of CPP
6. **Victoria Arinci**, Coordinator of the Unified Registry of Beneficiary Households
7. **Naomi Wermus**, Coordinator of Studying is Working
8. **Sergio Beros**, Former Secretary of Social Development
9. **Hilda Lanza**, Coordinator of the Education Area of CPP
10. **Martín Hourest**, city legislator



### **Annex 3: Questionnaires used in the semi-structured interviews**

Evaluation of the policy influence of the impact evaluation of the Programa Ciudadanía Porteña (CPP) and its component Studying is Working undertaken by the Buenos Aires city government.

Guidelines for semi-structure interviews with actors and key informants:

- 1. Context of the programme** (the characteristics of the political context that drives/motivates the programme) and the relation of the respondent with the programme ( here there is no specific reference to the impact of the evaluation)
  - Do you know how the Programa Ciudadania Portena came into being – the actors, processes and activities (actors involved, instances of consensus building, political context in which the programme was created)? What form did the debate in the legislature take, was it open and democratic?
  - What type of social policies and programmes prevailed /were common before the implementation of the CPP? What is it that is different between this programme and the previous ones (coverage, type of benefits, systems of monitoring and evaluation)? What influence/impact did the fact that the programme had a system of identification and selection of beneficiaries? Does it seem to you that there has been a change in the political weight/influence of civil society organisations regarding the design and implementation of social policies?
  - Do you know how the component Studying is Working came into being/was formed?
  - What is your view in regards to how the CPP functions? What do you consider to be the main strengths and weaknesses, its impacts or consequences and the proficiency of the programme’s teams?
  - Did you request information about the CPP? If so, which issues/aspects? Was it easy to gain access to it? Was the information provided in a timely manner? Were the answers you received clear and precise?
  - Do you think that the CPP has had a technical or methodological influence on other social programmes?
- 2. Regarding the impact evaluations of CPP and Studying is Working**
  - Do you know the CPP and its component Studying is Working were evaluated?
  - Are you aware of the results of the assessments? Do you know how you can access the reports/ assessments?

- Why do you think assessments were undertaken?
  - What do you think have been the main contributions of the assessment? Do you believe that this information is useful or relevant? If so, for who?
  - Do you think that the evidence provided by the assessment of the impact of the programme (for example, on the reduction of poverty and destitution, in the reduction of child labour the increase in school attendance) contributes to the discussion of different strategies of intervention in public policy?
  - Do you think the recommendations of the impact assessments contributed to the creation of new lines of action (for example the creation of the Studying is Working component)? Who contributed or opposed this process?
  - Can you identify or think of any conclusions or recommendations that have generated changes during the course of this programme? What about in other programmes/ policies?
  - From your point of view, what is the usefulness in terms of public policy studies or assessments that account for the results or the impact of programmes? (Inquire into the different possible dimensions: provides information, gives legitimacy, improves the quality of future discussions, its usefulness for adjusting the design and implementation of programmes, and helps promote thinking of new policies, etc.).
- 3. Regarding the demand** (given the circumstances and conditions surrounding the policy process, determine whether the evidence from the impact assessments can be an input to the decision making process)

Systems of evaluation and use:

- Have you requested at some time information on studies or evaluations that take into account for the results or the impact of social programmes from the Ministry of Social Development?
- If they have not done so, investigate the reasons. If they have, investigate why they did, and if the information seemed rigorous and pertinent, etc.
- In what moment do you think is more important to have information about the results or impact of a social programme (during change of government, economic policy etc.)?
- To which organisations or actors do you think the information about the results or impact assessments of social programmes would be most useful? For what

purposes would the information be used? What actors would be interested in financing this type of activities or project?

- From your point of view, what institutions have the capacity to carry out studies that take into account the results or impact of social programmes? What capacities do these institutions have? If they don't exist, what capacities should they have?

#### **4. About the supply**

##### **Context**

- In your opinion, is there a tradition of evaluating social programmes in the city government?
- Which were the most relevant experiences from the evaluation to remember?
- Who should generally be responsible for these types of evaluation assessments?

##### **Characteristics of the organisation responsible of the evaluation**

- Have you heard of the Organización de Estados Iberoamericanos para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura?
- What's your opinion about it from a technical point of view?
- Have you heard of the of Information, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit?

##### **Characteristics of the impact evaluations**

- Do you think the results and recommendations of the evaluations are clear and trustworthy? Why?

#### **5. The intersection between supply and demand**

- Do you know about the outreach and training conducted to disseminate the results and impact of the CPP Studying is Working programme?
- Do you think that the communication strategy implemented to disseminate the results of the evaluations was effective? Why?
- Did you find the channels of discussion and formats for communication suitable for this type of study? What other channels and formats can you think of that would be useful?

## **Annex 4: LEY 1878. Creación del programa "ciudadanía porteña"**

### **LEY Nº 1.878**

#### **Crea el programa "Ciudadanía Porteña. Con Todo Derecho"**

Buenos Aires, 1º de diciembre de 2005.

La Legislatura de la Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires  
sanciona con fuerza de  
Ley:

Artículo 1º - Del Programa "Ciudadanía Porteña. Con todo Derecho." Créase el Programa "Ciudadanía Porteña. Con todo derecho", consistente en una prestación monetaria mensual por hogar beneficiario, no retributiva, intransferible e inembargable, que se otorgará según las condiciones y pautas establecidas en esta ley y en su reglamentación.

Artículo 2º - Objetivo del programa.

El programa tiene como objetivo efectuar una transferencia de ingresos a los integrantes de los hogares beneficiarios. La prestación se dirige a sostener el acceso a la alimentación de los beneficiarios así como a promover el acceso a la educación y protección de la salud de los niños, niñas, adolescentes y su grupo familiar, la búsqueda de empleo y reinserción en el mercado laboral de los adultos.

Artículo 3º - Definición.

A los efectos de esta ley se entiende por "hogar" al grupo de personas, parientes o no, que viven bajo un mismo techo de acuerdo con un régimen familiar, compartiendo sus gastos de alimentación, y sostenimiento del hogar. Las personas que viven solas constituyen cada una un hogar.

Artículo 4º - Población beneficiaria.

Son beneficiarios del programa en el siguiente orden de prelación y conforme la aplicación del índice de vulnerabilidad:

- a) Hogares cuyos ingresos resultan hasta un 25% por encima de la línea de indigencia.
- b) Hogares cuyos ingresos resultan superiores al previsto en el inciso anterior y hasta la línea de pobreza, con hijos a cargo de hasta dieciocho (18) años de edad cumplidos y/o mujeres embarazadas y/o adultos mayores de sesenta y cinco (65) años a cargo y/o personas con necesidades especiales a cargo.
- c) Hogares cuyos ingresos resultan superiores al previsto en el inciso a) del presente artículo y hasta la línea de pobreza, sin hijos a cargo de hasta dieciocho (18) años de edad cumplidos, sin mujeres embarazadas, que no tienen adultos mayores de sesenta y cinco (65) años a cargo ni personas con discapacidad a cargo, según el grado de intensidad en función de la demanda efectiva para este programa.

Artículo 5º - Titulares de la prestación.

Son titulares de la prestación:

- a) En el caso de los hogares indigentes u hogares pobres con mujeres embarazadas y/o hijos hasta dieciocho (18) años y/o personas adultas mayores de sesenta y cinco (65) años a cargo y/o personas con necesidades especiales a cargo: la madre o jefa de hogar.
- b) En caso de ausencia permanente o incapacidad legal de la madre o jefa de hogar, el titular del beneficio es el padre a cargo del hogar o el jefe de hogar, siempre que demostrare fehacientemente esta condición.

Artículo 6º - Los titulares de las prestaciones son responsables de su efectiva utilización a favor de los beneficiarios, así como del cumplimiento de las corresponsabilidades y condiciones que en esta ley se establecen para la vigencia del beneficio.

Artículo 7º - Condiciones para acceder al beneficio.

Para acceder al beneficio es necesario:

- a) Presentar documento nacional de identidad argentino, clave única de identificación laboral, ser mayor de dieciocho (18) años de edad, tener residencia en la ciudad no menor a dos años y presentar certificado de domicilio.
- b) En los casos de existencia de hijos menores de dieciocho (18) años a cargo, deben acreditar la filiación mediante partida de nacimiento, presentar documento nacional de identidad de los/as niños/as, y certificados de inscripción o asistencia escolar en los casos de los/as hijos/as de cinco (5) a dieciocho (18) años. Quienes al momento de inscripción al programa no se encuentren escolarizados, tendrán un plazo de seis (6) meses para regularizar dicha certificación.
- c) Presentar documento nacional de identidad y clave única de identificación laboral de otros adultos integrantes del hogar.
- d) En el caso de hogares con personas menores de edad legalmente a cargo del/la solicitante, deben presentar documentación que acredite tal calidad, además de cumplir con lo indicado en el inciso b) de este artículo y con la presentación.
- e) Para el caso de hogares con personas con necesidades especiales a cargo, el/la solicitante debe presentar certificado de discapacidad expedido por autoridad nacional o provincial competente o la constancia de iniciación del trámite para su obtención, además del documento nacional de identidad y la clave única de identificación laboral.
- f) Para el caso de mujeres embarazadas, se requiere además del documento nacional de identidad y la clave única de identificación laboral, la presentación de certificado médico expedido por el sistema público de salud.

En aquellos casos que deba presentarse la clave única de identificación laboral y el/la ciudadano/a carezca de ella, la autoridad de aplicación arbitrará los recursos necesarios para su obtención.

Artículo 8º - Modalidad y monto del beneficio.

Las prestaciones monetarias del programa se efectúan a través del Banco Ciudad de Buenos Aires. La transferencia se realiza mediante la acreditación del monto en una cuenta bancaria destinada a tal efecto.

Los montos de las prestaciones son los siguientes:

- a) En los casos determinados en el artículo 4º, inciso a): el monto de la prestación es el equivalente al setenta y cinco por ciento (75 %) de la Canasta Básica Alimentaria estimada por el INDEC. La prestación se calcula según la composición del hogar,

considerando al adulto equivalente como parámetro para la estimación del beneficio por hogar, de acuerdo a los parámetros del INDEC. Para todos los casos de hogares beneficiarios con hijos de hasta dos (2) años de edad se considera como adulto equivalente por cada uno de los hijos en esta franja etaria, un monto que no podrá ser inferior al establecido en el art. 18, inc. a) de la Ley N° 24.714 y de la Ley N° 1.669.

b) En los casos determinados en el artículo 4º, incisos b) y c): el beneficio es del cincuenta por ciento (50%) de la Canasta Básica Alimentaria, considerando al adulto equivalente como parámetro para la estimación del beneficio, de acuerdo a los parámetros del INDEC. Para todos los casos de hogares beneficiarios con hijos de hasta 2 años de edad se considera como adulto equivalente por cada uno de los hijos en esta franja etaria, un monto que no podrá ser inferior al establecido en el art. 18, inc. a) de la Ley N° 24.714 y de la Ley N° 1.669.

La actualización de la prestación se realiza semestralmente en función de la variación de la canasta básica alimentaria según el INDEC.

La prestación es exclusiva para la adquisición de productos alimentarios y elementos indispensables para la higiene, limpieza del hogar y combustión necesaria para la cocción.

La transferencia sólo puede ser utilizada a través de una tarjeta prepaga en los comercios habilitados para tal fin, conforme surja del decreto reglamentario de esta ley. En el caso de ser beneficiarios del plan jefes y jefas de hogar o de otros subsidios que establezca la reglamentación, el monto adecuado se adecuará proporcionalmente.

Artículo 9º - Procedimiento para la selección de los/as beneficiarios/as.

El procedimiento para la selección de los/as aspirantes al beneficio se inicia con la solicitud de inscripción por parte de las personas que revisten el carácter previsto en el artículo 5º de la presente ley, conforme las modalidades y condiciones que establece la reglamentación de la presente.

La totalidad de los beneficiarios de la presente y su grupo familiar, deben estar inscriptos en el Registro Único de Beneficiarios (R.U.B.), caso contrario, deben inscribirse dentro del plazo de treinta (30) días hábiles desde que formalizan su inscripción al presente programa.

Para la determinación de los beneficiarios, las prestaciones se otorgarán en estricto cumplimiento de este ranking, cubriendo a todos los hogares indicados en el inciso a) del artículo 4º de esta ley, y a continuación, los beneficiarios indicados en el resto de los incisos del artículo mencionado.

La nómina de beneficiarios es publicada por los Servicios Sociales Zonales en los Centros de Gestión y Participación, y otros organismos del Gobierno de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires.

Artículo 10 - Corresponsabilidades de los beneficiarios.

Los/as titulares del beneficio asumen las siguientes corresponsabilidades:

a) En materia de protección de la salud:

- 1) Efectuar controles mensuales de salud de la embarazada.
- 2) Efectuar control quincenal de salud de niños/as menores de un mes.
- 3) Efectuar controles de "niño sano" y desarrollo nutricional mensual para los/as niños/as

de hasta los once (11) meses de edad.

- 4) Efectuar controles de "niño sano" y desarrollo nutricional bimestral para los/as niños/as de doce (12) a veintitrés (23) meses de edad.
- 5) Efectuar controles de "niño sano" y desarrollo nutricional trimestral de los/as niños/as de veinticuatro (24) a treinta y cinco (35) meses de edad.
- 6) Efectuar controles de salud y desarrollo nutricional semestrales en caso de niños/as de tres (3) a cinco (5) años de edad.
- 7) Efectuar controles de salud y desarrollo nutricional anual para los/as niños/as de seis (6) a trece (13) años de edad.
- 8) Efectuar controles de salud anual para los/as adolescentes de catorce (14) a dieciocho (18) años de edad.

9) Efectuar controles de salud anual para los/as adultos mayores de sesenta y cinco (65) años de edad y las personas con necesidades especiales.

10) En todos los casos, cumplir con la aplicación de las vacunaciones obligatorias.

b) En materia de educación:

1) Procurar que los/as niños/as entre tres (3) y cuatro (4) años de edad asistan al jardín de infantes.

2) Cumplir con la asistencia y permanencia de niños/as de cinco (5) años de edad en el nivel preescolar, presentando certificado de asistencia cada tres (3) meses.

3) Cumplir con la asistencia y permanencia de los/as niños/as o adolescentes de seis (6) a dieciocho (18) años de edad en la escuela, procurando su promoción al año siguiente, certificando asistencia cada tres (3) meses.

c) Otras corresponsabilidades:

1) Brindar información fidedigna de todo lo referente a la composición y las condiciones del hogar y de cada uno de sus miembros.

2) A una adecuada utilización de los recursos del programa, conforme lo prescripto en la presente.

3) Asistir a los eventos de capacitación en seguridad y calidad alimentaria y talleres de orientación laboral.

4) Los/as adultos/as de entre veinticinco (25) y sesenta (60) años de edad que se encuentren desocupados, deben mantenerse activos en la búsqueda de empleos, aprovechando también las ofertas de capacitación laboral implementadas en distintas jurisdicciones.

En todos los casos, el cumplimiento de estas corresponsabilidades se acreditará conforme lo prevea la reglamentación correspondiente.

Artículo 11 - Criterio de permanencia en el programa.

Corresponde la baja del programa en las siguientes situaciones:

a) Cuando se modifiquen las condiciones que habilitaron el acceso al programa y conforme la nueva situación, el/la beneficiario/a no reúna los requisitos de admisibilidad previstos en la presente ley.

b) Cuando no se cumplan las corresponsabilidades establecidas en el artículo 10 de esta ley. A tal fin se concederá a los hogares un plazo para regularizar su situación. En el caso de continuar con el incumplimiento se habilitará la retención del beneficio hasta tanto se

cumpla con las obligaciones determinadas en la presente ley. Agotadas estas instancias, si la situación de incumplimiento persiste, se procederá a la baja del beneficio.

c) En caso de que se compruebe la falsedad de la información brindada para acceder al programa.

Artículo 12 - Autoridades responsables de la ejecución del programa.

La Secretaría de Desarrollo Social o el organismo que en el futuro la reemplace es la autoridad de aplicación de la presente ley, quedando facultada para el dictado de todos los actos administrativos y la suscripción de los convenios necesarios para el cumplimiento de la presente.

La autoridad de aplicación remite a la Legislatura un informe trimestral sobre la implementación de la presente ley. Asimismo, remite un informe anual al Consejo Social.

Artículo 13 - El Poder Ejecutivo reglamentará la presente, dentro de los sesenta (60) días de su promulgación.

Artículo 14 - Derógase la Ley N° 1.506.

Cláusula Transitoria:

Todos los beneficiarios actuales de los programas Vale Ciudad y Apoyo Alimentario

Directo a Familias, que no reúnan requisitos para ingresar al Programa Ciudadanía Porteña, continuarán recibiendo los beneficios contemplados en aquéllos hasta tanto estén en condiciones de ingresar a este último.

Artículo 15 - Comuníquese, etc. **de Estrada - Alemany**

#### **DECRETO N° 24**

Buenos Aires, 10 de enero de 2006.

En uso de las atribuciones conferidas por el artículo 102 de la Constitución de la Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, promúlgase la Ley N° 1.878 sancionada por la Legislatura de la Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires en su sesión del día 1º de diciembre de 2005. Dése al Registro, publíquese en el Boletín Oficial de la Ciudad de Buenos Aires, gírese copia a la Secretaría Parlamentaria del citado cuerpo por intermedio de la Dirección General de Asuntos Políticos y Legislativos y a los fines de su competencia, remítase a la Secretaría de Desarrollo Social, a la Secretaría de Hacienda y Finanzas, a la Secretaría de Salud y a la Secretaría de Educación.

El presente decreto es refrendado por el señor Secretario de Desarrollo Social, por la señora Secretaria de Hacienda y Finanzas y por el señor Jefe de Gabinete. **TELERMAN (a/c) - Beros - Albamonte - Fernández**

#### **DECRETO N° 1.954**

**Aprueba y adjudica la licitación pública nacional N° 7/05**



## **Publications in the 3ie Working Paper series**

**Validating one of the world's largest conditional cash transfer programmes: A case study on how an impact evaluation of Brazil's Bolsa Família Programme** helped silence its critics and improve policy by Gala Díaz Langou and Paula Forteza, Working Paper 16, August 2012

**Addressing attribution of cause and effect in small n impact evaluations: towards an integrated framework** by Howard White and Daniel Phillips, Working Paper 15, July 2012

**Behind the scenes: managing and conducting large scale impact evaluations in Colombia** by Bertha Briceño, Laura Cuesta and Orazio Attanasio, Working Paper 14, December 2011

**Can we obtain the required rigour without randomisation?** by Karl Hughes and Claire Hutchings, Working Paper 13, August 2011

**Sound expectations: from impact evaluations to policy change** by Vanesa Weyrauch and Gala Díaz Langou, 3ie Working Paper 12, April 2011

**A can of worms? Implications of rigorous impact evaluations for development agencies** by Eric Roetman, 3ie Working Paper 11, March 2011

**Conducting influential impact evaluations in China: the experience of the Rural Education Action Project** by Mathew Boswell, Scott Rozelle, Linxiu Zhang, Chengfang Liu, Renfu Luo, Yaojiang Shi, 3ie Working Paper 10, February 2011

**An introduction to the use of randomized control trials to evaluate development interventions** by Howard White, 3ie Working Paper 9, February 2011

**Institutionalisation of government evaluation: balancing trade-Offs** by Marie Gaarder and Bertha Briceño, 3ie Working Paper 8, July 2010

**Impact Evaluation and interventions to address climate change: a scoping study** by Martin Prowse and Birte Snilstveit, 3ie Working Paper 7, March 2010

**A checklist for the reporting of randomized control trials of social and economic policy interventions in developing countries** by Ron Bose, 3ie Working Paper 6, January 2010

**Impact evaluation in the post-disaster setting** by Alison Bittenheim, 3ie Working Paper 5, December 2009

**Designing impact evaluations: different perspectives, contributions** from Robert Chambers, Dean Karlan, Martin Ravallion, and Patricia Rogers, 3ie Working Paper 4, July 2009. Also available in Spanish, French and Chinese

**Theory-based impact evaluation** by Howard White, 3ie Working Paper 3, June 2009. Also available in French and Chinese.

**Better evidence for a better world** edited by Mark W. Lipsey University and Eamonn Noonan, 3ie & The Campbell Collaboration, 3ie Working Paper 2, April 2009

**Some reflections on current debates in impact evaluation** by Howard White, 3ie Working Paper 1, April 2009

**For the latest 3ie working papers visit:**

[http://www.3ieimpact.org/3ie\\_working\\_papers.html](http://www.3ieimpact.org/3ie_working_papers.html)