

# Dissemination and Policy Influence



**C4ED – EUTF**  
March 2024

- So far, C4ED presented preliminary results of the impact evaluations
  - *How can these results be used to shape new programmes?*
- **Goals of this session:**
  - Make use of the results and evidence
  - Establish a culture of learning and embedding evaluations into programmes

- **Important:**  
Impact Evaluation Results  
  
are different than  
  
Political Preferences or values  
  
(e.g. Whether migration is good or bad or whether women should work outside the house, e.g. in construction, are political preferences)

1. Building on Existing evidence
2. Policy Influence Plan: pillars and key steps
3. Shaping policies based on the findings of this project
4. Working sessions

# 1. Building on Existing evidence

---

## Evidence from the EUTF funded interventions in HoA

# Key findings from Uganda CIE

- The **overall** impact is limited, due to limited take-up (and potentially limited time frame between end of training and follow-up survey – only 6 months)
- However, positive impacts of the RISE project on financial and soft skills
- When focusing on compliers...
  - i. Strong and positive impacts on employment. However...
    - ...Only males reach better working conditions as they open new income generating activities (IGA) and face less barriers than females
    - ...Male beneficiaries are more exposed to job-related injuries and illness as they tend to find employment in the manufacturing sector.
  - ii. Positive impacts on refugees' social integration

# Key findings from Ethiopia CIE

- positive impacts of VSLA intervention on employment and savings
  - beneficiaries are more likely to have a self-employment job as family workers and to have savings in formal financial institutions
- No impact on the development of new businesses nor on access to loans
  - but training provided by Field Agents (FAs) improved financial resource management and business practices
- Positive impact on resilience measured by well-being and food security
- But: no impact on self-perceived resilience
- No or limited impacts on social cohesion and integration:
  - decline in overall social capital and social cohesion scores, through a significant reduction in trust
  - Weakly significant or insignificant impact on integration and migration aspiration of refugees

# Key findings from Portfolio

- Preliminary results show an increase perceived employability of beneficiaries:
  - beneficiaries of training perceived their newly attained or improved skills as relevant for the local job market
  - wage employment is marginal among beneficiaries (instead family business self-employment)
  - only few graduates start own business (as many graduates lack financial capital to establish own business)
  - however, financial and entrepreneurship skills training were helpful in improving the opportunities for wage employment of graduates (Uganda) and successful business operations of MSMEs; especially VSLAs in Ethiopia
- Heterogenous outcomes on resilience and livelihoods:
  - training encouraged social interactions e.g. Uganda and fostered bonds between refugees and hosts
  - many graduates of financial and soft skills and members of VSLAs reported improved livelihoods
  - But has not (yet) translated into job creation
- Regarding intentions to migrate, beneficiaries reported they plan to stay in their home areas and improve their business. Those who expressed intentions to migrate said they planned to move within the country where they live
- Interesting result: refugees in Uganda and Kenya intend to return to home countries where they believe to have better chances of finding jobs with the certificates



# Combining with other evidence

---

## Preliminary Literature Review

Many projects had aimed at creation of jobs and income opportunities in Africa

Some projects had been accompanied by rigorous impact evaluations

Large scientific literature on Active Labour Market Programmes, mostly on developed countries, formal labor markets

Much less research on displaced populations, refugees or host communities and economies dominated by labour informality and under-developed private sector (Ethiopia)

Active Labour Market Programmes (ALMP) became very popular in Europe (and later elsewhere) after 1990 (Eastern Europe left Soviet block), when unemployment rose and remained stagnant → Idea: support unemployed people actively, and not only via money (unemployment benefits)

Many countries enacted such policies, and soon afterwards, impact evaluations were implemented in many countries. Programs similar across countries and same outcome variables (employment status)

A large amount of research and evaluation studies with same outcome variable  
→ Ideal situation for meta studies

Meta studies often covered low- and high-income countries

Overall often modest effects, partly also due to crowding-out

→ treated persons find jobs, but others lose them instead

ALMP can perform very well during a temporary shock (recession),  
but not so well as a general policy tool

→ overall increase of number of jobs at national level not possible

Furthermore, positive impacts often decrease quickly over time

But it can help marginalized groups to enter the labor market

→ effects not huge, so depends on willingness-to-pay-by-public-sector

Generally: publicly provided services have no or little effects

→ close collaboration with private sector employers important

Ideally: public sector as Regulator, private sector does Service Delivery

# Types of active labour market policies

- training, skills development, for workers
  - (temporary) wage subsidies, subsidized wage employment
  - job search assistance, labour market intermediation, job search support
  - public works
  - support for self-employment, business training, entrepreneurial trainings
  - microfinance support
  - business development services
- New labour markets through digitalized international services, vastly growing international labour market, where services are exported to rich countries (e.g. Europe, USA) → very large potential, but not much research yet and only accessible for educated persons with foreign language skills

Usually, relatively short trainings (e.g. 3 to 6 months), e.g. as internship, on the job training), or classroom based vocational training

Three large meta studies indicate: positive employment effects, but **not** huge

- 2.3 percentage point increase in employment
- 4 pp increase in employment (and 8.2 % in earnings)
- 2 pp increase in employment after one year, and  
6.6 pp increase in employment after two to three years,

- a) Generally earnings effects often insignificant (also due to statistical imprecision)
- b) it appears that employment effects increase over time (but not many studies) as labour market attachment accumulates

c) Public sector operated programmes perform worse (on average)

i) Vocational training needs to be demand driven - content of vocational training needs to be developed in close cooperation with employers/companies/firms to align with their needs

Public sector as Regulator, private sector for Service Delivery

ii) Ideally, training providers paid upon success (i.e. not number of people trained, but: number of people successfully placed into (long-term) employment) –

**Results based contracting:** Potentially interesting, but very strong monitoring required since private providers would „cheat the system“ – can only work in countries where the regulator is very powerful

1.1 to 2 pp increase in employment (in meta study, many high-income countries)

Effects are modest (but costs of interventions also modest)

Simply training people on how to write CV, application and search for jobs quite limited effectiveness

More helpful if:

- certification/verification of skills (because most employers do not trust CVs and rather hire from family or networks or friends of employees)
- address „intention-action gap“: e.g. goal setting, or lower the reservation wages
- or train people on Job Ethics, i.e. „How to behave“, Punctuality, no absenteeism, compliance rules



Business development services, entrepreneurship training

Overall little research; in addition hardly any research that estimates effects for more than 1 year → Hence, only results on short-term effects exists

Usually no effects on profitability/incomes (due to statistical noise, sample size)

Main outcome measure: opening of business and survival of business

For existing firms: Positive effects of training for male business owners, negative effects for female business owners, on survival

For new businesses: Training helps to speed up the process of opening a new business (but only for those who had planned to open a new business anyway)

General concern: in economically successful countries most jobs are created by the private sector

Public sector employment can be temporarily useful, but not for long-run economic development

Overall assessment for Public Works not positive: little impact but high costs

## Temporary wage subsidies

Generally: distorts the labour market: some people are hired and others are fired

studies find sizeable effects in short-term (e.g. a very large effect of 38 pp increase employment after 6 months in Jordan), but effects vanish once subsidy ends (e.g. after one or two years)

Very effective, if the aim is to have certain groups enter the labour market (if one accepts that others will be laid off instead)

For inexperienced unemployed youths, temporary wage subsidies can bridge initially the gap between the (low) wages employers are willing to pay and the high reservation wages of youth

## 2. Dissemination and Policy Influence

---

# Main Pillars of Policy Influence

---

1. Promotion of EUTF strategy to support evidence-based policy making
2. Dissemination of findings from the impact evaluations
3. Support the take-up of findings for future programming
4. Build a culture of using evidence into public policy planning

### **3. Shape policies and programmes based on the findings of this project**

---

---

- **Outputs produced so far:**

- Conferences / Training courses
- Videos
- Leaflets
- Reports

- **Planned outputs:**

- Seminars in Africa (Ethiopia and Mauritania, March 2024)
- COMPIE conference in Amsterdam (June 2024)
- Seminar in Brussels (November/December 2024)
- other research presentations (2025/2026, of final research reports)

How can we make sure that these results have an Impact on the ground, i.e. the future development and policy making in Africa ?

Results (Leaflets, Policy Brief, Reports, Videos and Films) need to reach a large audience

- your feedback, suggestions, recommendations and ideas
- working groups



## 4. Working Sessions

---

### Reconciliation and Synthesis

# Set up

- **3 to 5 working groups:**
  1. Policy implications and influence for Ethiopia (possibly 2 groups)
  2. Policy implications and influence for Uganda
  3. Policy implications and influence for Africa (HoA) in general
  4. Online group
- **Each group selects a rapporteur**
- **Each group has a moderator (C4ED)**
- **Duration: 40 min + presentation of results**

# Goals and policy areas

## **1. Ensure that results of the evaluations shape future policies:**

### **EVIDENCE-INFORMED-POLICY-MAKING**

Promotion of employment and income: Aspects to consider

- heterogeneity of results between target groups
- how to tailor better actions, what to do in TVET when wage employment is so low
- ways to improve livelihoods of refugees when the institutional/legal context in a country is a real obstacle?

## **1. Identify the relevant avenues and tools**

- Visibility and communication of results
- How to influence policy making and programme in the country?

## I. Dissemination of results (10min)

- WHAT? → *What specific conclusions should be disseminated?*
- HOW? → *Which channels are most useful? Films? Website?*
- WHO? → *Which audience is most interested in the results?*
- *Challenges / Mitigation / Recommendations*

## II. Policy influence strategy (20min)

### EVIDENCE-INFORMED-POLICY-MAKING

- WHAT? → *Which results shall enter future policy planning ?*
- HOW? → *How could or should results enter in future policy making*
- WHO? → *Which policy makers would value these results?*
- WHEN? → *When is Window of Opportunity to feed results into new programmes to be developed? Which topics and results areas are currently politically important and receive attention? Timing is important*
- *Challenges / Mitigation / Recommendations*

### III. Promotion of Learning culture based on Evidence (10min)

Which were the experiences of IPs and/or ministries/governments?

How shall or could the process of embedding evaluation and learning in programming be changed or improved?

- *WHAT? → What is needed to be promoted? Importance of CIEs and control group evaluation. Test innovative approaches? Embed an impact evaluation to a project?*
- *HOW? → How could results be used to "Create a Culture of using Evidence" ?*
- *WHO? → Which sectors and departments might be most interested in incorporating impact evaluations in future projects?*
- *Challenges / Mitigation / Recommendations*

# Policy Influence for Evidence Uptake

	What?	Who? –	How and When ?	Challenges / Mitigation / Recommendations
<b>I. Dissemination of Results</b>				
<b>II. Policy influence strategy</b>				
<b>III. Promotion of Learning culture based on Evidence</b>				