



Proposal for the development and implementation of an impact assessment scheme for the EMPRETEC Programme

Draft Project Proposal

Matthias Grossmann¹
University of Oxford

February 2006

This draft project proposal describes the development and implementation of a short-term 'soft' impact assessment for the EMPRETEC programme. The impact assessment is based on an assessment of PEC scores and business indicators (employment, investments and sales) of participants at the Entrepreneurial Workshop Training (ETW) before and after the training took place. Although this approach does not guarantee full attribution of the observed differences in business performance to the training intervention, it is a simple and quick to implement assessment to demonstrate positive behavioural changes as a consequence of the ETW methodology. Furthermore, this assessment approach should be seen as a first step only in a long-term strategy to develop proper Monitoring and Evaluation capacities with EMPRETEC centres around the world as well as a more comprehensive impact assessment methodology for assessing and attributing hard impacts not only to ETWs but also to other services offered by EMPRETEC centres.

Please note that this is a preliminary draft proposal. The final methodology and approaches used to implement the assessment –and thus the final proposal- depend on information gathered with different EMPRETEC centres. It should be seen as evolving and will be updated accordingly.

¹ Matthias Grossmann is a researcher at the Centre on Skills, Knowledge and Organisational Performance (SKOPE) at Oxford University

Table of Contents

1. Background	3
2. Project Proposal	4
2.1. Strengths	4
2.2. Weaknesses	5
2.3. Justification and purpose of this approach	5
3. Placing the short-term impact assessment in the context of a long-term M&E strategy	5
3.1. Short-term – Identification of soft impacts across countries.....	5
3.2. Medium-term – Identification of hard impacts across countries.....	6
3.3. Long-term – Development of M&E capacities with EMPRETEC centres.....	6
4. Proposed methodology for the short-term impact assessment	7
4.1. Data sources	7
4.2 Data collection.....	8
4.3. Data analysis	8
4.4. Three different levels of complexity –adapting the methodology to centres’ capacity ..	9
4.4.1 The basic level.....	9
4.4.2 The intermediate level	9
4.4.3 The higher level.....	10
5. Developing the short-term impact assessment –the action plan	11
6. Final outputs	12
7. References used	12
Contact Details	Error! Bookmark not defined.

List of Tables

TABLE 1. Data sources	7
TABLE 2. Elements of the basic approach	9
TABLE 3. Elements of the intermediate approach	9
TABLE 4. Elements of the higher approach	10
TABLE 5. Action Plan for the development of the short-term impact assessment	13

1. Background

The 12th EMPRETEC Directors' Meeting (9 -11 November 2005 in Geneva) gave ample room to reflect on the achievements and challenges of the EMPRETEC programme worldwide. More than 18 years since its inception, the EMPRETEC concept has contributed considerably to the development of entrepreneurial skills and the provision of crucial support services to businesses in more than 27 countries. Despite considerable achievements, EMPRETEC centres worldwide are facing many challenges, such as the struggle for sustainability, intense competition from other organisations and providers and the need to adapt to changing economic and business demands, including the challenge to re-position the EMPRETEC concept in an increasingly inter-linked world.

The development of a universal impact assessment for EMPRETEC centres was discussed in great detail as a crucial element of a strategy to re-position and strengthen the EMPRETEC concept. As the director of the UNCTAD EMPRETEC programme noted, *'impact assessment is one of the key elements of the strategy since this information is crucial for stakeholders to make decisions on their involvement in the programme'* (Krylova 2005).

There is the widespread, but more or less subjective, perception that the EMPRETEC concept generally has positive effects benefiting participants/businesses. The challenge is to demonstrate these effects in a systematic and thus credible manner in order to solicit external appreciation and ideally financial support for the future.

The development of a standardised impact assessment for use at all centres was one of the action points for future cooperation formulated at the Directors' Meeting. This proposal represents a first step in the translation of the action point into practice by proposing a short-term, quick to implement impact assessment approach.

One of the greatest challenges of impact assessments is the difficulty of attribution, that is, the difficulty of attributing any observed changes (e.g. in performance) to the specific intervention. Several approaches exist to address this problem, but any impact assessment is always subject to practical constraints, such as time, human resources, financial and ethical constraints. For a more detailed discussion on the various challenges and approaches to conduct impact assessments for the EMPRETEC programme, see the background note prepared by the author which is available upon request (Grossmann 2005).

Given these challenges and the urgency to assess and demonstrate the (positive) effects of the EMPRETEC concept, it was decided to first develop a 'soft' impact assessment which is not as rigorous as other, more experimentally designed assessments, but it provides a useful systematic insight into the behavioural changes and likely impacts on business performance. It is important to note that this approach should be considered a first step in a more long-term strategy to develop proper Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) capacities with centres and in developing and implementing a more comprehensive impact assessment focusing on attributing impacts of the training and other business services to businesses' performance.

The following sections describe the approaches, methodology and implementation arrangements for such a short-term impact assessment.

2. Project Proposal

It is proposed to develop and implement a short-term impact assessment for the Entrepreneurial Training Workshop which is at the core of the EMPRETEC Programme worldwide. The impact assessment will look at changes of Personal Entrepreneurial Competencies (PECs) occurring with participants before and after the training workshop. The hypothesis underlying the ETW concept is that the training workshop positively influences (that is, increases) PEC scores with participants after the training. In addition, it is assumed that higher PECs, which reflect a change in participants' entrepreneurial behaviour, also translate into better business performance in general, as entrepreneurs now do things better than before. However, one very important note needs to be made here: this link between changed behaviour and increased performance is not automatic. In other words, a better performance cannot be attributed properly to changes in behaviour, as a better performance can also be due to higher external demand, the company's products, etc. Similarly, the strength of attributing behavioural changes to the training depends on the time period when they are re-assessed after the training: the more time elapses between the training and the re-assessment of the PECs, the more changes can be influenced by un-observed, outside effects. In general, this means that the demonstrative strength of this short-term approach is on assessing behavioural changes (the so-called 'soft' impacts) and less on performance changes (the so-called 'hard' impacts).

2.1. Strengths

- It allows a systematic assessment of 'soft', i.e. impacts on entrepreneurial behaviour (PECs)
- Quick to implement
- Does not require much input/ support, apart from a common methodology and guidelines
- Can be implemented by each centre
- Half of the required information should already be available with centres as part of participants' assessment before the training
- Different degrees of complexity are possible, depending on the respective centre's capacity and resources

The main advantage of this approach mainly is that it is relatively quick to implement within each centre. The procedures, which will be explained in detail below, mainly involve certified interviewers assessing PECs scores of applicants before the training (which should anyways already be done by all centres as part of the application-screening process). In addition, it requires the same certified trainers to re-assess PECs of a selected group after the training took place (e.g. 2, 4, 6 months after the training). Again, as regular follow-ups with former participants should be a key element of the ETW concept, only the re-assessment interview would be an additional requirement. This depends, of course, on each centre's capacity –as a major criticism from EMPRETECOs around the world is exactly this lack of follow-up services. In this sense, however, the proposed impact assessment can even represent an opportunity to strengthen centres' commitment for follow-up services by combining the re-assessment PEC interview with the usual follow-up visits.

2.2. Weaknesses

- It is a limited approach, focusing on behavioural changes
- The demonstrative strength depends on the time frame
- Only indicative conclusions can be made in regard to business performance changes ('hard' impacts such as changes in employment, investment and sales)
- It only assesses the ETW but not the impacts of other businesses services offered by EMPRETEC centres

The major disadvantage, as discussed above, is that this approach focuses on soft impacts and behavioural changes. Changes in performance indicators are difficult to attribute other than on a subjective basis. In addition, the approach only assesses the ETW –the other services can be included in an assessment but only on a more or less subjective basis.

2.3. Justification and purpose of this approach

In total, the suggested impact assessment is a compromise between practical considerations (mainly resource constraints) and demonstrative strength (reach). Nonetheless, it might be very useful to demonstrate the positive effects of the ETW –which is EMPRETEC's major strength- to external partners. The more centres participate, the more powerful this demonstration becomes. In addition, a broad participation of centres also involves the assessment of various target groups, as some centres focus on high-achieving entrepreneurs, whereas other centres primarily target micro-entrepreneurs. Differences between centres and participants in PECs might provide valuable information in regard to target group characteristics (e.g. the question 'who benefits most and why?' could be answered). Moreover, a wide participation also lends more justification and strength to subjective evaluations in regard to business performance and usefulness of other support services: if a majority of participants in centres around the world even subjectively express satisfaction with the services and perceive them as positive influences on their businesses, there must be a general positive influence, even if it cannot, with this approach, be assessed systematically (but which can be taken up with other approaches in the future).

All in all, this approach would be very useful to demonstrate positive effects of the EMPRETEC concept across countries.

3. Placing the short-term impact assessment in the context of a long-term M&E strategy

As mentioned above, the propose assessment should be regarded as one step in the development of a long-term strategy to monitor and evaluate impacts on a regular basis. The aim for now is to provide an initial assessment on the benefits of the EMPRETEC concept (training) to entrepreneurs. In general, three different stages can be identified:

3.1. Short-term – Identification of soft impacts across countries

This proposal relates to this first step –a quick assessment of behavioural changes as a result of the ETW. It can be combined with subjective assessments of performance indicators, role

of other services and satisfaction. At the core is the assessment of PECs before and after the training, but additional information can be collected to an extent to be discussed with centres.

This intervention should be implemented on a short-term basis and first results could be expected as early as mid-2006.

3.2. Medium-term – Identification of hard impacts across countries

Another step in the M&E capacity strategy is to develop and implement an impact assessment that is focusing at hard impacts. Due to the problem of attribution, such an approach is more likely to be an experimental design with two groups (one intervention, one control group). With such a design, it is also possible to look at impacts on performance indicators. Such an approach, however, is more capacity and resource intensive and is likely to be conducted only once or regularly after several years (e.g. on a three or four-yearly basis).

The development and implementation of such an approach needs more support from UNCTAD and is likely to focus on one to three pilot centres first to test the methodology and insights. However, the preliminary work to be conducted for the short-term assessment will reveal some information that can be used to identify suitable centres. For more information on methodology, requirements and constraints, see the author's background note (Grossmann 2005).

The intervention could be developed and implemented by late 2006/ early 2007, depending on resources and support available.

3.3. Long-term – Development of M&E capacities with EMPRETEC centres

The long-term ideal is to develop proper and standardised M&E systems within EMPRETEC centres. The purpose is to generate information that is not only useful for the assessment of impacts of various activities (including impacts of other services, not only training) but also for strategic guidance and governance of centres.

Ideally, centres would be able to track each client, including the services used, cost and incomes attributed to each client, as well as measures on satisfaction, retention of services and regular updates on performance. Crucial to the effectiveness of such an M&E system is that clients are bound to the centre through regular follow-ups and encouraged to provide information themselves through various possible incentive schemes (for discussion see Grossmann 2005).

Another crucial element is the development and implementation of a proper database system that is easy and cheap to implement as well as to maintain. This system should be made available to all centres and necessary support, e.g. training or guidelines be developed and provided. With these systems in place, it would be easy to generate regular updates on impacts and assessments.

This strategy is of long-term nature and depends on the centres' capacity, willingness and support available and is likely to take several years. What is important, however, is the driving force of UNCTAD to push this issue further.

4. Proposed methodology for the short-term impact assessment

As mentioned, at the core of the assessment is the evaluation of PEC scores before and after the training. A similar methodology has been used by Lopes (1999) and SEBRAE (2002), although with different data collection approaches. This approach is a non-experiment approach and might be useful for cases where causal relationships can be identified. It is suitable for assessing the ETW because it has a string underlying programme logic (i.e. the strengthening of entrepreneurial competencies)

4.1. Data sources

Different data sources need to be used for the assessment. TABLE 1 summarises the requirements:

TABLE 1. Data sources

Data sources needed	Description
Questionnaire before the training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardised questionnaire to capture participants' personal characteristics • Standardised interview questionnaire to assess participants' PECs
Questionnaire after the training	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standardised questionnaire to evaluate personal perception about business performance, satisfaction with services, usefulness of other support services • Standardised interview questionnaire to assess participants' PECs
Sample Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Depending on centres' capacity, but at least a group of 50 to 60 per centre
Time Frame	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideally on a continuous basis (e.g. once per month), depending on centres' capacity; otherwise regularly, e.g. 2, 4, 6 months after the training

1) A standardised questionnaire to gather information on participants' characteristics before the training: variables might include: age, gender, education, business status (running a business or planning to start one), business experiences, etc. The questionnaire needs to be developed based on feedback from centres. In general, most centres should already use the standard ETW application questionnaires, where the majority of characteristics are covered. Such a questionnaire may be modified to include questions on expectations on the course, current business performance and expected business performance.

2) A standardised interview questionnaire for the evaluation of PECs: based on the input from centres, a standardised questionnaire (which nonetheless leaves scope for country-specific issues) needs to be developed. This point is crucial to guarantee that PECs are measured according to the same principles and methodology across centres and careful input needs to be devoted to this aspect.

3) A standardised questionnaire to gather information on participants' changes in performance, degree of satisfaction and usefulness of services received: variables might include questions on performance changes (e.g. in employment, turnover and sales), and whether the changes are perceived to be influence by the training or any other service received by the client. Even if these measures are subjective and cannot be properly attributed to the training or services, it can reveal important insights when aggregated internationally.

4) A standardised interview questionnaire for the evaluation of PECs: like the assessment before the training, the interview aims at re-assessing PEC scores after the training

5) Sample size: generally, the larger the sample size, the better the insights. The sample size is of course compromised by capacity, time and resource constraints. A general guideline is to have groups of at least 50 to 60 participants for statistical correctness. Ideally, the sample is selected randomly (e.g. every second applicant applying to the course will be re-assessed after the training). The modalities need to be spelled out, based on centres experiences with the application process and flow of applications (e.g. when do applicants apply for a course? Do they approach the centre or is the centre approaching them?).

6) Time frame: ideally would be a repeated assessment on a monthly basis (once per month for 6 months) as this repeated information might provide useful information on changes occurring within businesses and behaviours. Again, capacity constraints might dictate less numerous re-assessments on a broader time scale, e.g. once after 3, 6 and 12 months. It is important to note that the more time is between the training and the re-assessment, the more difficult it becomes to attribute behavioural changes to the training intervention. Indeed, evidence from existing studies using this methodology indicates that the positive behavioural effect seems to disappear (in the sense of one being unable to detect it with the standard PEC assessment methodology) after some time. It would thus be interesting to identify when this transition occurs.

4.2 Data collection

Data collection would largely be conducted by centres themselves. The assessment of PEC scores should be conducted by certified interviewers who normally conduct the application screening. It is important that the same interviewer conducting the pre-training assessment should also conduct the re-assessment interview in order to reduce personality biases in the interviews as much as possible. It is thus possible that two or three certified interviewers deal with a specific number of individuals per group. Ideally, each interview should be attended by two interviewers to allow for cross-checking. With the consent of participants, interviews should also be taped for later clarifications or cross-checking by a second interviewer. All interviewers should follow the same procedures and questions. In cases where centres face capacity constraints (e.g. too few interviewers are available for this task as most interviewers are also trainers), it might also be a possibility to train local interviewers (the training mainly consists of participating at the ETW and some training with the standardised questionnaire by experienced trainers). The modalities of this need to be developed, but it should also be looked into the possibility of providing financial support by UNCTAD for this specific purpose.

If a common database can be set-up in the short-term (this option is currently being explored by UNCTAD), it might be used by the centres to collect, store and transmit the data. In this sense, it is also assured that the data format and input is consistent across countries.

4.3. Data analysis

Data analysis will be based on various approaches, depending on the nature and quality of the data. PEC scores and changes can be observed over time and across countries and statistical techniques will be used for the analysis, where the specific techniques used depend on the range of questions to be addressed as well as the quality of the data. In addition, qualitative approaches will be used for the more subjective information.

The analysis will be conducted by the consultant with the possible input of other experts.

4.4. Three different levels of complexity –adapting the methodology to centres' capacity

The advantage of the described approach is that it can be used in different degrees of complexity and thus analytical strength. Depending on centres' individual capacity, three different levels of complexity can be identified. With improving capacity, centres thus can 'graduate' towards higher levels. Moving up the 'ladder' is similar to moving towards the medium-term impact assessment approach discussed above.

4.4.1 The basic level

The basic level of complexity corresponds to the basic methodological approach described above. It is summarised below:

TABLE 2. Elements of the basic approach

Elements	Description
Groups: 1	1 Group (participants at the ETW who are assessed before and after the training)
Sample size	Depending on centres' size, but at least 50 to 60
Questionnaires	1 Pre-training background questionnaire, 1 pre-training PEC assessment interview questionnaires, 1 post-training PEC re-assessment interview questionnaire, 1 post-training questionnaire on behavioural changes, usage of services, satisfaction and performance indicators
Time scale	Depending on centres' capacity; re-assessment on a continuous (once per month) or regular (2,4,6 month) basis

The basic approach mainly consists of one group of participants who are assessed before and after the training. The questionnaires include the PEC assessment and re-assessment and the background and post-training questionnaires.

In general, this approach should be feasible with all centres and should be straight-forward to implement.

4.4.2 The intermediate level

As compared to the basic level, the intermediate approach aims at strengthening the attribution of the training to observed changes (impacts) by introducing a second, comparison group. The approach is summarised below

TABLE 3. Elements of the intermediate approach

Elements	Description
Groups: 2	Group 1: participants at the ETW who are assessed before and after the training Group 2: applicants who were assessed before the training and qualified to participate, but did not participate in the end
Sample size	Depending on centres' size, but at least 50 to 60 for both groups
Questionnaires	2 Pre-training background questionnaire (for each group 1), 2 pre-training PEC assessment interview questionnaires, 2 post-training PEC re-assessment interview questionnaire, 2 post-training questionnaire on behavioural changes, usage of services, satisfaction and performance indicators
Time scale	Depending on centres' capacity; re-assessment on a continuous (once per month for up to 6 months) or regular (2,4,6 month) basis

As with the basic approach, one group of participants is assessed before and after the training. At the same time, however, a second group is generated with those who applied for the training, who were assessed and qualified but in the end did not participate (e.g. because they had no time, no money, etc.). It is important that this second control group should only consist of those who met the minimum requirements but who did not participate. It should not contain applicants who did not qualify, as the observed difference in behaviours between the two groups then might be due to the fact that the participants were better qualified and not to the training as such.

The advantage of having a control group is that the attribution of impacts to the training is more firm and secure than with one group alone. There are, however, a number of constraints to this approach. The main constraint is the availability of qualifying applicants who in the end do not participate. In most cases, applicants who do not participate do not qualify in the first instance. As both groups should have a minimum of 50 to 60 participants (preferably more), only larger centres might have sufficient qualifying applicants who did not participate. In addition, having two groups of course duplicates the effort and resource requirements.

4.4.3 The higher level

On the higher level, the impact assessment resembles a quasi-experimental design, where two matched groups are used. As compared to the intermediate level, the second group however can be established independently from the participants group. The elements of the approach are summarised below:

TABLE 4. Elements of the higher approach

Elements	Description
Groups: 2	Group 1: participants at the ETW who are assessed before and after the training Group 2: external control group with matched members who did not use the training or a service
Sample size	Depending on centres' size, but at least 50 to 60 for both groups
Questionnaires	2 Pre-training background questionnaire (for each group 1), 2 pre-training PEC assessment interview questionnaires, 2 post-training PEC re-assessment interview questionnaire, 2 post-training questionnaire on behavioural changes, usage of services, satisfaction and performance indicators
Time scale	Depending on centres' capacity; re-assessment on a continuous (once per month for up to 6 months) or regular (2,4,6 month) basis

The control group can be made up of equally qualified entrepreneurs who do not use the training or another service. The major difficulty is a possible selection-bias: the control group might consist of less motivated members who do not want training or services as compared to the participant group. In order to match the groups, the standardised PEC assessment should be used for both groups. In addition, the control group might consist of entrepreneurs who have used other BDS services from another provider and who do not know about EMPRETEC. This might be used to reduce the selection bias inherent in such an approach. Ideally, it might be possible to co-operate with another existing BDS provider whose client group can be used as a control group. Members' PEC scores are assessed and those who would qualify for the EMPRETEC course (those meeting the minimum score requirements) are then admitted to the control group. Procedures need to be developed that reduce any potential biases (e.g. the knowledge alone of being in a control group can alter the behaviour and thus observed outcomes).

The advantage is that not only training impacts can be attributed, but also the impacts of other services not only on behaviour but also on business performance.

The descriptions above already reveal the complexity of such an approach and the difficulty of generating proper comparison groups. In this sense, this approach is more likely to be practicable for larger centres with sufficient capacity to implement such an approach.

Overall, it is more realistic to implement a short-term impact assessment based on the basic or intermediate approaches.

5. Developing the short-term impact assessment –the action plan

This section discussed the concrete action point necessary to develop the short-term impact assessment. assessment. Note, at this first stage the action points relate to the development of the methodology and methodology and guidelines, it does not yet relate to the second stage, the implementation, i.e. the conduct the conduct of the assessment. The latter will be based on the methodology and guidelines to be developed be developed on the basis of centres' feedback. A summary of the action points is presented in ANNEXE A

TABLE 5 below. Please note that most action points are indicative at this stage and will be adapted according to the overall progress with the impact assessment in general.

Step 1:

The first step is to establish the operational capacity for the project to proceed. This mainly includes the identification of partners and support focal points within UNCTAD and centres for specific tasks. For example, it is useful to identify a counterpart who will assist with the translation of letters/ guidelines into Spanish or who might provide logistical support with communication. A common contact list should be established by UNCTAD and possible tasks and involvement be discussed.

Step 2:

In order to assess the potential of using a free and easy to use database, it would be important to gain access to the sample database used by SEBRAE to review its potential, operational modalities and prospects for usage with centres, etc. It is suggested that Lorenzo contacts SEBRAE in this regard.

Steps 3 -6:

Before finalising the modalities of the impact assessment, we need more information from centres on their capacity, number of participants and courses conducted, information collected on participants, the PEC assessment procedures and whether any follow-ups are conducted. Based on this information, a methodology and implementation guideline can be established that take into account centres' constraints and capacity, as well as help identifying suitable centres for piloting the assessment. In addition, centres might provide us with samples if impact assessments already conducted to assess the potential reach to participants and information collected. This information might also be used for a narrative overview of experiences with the EMPRETEC programme.

With the help of certified interviewers (UNCTAD might help in identifying suitable candidates), the standardised assessment questionnaires can be prepared, as well as all guidelines and other questionnaires.

Steps 7-8:

Before universally conducting the assessment with all centres, it should be piloted with one or two centres to gather experiences on the modalities, difficulties and quality of data. Based on these experiences, the guidelines and methodology can be adapted accordingly for repetition with other centres.

Steps 9-10:

Based on the availability of data, analysis will proceed. Regular updates will be made available and the final report will summarise the cross-country experiences for the EMPRETEC programme.

6. Final outputs

The final outputs will be a report highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of the EMPRETEC approach as based on the impact assessment. Several updates might become available over the course of the assessments and different formats can be developed to address various target groups (e.g. as promotion for donors and other supporters; as advertising material for potential clients, etc.). The actual outputs depend on the concrete demands and can be adapted accordingly.

7. References used

Grossmann, M. 2005, *The Impact Challenge: Conducting Impact Assessments for the EMPRETEC Programme. A Background Note*, University of Oxford and UNCTAD, Oxford,

Krylova, T. 2005, *Introductory Remarks, 12th EMPRETEC Directors' Meeting, Geneva 9-11 November 2005*, Geneva.

Lopes, R. M. A. 1999, *Short-Term Evaluation of a Competence-Based Training for Entrepreneurs - EMPRETEC Programme*, Paper presented at Babson College - Kauffman Foundation -Entrepreneurship Research Conference 1999, University of Sao Paulo -USP, Sao Paulo,

SEBRAE and IBQP-PR 2002, *Pesquisa de Impacto do Empretec no Brasil.*, Instituto Brasileiro de Qualidade e Produtividade no Paraná, Curitiba, PR.

ANNEXE A

TABLE 5. Action Plan for the development of the short-term impact assessment

Step	Issue	Activity	Output	By whom?	Timeline
1	Establish operational capacity for the project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify support partners and staff at UNCTAD Establish communication modalities and responsibilities Define tasks for next steps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have contact list for support partners Have communication established 	UNCTAD	By 10 February
2	Explore the potential of a common database and how it can be linked to the assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get access/ login to SEBRAE database Identify operational modalities, variables that are covered, communication modalities Prepare a short assessment on the potential use, requirements and constraints (or, if possible, do quick SWOT analysis on database) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Assessment is available for discussing next steps, or, potentially formulating project proposal for the implementation of the database with other centres 	UNCTAD MG	15 February: login made available End of February: initial assessment done
3	Establish information request package on impact assessment potential with each centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare assessment questionnaire for centres (Questions relating to: what information do you collect with one exemplary client? –From application, course evaluation to follow-up: list all steps and information that is collected from a client over time) Centres fill in questionnaire and send it back Centres send their last three impact assessments, if they conducted one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a questionnaire and information request ready 	MG	End of February
4	Establish communication with centres; provide information about impact assessment and information requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Centres fill in questionnaire and send it back Centres send their last three impact assessments, if they conducted one 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Feedback available Studies available 	Centres MG UNCTAD	Mid March
5	Preparation of methodology and questionnaires	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare methodology guideline based on centres' feedback on capacity and feasibility Prepare questionnaires for assessment (4 types) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have a final methodology for discussion Have assessment questionnaires ready 	Centres MG UNCTAD Certified trainer	End of March/ beginning of April
6	Preparation of implementation guideline	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prepare detailed guideline on the procedures and implementation of the assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Guidelines ready, disseminated and reviewed 	MG UNCTAD	Mid April
7	Conduct of assessment with one or two pilot centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> One or two centres (to be chosen) conduct the impact assessment Reviewing experiences and lessons Updating the methodology and guidelines where appropriate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data from assessment becomes available and analysed Review note on experiences and lessons prepared and disseminated; updated guidelines available 	Centres MG UNCTAD	April-June
8	Conduct of standardised impact assessment with other centres	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As many centres as possible do the impact assessment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact assessments conducted and data made available 	Centres	June- December
9	Data analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysing data; formulating research questions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data analysed and available 	MG Experts	As it becomes available
10	Reporting of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preparation of final report with all cross-country results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final report prepared and disseminated 	Depends on overall timeframe	

Note: activities, responsible partners and time frame are indicative only at this stage. Many action points depend on the overall progress of the project