
Final Report

Regional Workshop – Use of knowledge for a better public policy influence August 11th and 12th

1. About the Workshop

Between August 11th and 12th, the ***Use of knowledge for a better public policy influence workshop*** took place in Lima, Peru. It was framed within the ebpdn Latin American chapter¹ and it rapidly grew in scope, reach and funding. Originally, it hoped to bring together 10 institutions; it ended up hosting **34 organizations**, represented by nearly **60 people**, from **15 countries**. This could have never been achieved without the generous support of IDRC, GDN, and ODI, as well as the coordinated effort of the Advisory Committee: Enrique Mendizabal (onthinktanks.org), Norma Correa (PUCP), Vanesa Weyrauch (CIPPEC), Javier Portocarrero (CIES), Orazio J. Bellettini (Grupo FARO) and the support of Carolina Robino (IDRC).

2. Objectives

The workshop's main objective was to strengthen capacities for public policy influence of regional think tanks by reinforcing the relationships between executive directors of such organisations.

The meeting provided them with a space to discuss (i) the state of the art of policy influence in Latin America; (ii) the changing context: both internal, characterised by general elections across the region, and external, the global recession and the rapidly decreasing funding for Latin America; and (iii) the plans for the medium and long run for the think tank business model within these circumstances.

This space was also used to present and discuss tools, strategies and concrete experiences of communicating research and influencing public policies.

Please refer to Annex 1 for the detailed agenda.

3. Attendees

The workshop was directed to executive directors of Latin American Think tanks, as well as to professionals involved in research – action of said institutions, interested in

¹ This has a research constituent coordinated by the Economic and Social Research Consortium (CIES, Peru) whose objective is to explore, through an interdisciplinary prism, the interfaces between research and politics in Latin America. This component is part of a bigger project coordinated jointly by the Centre for the Implementation of Public Policies Promoting Equity and Growth (CIPPEC, Argentina) and CIES, aimed at strengthening capacities on knowledge management throughout Latin America's Civil Society. For more information on CIES, please visit: <http://www.cies.org.pe/who>, and on CIPPEC, please visit: <http://www.cippec.org/Main.php?do=newsArticlesShow>

dominating influence tools. Therefore, a good assortment of executive directors, communication officers and researchers was achieved.

Please refer to annex 2 for list of attendees.

4. The Workshop

4.1 Panel 1 – “Lessons learned by leading think tanks of the region”

Moderated by journalist Mirko Lauer, Executive Directors of five regional think tanks², shared their lessons on how to face the challenges related to research influencing public policies. The focus was on the mechanisms and level of influence think tanks have on public policies. It was particularly interesting the influence in mass media, since a possible measure of the level of influence could be the number of times the organizations are mentioned in the different outlets.

Some of the lessons learned are:

- The importance of emphasizing communication skills in researchers, as well as having a press chief.
- Communication strategies must be tailored towards different audiences.
- Investment in media outlets, even in the shape of social capital, should be considered.
- Building trust is a permanent endeavour.
- The influence strategy is not independent of the policies generating process.
- Demand and supply must be articulated to define a research agenda, and the high quality of the products must be assured.
- There are limited resources; however, if enough emblematic projects are associated with an institution, the financial strategy can be aligned. But this has only worked for some of the organizations.

The main questions were: how is the work characterized? Is influence or visibility the priority? How can the policy briefs remain impartial? How are plurality and cohesion achieved simultaneously?

Most of the panel agreed that it is important that the produced research generates interest and is thus published. The political context the country is in (democracy or dictatorship) is also important, as well as to bear in mind that impartiality is very difficult to achieve; therefore, a plurality of voices within the Think tanks should be one of the objectives of the organization. Throughout the process it is crucial to identify, locate and coordinate with the main actors, especially those who can really influence the government. And a delicate balance is always pursued, between having high or low visibility, because over exposure or under exposure can go either way.

4.2 Panel 2 – “Policy influence and the media” Part I – The policy makers’ perspective

Moderated by independent researcher Enrique Mendizabal, the authors of the studies (i) *The state's role in funding research on public policies in Latin America* and (ii) *Mass media and the use of research on public policy in Latin America*,

² Participan: Roberto Steiner, Fedesarrollo, Colombia; Fernando Straface, CIPPEC, Argentina; Javier Portocarrero, CIES, Perú; Leopoldo Font, CLAEH, Uruguay; y Eugenio Rivera Urrutia, FUNDACION CHILE 21, Chile.

winners of the research call launched in February 2010 through the ebpdn network, presented their main findings to the audience.

The state's role in funding research on public policies in Latin America

There are two main financing schemes in the region: (a) programmatic: oriented towards hard sciences, thus, not much is left for think tanks. These funds are primarily oriented towards university research centres; and (b) non programmatic: consultancy-type contracts, per project, and does not cover most of the human resources needed. Most of these depend on the relationship of the scientist and the politician.

Non programmatic offer has opacity problems; sometimes the government ends up dictating much of the think tank's agenda. The majority of the funds that come either directly from international cooperation sources or are channelled through public organisms, already have a specific agenda. In this context, public policies' independent evaluation, financed by public entities, becomes a great market niche for think tanks.

Some recommendations

For think tanks: encourage interaction and meeting spaces, research consortiums and other collective strategies, to be able to compete with the funds allocated to universities.

For the State: include "public policies" in the national budget assigned to science and technology, which will guarantee a research line within the state.

Mass media and the use of research on public policy in Latin America

Think tanks (TT) find their purpose in their ability to act as an interface, as practice spaces, as strength spaces in the process of public policy design; exploring the tensions between pluralities and establishing action lines, which have diffuse and permeable frontiers.

The communicational dimension of think tanks does not have a single message, or a unique communication agent.

To think about the TT in terms of their influence, is to think of them in terms of the political space. Mass media has a leading role in these processes.

This paper explores the use of research produced by TT in the public sphere; of the distance between disseminating and receiving the results, and the distance between media and social space. In many cases there are problems with the relationships of the actors of each field.

Because many of the journalists are immediately labelled within the political arena, many of them have opted for not working anymore in research. Thus, they are consumers of information that has already been processed. This should be valued and exploited by TT, since highly valued information is the contact element.

It is advisable to have long term communicational strategies, especially if the objective is to influence the public agenda. Thus, the hiring of communicators is not necessarily to increase the organization's visibility, but to be able to use the media for policy influencing.

The "expert" figure, as well as the over exposure of the TT, could give the idea of demand based research.

Discussion summary

- The institutional communication strategy has to be adapted to the type of organization that wants to give or exchange information.
- In order to minimize the distortion of contents generated by the media, a selection of the type of information that goes to each outlet needs to be done. Likewise, there should be a distinction between public policies and State policies; and between the public's opinion, and public opinion.
- The communication issue of the TT should not be restricted to having or not a central press office, and filtering all the actions through it. Rather, the communicational consequences of each of these should be pondered.
- There will always be tensions between being pro-active or reactive to research demands.
- The lack of funding for social sciences is a common denominator. The challenge is to make it profitable, and of a standardized (high) quality.
- One of the risks is that, if the results of the research are not consistent with the public policy, these could be shelved.
- Monitoring and evaluation should be thought of as the main route to obtain public funding.

4.3 Working lunch – Mercedes Aráoz presents her experience

Mercedes Aráoz's experience is both as an academic and as a Minister of Commerce and Tourism, of Production, and of Economics and Finance.

She started on the public sector as adviser to the National Council of Competitiveness; an area has been neglected in the past. The business and commercial sector were convened; one of the findings being that this sector did not have a network, and another that researchers are invisible to them. On the other hand, the State doesn't finance research either, only consultancies. Thus, researchers need to know how to navigate within this context, and work towards the establishment of an endowment.

On 2006, Ms. Aráoz produced a policy paper on Competitiveness within the *Elections Peru 2006 project* that constituted the public agenda for that presidential period (2006 – 2011). The think tanks' proposals became part of the Government Plan, thus, the contribution of the academic sector was recognized.

One of the major problems is that some of the issues become trendy, and they do not necessarily address public management problems, nor provide long run solutions. Another main difficulty of the public sector is that it is not able to transform its policies into strategies, beyond just solving the problem, and thus providing a medium and long term action course.

In Peru, political parties do not have think tanks, and have lost their ideological capacity. Public Policies schools do not exist; thus, most people become Congress men and women, or start a career in the political sphere without knowing about public management. Think tanks should approach political parties, to help them imagine and cultivate future leaders.

Mass media is not really connected with think tanks; they only call them for a quick solution or answer. Therefore, these institutions should approach the media, present their papers and interact with journalists, always bearing in mind

that the media are businesses and therefore, thinking of contents as products to sell.

As a public servant, it is a must to listen to the different groups and conceptualize agendas; the important players do not have an updated agenda. The various actors are quite dispersed.

For public sector actors, it is important to have spaces such as the Consultative Council hosted by CIES, given that having academic support is vital, because it improves the perception the public have of them.

Objectivity, as such, does not exist. Rather, having academic training, one can talk about technical rigor and soundness, which politicians need.

Discussion

Moving from academia towards being a public servant, was positive, and well received by all political parties, since she didn't have previous links with any of them. Still, there were some who are very hostile towards academics. Nonetheless, it was important to attend as many forums as possible during 2006.

Debating ideas, especially with those who are not your allies, is essential for public management, since it is very difficult to have a space to think, and these conversations allow a wider view of issues.

The most important ability is to be able to communicate ideas in simple terms, and to be very prudent. Thus, a press team, with social communicators is a must. A misunderstood word can cause lots of trouble.

It is also important to understand that public servants are interdisciplinary, although, sadly, inter-sectorial work in the Peruvian State is nearly non-existent. However, there are efforts being done towards solving this state of affairs.

A feminine woman as the Economics Minister is not the standard. The transition, from academia to public office, is exhausting, and the highest costs are paid by the family. The return to the academic world is also costly, and lonelier. It is important to maintain the networks.

4.4 Panel 3 – “Policy influence and the media”

Part II – Mini workshop: working with the media for public policies influence

Moderated by consultant Jon Barnes, this session aimed to facilitate dialogue and experience exchange, on the aforementioned subject.

Why work with the media? Because they help to get the message to the ears of policy makers, they have a massive reach to diverse set of audiences and they could be used as a platform for debate. Mass media is very powerful; and it is important to distinguish between the policy of the media and its power.

Opportunities:

There is a tendency of communicational professionalization in some think tanks, including specialized personnel. Some are even generating their own communicational platforms. On several levels and directions, the new informational technology potential should also be tapped.

The media landscape is also changing; there is a fall in research investment by the media, creating an opportunity niche for think tanks. There is an overload of information, which can also be a window of opportunity for think tanks, since they provide sound and technically rigorous information.

Mass media not necessarily focus on what is important, but in what can be interesting for the public. Thus, this may condition think tank's opportunities with how current is the issue, the novelty of the findings and how periodic are the hooks. It is important to consider public demand; the findings must be relevant for public opinion, in order to grab journalists' attention. What internal agreements are needed to foster communication?

Main results of group work

- Sometimes media distort information: how should think tanks work? By information demand or supply?
- There is lack of clarity on the different roles think tanks and consulting agencies have.
- The lack of funding prevents an adequate press planning, and opinion columns could be used as an alternative.
- Synthesising information, translating it to a journalist language and ensuring that the same message is broadcasted is important.
- There is a clash of egos between journalists and researchers.
- Many organizations and researchers lack the adequate language to communicate appropriately with the average citizen.
- Digital tools are important, as is working with youngsters who are just leaving university (undergrad), to generate a media strategy.
- Journalists have a high turnover rate; however, if a personal relation is established, they will advocate for dissemination from any area in which they are located.
- Visibility in the media is not necessarily a success indicator.
- Constant training of both, journalists and researchers, should be a good starting point for breaching the differences.
- A clear, concrete communication strategy should occur: who is the public, what are the most adequate formats, what are the most appropriate messages. Products should be formatted according to the targeted media outlet.

4.5 Panel 4 – Political Influence during Electoral Periods

Moderated by journalist Santiago Pedraglio, consultant Norma Correa presents the case study of the "Peru Elections 2011 – focusing the electoral debate", as a working prototype, that includes acting as a hinge between academia, political parties, mass media and international cooperation. It is discussed by many of the cases presented on the first panel, and includes the presentation of a somewhat similar experience from Benin.

Discussion

- National characteristics aside, a "model" methodology could be extracted from all these examples of influencing policies during an electoral context.
- Maybe the role of civil society could be enhanced; in Costa Rica, for example, civil society groups discussed five proposals which were later handed to the political parties, as part of the citizens' suggestions.
- In Guatemala, due to the political situation, ASIES included the international relations topic in its agenda.

- FEDESARROLLO (Colombia) also discussed the topic in closed meetings, since political parties were not willing to discuss it openly, due to its sensitivity.
- More effort should be directed towards how politicians, themselves, can raise political debate.
- Although international donors have had influence on the topics chosen, they not necessarily have control over the contents.

Conclusions:

- Which aspects should be influenced? The options presented so far have been government plans; specific policies; and the public agenda. These are all valid options, and it is up to the time frame to choose one or the other.
- Each project can choose who to talk to: political parties; mass media; business sector. This depends on the context, and a mix of people to talk to is also an option.
- A think tank can also choose to support one candidate.
- It is important to bear in mind that the political scene is different in each country, as well as the way in which political parties are constituted.
- Sometimes the action's influence is not necessarily on the winning party, but on the opposition.

4.6 Panel 5 – M&E of policy influence: its time to start

The goal was to present and debate real opportunities and challenges for monitoring and evaluation of political influence of regional think tanks.

Reasons:

- Accountability
- Empowerment

Internal challenges:

- Lack of resources or of experience.

External challenges:

- Self-censorship, weak socialization of experiences.

Influence:

- Direct: when research changes the way of doing things.
- Indirect: when research provides with another perspective.
- Influence goal: contribute to the changes the organization wants to see, but does not implement.
- Sometimes a change in content and procedure is achieved, but if a change in attitude, beliefs and/or behaviours is not attained, this is not sustainable.

Each project should have evaluation strategies, and the components – such as products, activities and strategies – can also be evaluated, as can be the programs and the organization.

Map of change:

- Strategies
- Influence goals
- Long term effects
- Policy changes that want to be achieved
- Perspectives of this field

It is important to return to the map of change throughout the evaluation process.

The organization's goals have to be clear before starting influence or monitoring and evaluation processes. They also have to bear in mind that they manage financial and human resources, and have to make decisions on the best way to use them.

Influence means different things for different institutions; to some it is to publish in journals; to others, to discuss with policy makers. No matter how academic is the work, it has to be communicated.

The experience of the ARU Foundation was presented as a case study, and the conclusion was that the most effective policies are those based on evidence, although in Bolivia this is not the general rule.

The public policies process is very complex; there are many actors. Evidence plays a smaller role in the influence process.

The influence plan: the right evidence, given to the right people in the right language and in the right moment.

An important presentation letter is the capacity of self evaluation.

National financiers evaluate the use of resources; however, once they give the money, there is a tacit agreement that they comply with what is going to be done, thus there will be no questions regarding the impact the organization has. However, organizations financed by foreign financiers have to be evaluated.

The power points, presentations, documents and conclusions of this workshop can be found at: <http://www.cies.org.pe/actividades/Taller-internacional-Conocimiento-para-una-mejor-incidencia-en-politicas-publicas>

5. General Conclusions

During two days, executive directors of Latin American Think Tanks, as well as the professionals involved in the research action of those institutions – such as the communication officers – were deeply involved in discussing in different approaches of facing the challenges related to research for policy influence; how to tackle the role and power of the media, in order to be able to collaborate with it; and socializing the think tanks' experiences and lessons learned from influencing policies during electoral processes. Finally, a set of concrete methodologies and tools that will enable the monitoring and evaluation of policy influence were shared.

Within the framework of the workshop, the book *"The links between knowledge and politics: the role of research in Latin American public debate"* was presented and discussed by a panel of experts and by some of its main authors. This publication was the final product of the research call launched through the EBPDP network on February 2010, and four of the nine chapters were the direct result of said research call. The other five were donated by the different authors, mostly based on previous studies, and the interest to contribute to this body of knowledge.

Most of the participants agreed that meeting face to face conveys an added value, since it allows a personal and more direct way of establishing a relationship, recognizing possible working synergies. The workshop highlighted a critical mass of experience and evidence that has identified a Latin American technology on the think tank role during electoral processes – with examples from Argentina, Colombia, Chile, Peru and Uruguay – that could be exported in the near future, for example, within a South – South cooperation scheme.

The meeting ended highlighting that there are still many issues that need attention, such as (i) build up knowledge on how public policies are formulated, and (ii) the debate between numerical evidence and academic evidence to influence public policies. The book, *The Political Game in Latin America: How Are Public Policies Determined?*, published by the IADB, was recommended, as well as the report *The policy of public policies*, available in Spanish, and published by IPES.

Spaces such as this one strengthen think tanks' capacities, by sharing and identifying the most appropriate working methodologies that will work for each organization.

6. Evaluation

The workshop was positively judge by the assistants, receiving over 90% of satisfaction regarding the selection and relevance of themes, expert selection, and knowledge of the subject.

Although all panels received over 80% satisfaction, the more appreciated were the ones on Lessons Learned, on Monitoring and Evaluation, and the last conclusion session.

However, most of the attendees would have appreciated more time to work with the presented tools, and even more work methodologies.

The suggested subjects for future gatherings were:

- How are public policies formulated in the region?
- Relationship with media and social networks for experience dissemination.
- Strategic Planning

Please refer to annex 3 for the results compilation.

7. Budget

The workshop costs came to US\$ 67,995.00 that included the two days, plus an extra half day for the TTI, financed by IDRC.

The general figures are the following:

		US\$	%
Funds	IDRC	40606	59.72
	GDN	10375	15.26
	ODI	17014	25.02
	Total	67995	

		People	%
Participants	IDRC	33	55
	GDN	8	13.33
	ODI	19	31.67
	Total	60	

Please refer to annex 4 for the details.

8. Photographs



Workshop – Use of knowledge for a better public policy influence

Dates: August 11th & 12th, 2011

Place: Lima, Peru

Objective: Strengthen capacities on influence in public policies of regional Think Tanks, by building up the relationships between executive directors, as well as presenting and discussing tools, strategies and concrete experiences of communicating research and influence regarding the production of public policies.

DAY 1 – Thursday 11 th August, 2011					
Time	Activity	Goal	Contents	Expected Results	Products
08.00 – 08.30	Registry and handing out of materials	Attendees become familiar with the documents that are going to be discussed for the next two days			Materials
08.30 – 09.30	Introduction of participants	Attendees introduce themselves, and summarize their organizations, and how they perceive their role in the public policy cycle.	Relaxed introduction dynamic.	Participants become acquainted with each other.	
09.30 – 11.30	Panel: “Lessons learned by leading think tanks of the region”	Share the practical knowledge, mechanisms and level of influence think tanks have on public policies.	Executive Directors of five regional think tanks ¹ , shared their lessons on how to face the challenges related to research influencing public policies. Moderated by Mirko Lauer.	Participants have a deeper knowledge of the five presented experiences, including concrete organizational strategies to improve influence.	Presentations
11.30	COFFEE				
11.45 – 13.45	“Policy influence and the media” Part I – The	Presentation and comment of the main findings of two studies about media and their	Mesa: • Marcos Roggero • Natalia Romé	Participants became acquainted with case studies where research was	Presentations

¹ Roberto Steiner, Fedesarrollo, Colombia; Fernando Straface, CIPPEC, Argentina; Javier Portocarrero, CIES, Perú; Leopoldo Font, CLAEH, Uruguay; y Eugenio Rivera Urrutia, FUNDACION CHILE 21, Chile.

	policy makers' perspective	relation with Latin American think tanks and policy makers.	Moderador: Enrique Mendizabal	related to the production of public policies.	
13.45 – 15.30	Working Lunch	Mercedes Aráoz presents her experience	Presentation of a transition – from academia to public office – testimony: lessons learned and general insights.	Generate a “relaxed” space to candidly discuss this experience.	
15.30 – 17.30	“Policy influence and the media” Part II – Mini workshop: working with the media for public policies influence	Provide participants with concrete tools to work with the media, as a key character for policy influence: when, where, how, amongst others.	Jon Barnes moderates the discussion on the shapes, experiences and possible ideas to work effectively with the media, for policy influence.	The participants exchange ideas, methodologies, and concrete experiences of working with ,mass media, such as training for journalists.	
18.30 – 19.30	Presentation of the book: “The links between knowledge and politics: the role of research in Latin American public debate”	Identify and analyze the factors that influence the role of research in the Latin American policy cycle, specifying how producing and using agents interact with each other.	PANEL: • Enrique Mendizabal - presentación • Martín Tanaka (autor) • Norma Correa (agenda) Comments: • Mercedes Botto (FLACSO) • Antonio Romero (IDRC)	Public event, were attendees can discuss the main findings of the book.	Book.
19.30	COCTAIL				

DAY 2 – Friday 12 th August, 2011					
Time	Activity	Goal	Contents	Expected Results	Products
09.00 – 11.00	Political Influence during Electoral Periods - Presentations	Consultant Norma Correa presents the case study of the “Peru Elections 2011 – focusing the electoral debate”, Commented by (Grupo	Working prototype, that includes acting as a hinge between academia, political parties, mass media and international cooperation	Participants will be exposed to concrete strategies and tools that have worked in different electoral contexts.	Presentation-

		FARO) y Leonard Wantchekon (Princeton University)	Moderator: Santiago Pedraglio.		
11.00 – 11.15	COFFEE				
11.15 – 13.15	Political Influence during Electoral Periods - Discussion	Discuss the presented experiences	Based on the previous presentations, participants collectively arrive to conclusions.		
13.15 – 15.15	LUNCH				
15.15 – 17.15	Workshop: “M&E of policy influence: its time to start”	Generate awareness of the importance and the challenges of a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system of policy influence. Give concrete information and sources on methodologies and tools to start an M&E process.	Based on the Manual “Apprentices, doers and masters” produced by CIPPEC’s Civil Society Area, as a main tool.	Participants will be more convinced and interested in starting to strengthen their capabilities of M&E of influence in public policies.	Manual “Apprentices, doers and masters”
17.15 – 18.15	Discussion over future cooperation and events	Collectively, draw the main conclusions of the past two days, and of possible future synergies.	Moderated by Javier Portocarrero.		

Annex 2 – List of participants

No.	Name	Surname(s)	Position	Institution	Country
1	José Carlos	Sanabria	Coordinator Department of Socio- Politic Research	Asies	Guatemala
2	Lorena	Escobar		Asies	Guatemala
3	Ileana	Morales		Fosdeh	Honduras
4	Werner	Hernani		Fundacion Aru	Bolivia
5	Celina	Grisi	General Coordinator	Fundacion Aru	Bolivia
6	Osvaldo	Nina	Executive Director	Inesad	Bolivia
7	Stefany	Estrella Riveros	Junior Researcher	Inesad	Bolivia
8	Idelin	Molinas	Executive Director	Instituto Desarrollo	Paraguay
9	Elvio	Segovia		Instituto Desarrollo	Paraguay
10	Fernando	Masi	Executive Director	Cadep	Paraguay
11	María Galilea	López	Communications Coordinator	Cadep	Paraguay
12	María Eugenia	Hidalgo		CEDA	Ecuador
13	Gabriela	Muñoz	Executive Director	Ceda	Ecuador
14	Ricardo	Cordoba	Executive Director	Funda Ungo	El Salvador
15	María Elena	Rivera		Funda Ungo	El Salvador
16	Andrea	Ordóñez	Research Director	Grupo Faro	Ecuador
17	Alexandra	Rivadeneyra	Assistant to the Executive Direction	Grupo Faro	Ecuador
18	Jon	Barnes		No tiene	Británico
19	Federico	Burone	Regional Director	IDRC	Uruguay
20	María	Urbina Fauser		IDRC	Uruguay
21	Antonio	Romero	Program Officer	IDRC	Uruguay
22	Carolina	Robino	Program Officer	IDRC	Uruguay
23	Raquel	Zelaya	Executive Director	Asies	Guatemala
24	Diana	Tussie	LATN Director	FLACSO	Argentina
25	Miguel	Pulido	Executive Director	FUNDAR	México
26	Marcos	Roggero	Researcher	Universidad Catolica de Córdoba	Argentina
27	Martín	Lardone	Researcher	Universidad Catolica de Córdoba	Argentina
28	Natalia	Romé	Researcher	Inpade	Argentina
29	Leonardo	Merino Trejos	Executive Director	Estado Nacion	Costa Rica
30	Mercedes	Botto	Researcher	Conicet	Argentina
31	Arthur Hugh	Grigsby		Nitlapan	Nicaragua
32	Fernando Diego	Straface	Executive Director	Cippec	Argentina
33	Jorge	Mora Alfaro	Director	Flacso	Costa Rica
34	Eugenio Andres	Rivera Urrutia	Economic Program Director	Fundación Chile 21	Chile
35	Alberto	Saracho		Fundacion idea	México
36	Leandro	Echt		Cippec	Argentina
37	Vanesa	Weyrauch	Civil Society Directorate	Cippec	Argentina
38	Leopoldo	Font	Executive Director	Adinet	Uruguay
39	Roberto Ricardo	Steiner Sampedro	Executive Director	Fedesarrollo	Colombia
40	Martin	Benavides	Executive Director	GRADE	Peru
41	Lorena	Alcazar	Main Researcher	GRADE	Peru
42	Paula	Pino		GRADE	Peru

43	Rosa	Morales	Investigadora	IEP	Peru
44	Roxana	Barrantes	General Director	IEP	Peru
45	Cesar	Lacerna		IEP	
46	Francesca	Uccelli Labarthe		IEP	
47	Jeronimo	Chiarella Viale	Research Directorate	Environment Ministry	Peru
48	Freddy	Injoque	Research Directorate	Environment Ministry	Peru
49	Victor	Bullón	Post Graduate Studies Director	UNCP	Huancayo - Peru
50	Juan	Elorrieta	Coordinator	GuamanPoma	Cusco-Peru
51	Carlos	León	Professor	USAT	Chiclayo-Peru
52	Elin	Baldárrago	Coordinator	UCSP	Arequipa-Peru
53	José	Tavera	Economics Coordinator	PUCP	Peru
54	Milagros	Mejía	Executive Director	Instituto del Perú	Peru
55	Enrique	Mendizabal	Director	Onthinktanks.org	Peru
56	Javier	Portocarrero	Executive Director	CIES	Peru
57	Xavier	Gordillo	Adjunct Director	CIES	Peru
58	Ilina	Carrasco	Press and Institutional Relations Officer	CIES	Peru
59	Micaela	Pesantes	Projects Adviser	CIES	Peru
60	Ricardo	Uceda	Executive Director	Instituto Prensa y Sociedad	Peru

Regional Workshop – Use of knowledge for a better public policy August 11th and 12th, 2011

1= Poor
2 = Bad
3 = Regular
4 = Good
5 = Very Good

	Average	%
1. In general, what is your opinion of the workshop?		
1.1 Relevance of topics	4.53	90.53
1.2 Event organization	4.53	90.53
1.3 General opinion of the workshop	4.47	89.47
4.1. Lessons learned by leading think tanks of the region		
4.1.1. Relevance	4.67	93.33
4.1.2. Speakers knowledge	4.83	96.67
4.1.3. Quality of the material	4.22	84.44
4.1.4. General opinion	4.56	91.11
4.2. Policy incidence and the media: The policy makers'		
4.2.1. Relevance	4.41	88.24
4.2.2. Speakers knowledge	4.29	85.88
4.2.3. Quality of the material	4.06	81.18
4.2.4. General opinion	4.06	81.11
4.3. Working Lunch		
4.3.1. Relevance	3.69	73.75
4.3.2. Speakers knowledge	4.25	85.00
4.3.3. Quality of the material	3.94	78.75
4.3.4. General opinion	3.88	77.65
4.4 Policy incidence and the media: Mini workshop		
4.4.1. Relevance	4.33	86.67
4.4.2. Speakers knowledge	4.06	81.11
4.4.3. Quality of the material	3.94	78.89
4.4.4. General opinion	4.00	80.00
4.5. Political Influence during Electoral Periods: Presentation		
4.5.1. Relevancia	4.41	88.24
4.5.2. Speakers knowledge	4.71	94.12
4.5.3. Quality of the material	4.47	89.41
4.5.4. General opinion	4.44	88.89
4.6. Political Influence during Electoral Periods: Discussion		
4.6.1. Relevance	4.42	88.33
4.6.2. Speakers knowledge	4.75	95.00
4.6.3. Quality of the material	4.67	93.33
4.6.4. General opinion	4.54	90.77
4.7. M&E of policy influence: its time to start		
4.7.1. Relevancia	4.71	94.29
4.7.2. Speakers knowledge	4.71	94.29
4.7.3. Quality of the material	4.64	92.86
4.7.4. General opinion	4.60	92.00
4.8. Discussion over future cooperation and events		
4.7.1. Relevance	4.60	92.00
4.7.2. Speakers knowledge	4.60	92.00
4.7.3. Quality of the material	4.60	92.00
4.7.4. General opinion	4.43	88.57

4. What is your opinion of the covered topics?

5. What is your opinion of the different moderators?	5.1. Mirko Lauer		
	5.1.1. Relevance	4.44	88.75
	5.1.2. Speakers knowledge	4.40	88.00
	5.1.3. Calidad de la Exposición	4.53	90.67
	5.1.4. Apreciación General	4.41	88.24
	5.2. Mercedes Araoz		
	5.2.1. Relevance	4.19	83.75
	5.2.2. Speakers knowledge	4.33	86.67
	5.2.3. Quality of the material	4.27	85.33
	5.2.4. General opinion	4.27	85.33
	5.3. Jon Barnes		
	5.3.1. Relevance	3.94	78.82
	5.3.2. Conocimiento de los expositores	3.88	77.50
	5.3.3. Quality of the material	3.56	71.25
	5.3.4. General opinion	3.88	77.65
	5.4. Santiago Pedraglio		
	4.4.1. Relevance	4.47	89.33
	4.4.2. Speakers knowledge	4.64	92.86
	4.4.3. Quality of the material	4.71	94.29
	4.4.4. General opinion	4.60	92.00