

Setting the scene

Benjamin Davis
Jenn Yablonski

Methodological issues in evaluating the impact of
social cash transfers in sub Saharan Africa

Naivasha, Kenya
January 19-21, 2011



Why are we holding this workshop

- Massive expansion of social cash transfers in SSA
- Most accompanied by rigorous impact evaluation
 - We have recently begun a second generation of impact evaluations
- Discuss advances and challenges in methods, analytical issues, and implementation



Goals of the workshop

- Share experiences of impact evaluation
- Build lines of communication among evaluators and clients
- Work through some of the methodological conundrums
- Present and discuss papers with goal of publishing special issue of *Journal of Development Effectiveness* (3ie)



Face a fundamental question

- Do we really need all these impact evaluations?
 - For what purpose? What is the evidence for?
 - How to make them useful for implementers
 - Does the intended target audience need a Rolls Royce to establish proof of concept?
 - How to add value to impact evaluations and existing evidence



Who is behind the workshop

- Under the umbrella of The Transfer Project
 - UNICEF, SCUK, UNC
 - National gov and research partners
- Funded by the FAO-UNICEF pre project on understanding the economic impacts of SCT
- Underlying funding by DFID



The Transfer Project: Objectives

- Provide evidence on the effectiveness of social cash transfer programs in achieving impacts for children.
- Inform the development and design of social cash transfer policy and programs
- To promote learning across the continent on social transfers programme implementation, and research & evaluation.



Transfer Project: The 3 Pillars

- Regional learning, exchange and network/
community of practice
- Technical assistance and impact evaluation
- Synthesis of regional lessons on programme
design



Social cash transfers in SSA: A wide variety of experiences (1)

- Universal old age pensions
 - South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Swaziland, Lesotho
 - (and pilots in Zambia, Kenya, Uganda,
- Near universal child grants
 - South Africa (poverty), Namibia (OVC)
 - Pilot in Zambia

→ These tend to be nationally owned and domestically fully funded



A wide variety of experiences (2)

- Poverty targeted (community) grants for OVC
 - Kenya, Lesotho
- Poverty targeted (community) household grants
 - Malawi, Zambia, Zimbabwe
 - Ultra poor, labor constrained
 - Ethiopia, Rwanda, Zimbabwe
 - Direct assistance for labor constrained poor
 - Cash/food for work for non labor constrained poor
 - Graduation into productive activities
 - Mozambique
 - Incapacitated, primarily elderly (plus means test)
 - Ghana, Tanzania
 - Verification with proxy means
- Experimenting with different options
 - Kenya HSNP
 - Community, dependency ratio, old age
 - Uganda
 - Community, old age
 - Ethiopia
 - Minimum package



Social cash transfer programs with government support

Old age pensions	Child grants	Pov/community based targeting	Combo/community based targeting
Lesotho (80,000)	Namibia (108,000)	Malawi (26,000 hhs and scaling up)	Rwanda (143,000 ind and scaling up)
South Africa (4 million)	South Africa (8 million)	Zambia (9,000 hhs; scale up to 22,000)	Ethiopia (PNSP 1.6 million hhs; BOLSA 8,000)
Namibia (115,000)	Zambia (begin 2010; will scale up to 33,000 hhs)	Tanzania (10,000 hhs in pilot)	Pilots on the way
Botswana (91,000)	OVC/community based targeting	Kenya Hunger Safety Net (scaling up to 60,000 hhs)	Zimbabwe (pilot begin 2011, 55000 by 2014)
Swaziland (60,000)	Kenya OVC (100,000; scale up to 300,000 by 2013)	Mozambique (170,000 hhs)	Uganda (pilot begin 2011, 65000 by 2015)
Zambia (4,700 hhs in pilot)	Lesotho (1,000 hhs in pilot; scale up to 10,000 by 2011)		Ethiopia (Minimum social protection package, pilot begin 2011)

What's different about social cash transfers in SSA---context

- Context
 - HIV/AIDS
 - Economic and social vulnerability
 - More widespread poverty
 - Continued reliance on subsistence agriculture
 - Exit path from poverty is not necessarily through the labor market
 - Less fiscal space---donors play a stronger role
 - Dependent on bilateral, multilateral support
 - Weaker institutional capacity to implement programs
 - Weaker service supply



What's different about social cash transfers in SSA---Design

- Program design
 - Universal old age pensions
 - Near universal child grants
 - Unconditional (for the most part)
 - Prominent role of community in targeting
 - Focus on OVC and other specific vulnerabilities



Challenges facing social cash transfers in SSA

- Future is not assured
 - Assuring political and financial sustainability
- How to better link with other components of social protection
- Assuring efficient implementation
 - Targeting
 - MIS
 - Monitoring and evaluation
 - Building capacity and institutions
- How to better share wealth of experiences across countries in the region



Key policy questions

- Targeting
- Linkages with services and other programs
- Economic impacts—and are social cash transfers developmental?
- Concerns regarding dependency
- Transfer size relative to impact
- Costing and cost effectiveness
- Gender and household dynamics



Massive expansion in SCT impact evaluation

- Malawi SCT
 - Mchinji pilot, 2007-2009
 - Expansion, 2011-2013
- Kenya CT-OVC
 - Pilot 2007-2011
 - Expansion, 2011-2013
- Mozambique PSA
 - Expansion, 2008-2009
- Zambia
 - Kalombo pilot, 2005
 - Monze pilot, 2007-2010
 - Expansion and child grant, 2010-2013
- South Africa CSG
 - Retrospective and expansion, 2010-2012
- Ethiopia
 - PNSP
 - Regional minimum social protection package, 2011-2013
- Ghana LEAP
 - Pilot, 2010-2012
- Lesotho, CSP
 - Pilot, 2011-2012
- Uganda, begins in 2011
- Zimbabwe, begins in 2011
- Tanzania, TASAF



Evaluating SCTs: What kind of indicators do we look for?

- Long list of indicators
 - Welfare (income/expenditure), food consumption, dietary diversity, school enrollment, morbidity, use of health services, nutritional status (stunting, etc), economic activities (production, investment, labor allocation), child labor
- Theory driven evaluation
 - Behavioral model; thinking through the casual chain
 - Impact conditioned by
 - design and implementation issues
 - context



What impact should we expect from a cash transfer program?

- For very poor households, the first, immediate impact will be on fulfilling immediate needs
 - Food expenditure and composition; dietary diversity
- Once food needs met, cash may alleviate other constraints.
 - Second level of impact comprised of other direct expenditures
 - Children's clothes
 - Expenditure in health and education (mediated by availability of schooling)
 - Investment in productive activities, household goods, etc (mediated by availability of opportunities)



What impact should we expect from a cash transfer program?

- Third level of impact is less direct, but strongly associated with program during implementation, either as a message or a formal conditionality
 - Birth registration (mediated by availability of service, etc)
- Fourth level of impacts is less direct, with more mediation by other factors
 - School attendance (mediated by supply, household labor needs, etc)
 - Nutritional status (mediated by sanitation, health status, information, etc)
 - Health outcomes (mediated by supply, sanitation, nutritional status, etc)
 - Use of health services (mediated by access and quality of supply, etc)
 - Child labor (mediated by household economic activities)
 - HIV/AIDS (mediated by access and quality of services, social power/contest, etc)

