Assessing the Impact of the Ethiopian Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP)

Alemayehu Seyoum Taffesse International Food Policy Research Institute

Fifth Transfer Project Research Workshop: Evaluating National Integrated Cash Transfer Programs April 6-8th 2016, Addis Ababa: Radisson Blu Hotel

Key Features

Image: Motivation

- the drought of 2002-03;
- New Coalition for Food Security in Ethiopia (2003)

□ Features

- Coordination and commitment donors (9), government;
- Predictability multi-year planning and financing;
- Combine transfers with asset building PW plus direct support ;
- Integrated with the broader development agenda;
- Large
 - $\circ~$ Beneficiaries Up to 8 million persons, started with about 300 woredas (40%), it will reach more than 400 soon;
 - Cost US\$1.5 billion (2005-09); US\$2.1 billion (2010-14);
- Geographic and community targeting;

Assessing the impact of the PSNP in the Highlands Methodology

- Approach: "Before/after" "with/without" design estimate the difference between outcomes achieved by beneficiaries – double difference (difference-indifference)
- Requires a comparable "without" group; i.e. households not receiving PSNP benefits but were similar in observable characteristics to PSNP beneficiaries -Matching
- □ This approach became inapplicable at the later stage of evaluation *too few households that have never received benefits and too different*;

Instead, we estimate the following relationship:

- \Box We use all five rounds of data when estimating equation (3.1);
- Payments are for 10 months prior to the survey. They are expressed in real (2014 Birr) terms, adjusting for inflation.
- □ Other factors:
 - characteristics that do not change over time (such as location and pre-programme household characteristics);
 - characteristics that do change such as household size and composition and the age and sex of the household head; and
- □ Instrumental-Variables Household Fixed Effects estimator (IV-FE).

Assessing the impact of the PSNP in the Highlands Data

□ a panel of households (beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) in 68 woredas in Tigray, Amhara, Oromiya and SNNP (2006, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014)

□ Low attrition:

- 3,670 hh in 2006; 3,091 hh in 2014 (attrition of 1.7% p.a. (better than US Census Bureau))
- □ Comparability over time:
 - Survey fielded at approx. same time of year;
 - Core questions, enumerator training etc not changed;
 - Core team (JH, AS, YY) involved since 2006;
- □ But no "non-PSNP *kebeles*"; therefore cannot quantitatively assess impact of public works; also, first survey occurred one year after PSNP began



□ Additional households included over time:

- woredas in Amhara that were initially supported through USAID ("Amhara-HVFB");
- additional Direct Support households, additional recent graduates.
- Sample size in 2014 was ~5,100 hh
- □ Quantitative data at the *kebele* (since 2006) and *woreda* (since 2010) levels;
 - *Woreda* data focuses on resources needed to implement PSNP and HABP; data on payment processes
 - *Kebele* data focuses on local infrastructure and implementation of PSNP and HABP

- □ Detailed qualitative work undertaken in 10 *woredas*. This includes:
 - Key informant interviews (officials, task force members, DA, MFI representatives, traders)
 - Focus Group Discussions (Chronically dependent households, Recent graduates, Women, Men, Youth)
 - Household case studies: Graduates, Long term PSNP beneficiaries, household participating in HABP, youth

Impact

□ Improved household level food availability and security;

- Lower food gap;
- Higher diet diversity;
- Increased per capita food and total consumption;
- □ Improvements are not seen at the child level.
 - Little change in child nutritional outcomes due to PSNP;
 - Child diet quality is poor.
- □ Missing link nutrition knowledge of mothers and the household at large:
 - Mother had no contact with health extension workers;
 - Mother had not received information on good feeding practices;
 - Poor hygiene and water practices observed;

Key Lessons

- □ **Dialogue** genuine; covers what and how (mechanisms, implementation strategy); across design, implementation, revision
- **Ownership** Government program;
- □ Complementarity addressing emergency, enhancing resilience, and promoting development (E.g. Drought Risk Financing (DRF))
- □ **Integration** part of the national development effort/plan;
- □ **Coordination** among donors, donors and government, within government;

Decentralized implementation –

- Government federal, region, woreda, and kebele levels;
- Community targeting, community asset selection, appeals;

Key Lessons

□ Monitoring and evaluation

- a part of the initial design and mutual understanding;
- independent but collaborative government, donors, the national statistical agency, external evaluators;
- rigorous evaluations (five, so far) and related studies:
 - Create opportunities to learn and adjust (Payroll and Attendance Sheet System (PASS), Client cards)
 - Help bridge results-based budgeting and longer term programming designed to achieve impact
- □ Design (PSNP4, SCT pilots)
 - Child nutrition
 - Pregnant and lactating women (PLW)

IN-SCT Evaluation Study

Objectives

- estimate impact of SCT program on child nutrition and health outcomes:
- evaluate the operational linkages and effectiveness of coordination of the system approach of program:
- assess impact of soft conditionalities related to nutrition: is household dietary diversity of DS clients and Temporary Direct Support clients improved?
- assess the effectiveness of the program in reaching the target group and delivering expected social outcomes: nutrition, health, education and child protection;
- identify challenges and lessons learned;