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Key Features

- **Motivation**
  - the drought of 2002-03;

- **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
    - 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;
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Methodology

- **Approach:** “Before/after” “with/without” design - estimate the difference between outcomes achieved by beneficiaries – **double difference** (difference-in-difference)

- 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:

\[ \text{Food Gap}_{i,t} = \beta \cdot \text{Public Works payments}_{i,t} + \delta \cdot (\text{other factors affecting the food gap}) + \epsilon_{i,t} \]

- 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).
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Data


- 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
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- 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
Assessing the impact of the PSNP ... cont’d

- 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;