

# Cash Plus & Systems Linkages Overview

Session 5: Cash plus – system linkages  
presentations

Tia Palermo, Fabio Veras, Jenn Yablonski

**June 7, 2017**

**Transfer Project Workshop  
Dakar, Senegal**



Food and Agriculture Organization  
of the United Nations



## Background



Important to keep in mind broad definition of social protection:

Comprises the set of public and private actions which address **income poverty, economic shocks**, as well as **social vulnerability** (Sabates Wheeler and Devereaux 2008; UNICEF 2012)

Recognizes that poverty and **exclusion** are mutually reinforcing

## Limits of cash transfer impacts

Broad, positive impacts of cash transfers

Some limitations:

Limited impacts on morbidity, but may increase care-seeking when ill and self-reported health (Novignon, et al., forthcoming)

Neither agriculture nor social protection alone can address all constraints faced by poor rural households (Daidone 2017)

Limited effects of cash alone on child stunting and nutrition (de Groot et al. 2016)

Zambia: increased skilled care attendance at birth, but only in communities with higher quality health facilities (Handa et al., 2015)

# What underlies limitations of cash transfers?



## Behavioral mediators

- e.g., attitude towards risk, forward looking behaviour, time preference, information.
- particularly when transfer value is too small and/or regularity is not guaranteed

## Moderators (exclusion from sectoral policies: Quality, availability and access to supply side)

- e.g., schools, health facilities, access to extension services, access to inputs, access to markets.
- but also shocks, norms and prices

## Motivation for Cash plus

In policy discussions of social protection systems:

- Integration and linkages between SP programmes/ services and with other sectors seen as a way to reduce fragmentation/ improve coordination
- Often same/overlapping populations → implementation harmonization (e.g. targeting, registration, coordinate staff...)
- Given cash transfers have often been flagship/backbone SP programmes (although not always!), often seen as entry point for better integration

## Motivation for Cash plus

- Coordinated or complementary interventions:
  - expanding/improving health and school infrastructure to address moderators
  - behavior change interventions to address knowledge and behavioral mediators
- Coordinated and coherent agricultural and social protection policies and programs
  - Complementary agriculture programmes may unleash the power of CT to be more “productive” – moderator
  - Allow families to take more risk in a sustainable manner and increase their production (of crops of high-return, but riskier) and income – behavior change.

## Cash plus: a definition?



Social protection interventions that provide regular transfers plus a combination of additional components or linkages that seek to address the limitations of income effects by augmenting those effects, inducing further behavioral change or seeking to address supply-side constraints (Roelen et al., 2017)

*The combined “plus” can be ‘integrated’ into the programme or it can be externally linked*

## What is the “plus”



### Integral

- Additional transfers, e.g., asset transfers, supplementary feeding
- Information/sensitization/BCC
- Psychosocial support

### External

- Providing access to services, e.g., health insurance, micro-credit, tuition fee waivers
- Facilitating linkages to services, e.g. referrals, co-responsibilities

Given UNICEF and FAO mandates, Transfer Project “plus” has mostly focused on:

- social sectors/social welfare services
- productive activities, particularly in agriculture

But important to recognize broader menu of options!



## What is the “plus”



### **In agriculture, besides integration or external linkages... there is also the issue of coherence...**

- Coherence to avoid/minimize conflicting interactions between policies/programs and to boost economic opportunities for beneficiary (productive impacts) – e.g., combining PSNP and Household Asset Building Programme (HABP) in Ethiopia.
- Complementary programming for non-beneficiaries of cash transfers may need to be aligned to overcome some bottlenecks/moderators (e.g., Supporting the supply response to the exogenous increase in demand).

## SP + Agricultural Interventions: What does evidence say so far?



- Available experimental evidence focus on integrated (or integral plus) programmes that do not necessarily have social protection-related cash transfers at the core of interventions.  
e.g., Graduation approach
- Those that do have SCT at their core (e.g. Latin American CCT plus agricultural interventions) or the combination of PSNP and OFSP/HABP have not been evaluated through experimental design.
- Mixed evidence, but positive impacts on adoption of new technologies, high investment in agriculture (inputs and assets), but not necessarily high production.

# Lessons learned from case studies on nutrition, health & psychosocial support



## Supply of quality services

- crucial for achieving impact in areas of health, nutrition and behavior change

## Trained & resourced social workers

- Linkages to services requires successful case management

## Knowledge & commitment of roles and responsibilities

- on behalf of all parties involved

## Political commitment

- to forge relationships between implementing ministries and institutions

## Increased resources

- To match increased ambitions

Case studies from Ghana, Chile, Ethiopia (Roelen et al. 2017)

## Implications for design & research



- Programme design and implementation needs clear theory of change: why are we putting these components together?
- Fit for purpose: need to better (and first) understand the moderators/key mediators to improve design the “plus”  
  
→ Also allows better impact (and process) evaluations, examining the theory of change → adaptation for better programming

## Implications for design & research



- Preliminary evidence suggests that the “how” matters significantly
  - Policy makers and programme managers demand for evidence and examples on how to effectively design and implement is also high
  - E.g. – *use of MOUs between ministries; access to MIS of the different programmes, integration vs external linkages*
- What are implications for what we measure in impact evaluations, and need for other types of research  
(possibly in combination)

## Discussion questions (some controversial!)

- What is the theory of change/causal framework for different national “cash plus” approaches, and are we testing these?
- What are the key “how” questions, and how to answer these?
- Is catchy name “cash plus” driving away (or simply hiding) the discussion of truly integrated social protection systems adapted to each country’s realities (and capacities)?
  - Is “cash plus” more appealing because it is more “easily” evaluable?
- How to ensure that programme design responds to both the right drivers/bottlenecks and national capacities, rather than pre-conceived programming or research interests?
  - Need to beware of potential risks/unintended consequences of the “plus” also - e.g. example of social worker bias

# References



Daidone S. Synergies between Social Protection and Agriculture: What is the evidence so far? Presentation to Public Policy and Human Development, Maastricht University, March 29, 2017.

De Groot R, Palermo T, Handa S, Ragno LP, Peterman A. (2017). Cash Transfers and Child Nutrition: What We Know and What We Need to Know. *Development Policy Review* (online ahead of print). <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/dpr.12255/abstract>

Roelen K, Devereux S, Abdulai AG, Martorano B, Palermo T, Ragno LP. “How to make ‘cash plus’ work in social protection: linking services and sectors.” UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti Working Paper. Florence, Italy, forthcoming.

Sabates-Wheeler R, Devereux S. Transformative social protection: the currency of social justice. *Social Protection for the Poor and Poorest*: Springer; 2008. p. 64-84.  
UNICEF. Integrated social protection systems: Enhancing equity for children. UNICEF Social Protection Framework. New York: UNICEF, 2012

Veras Soares F, Knowles M, Daidone S, Tirivayi N. Combined effects and synergies between agricultural and social protection interventions: what is the evidence so far? (2016). FAO.