

Social Assistance in Developing Countries Database

Version 4.0 August 2008

Armando Barrientos, Rebecca Holmes and James Scott
Brooks World Poverty Institute, The University of Manchester
Overseas Development Institute



The UK Department for International Development (DFID) supports policies, programmes and projects to promote international development. DFID provided funds for this study as part of that objective but the views and opinions expressed are those of the authors alone.

README NOTES on the Database

The database aims to:

- provide a summary of the evidence available on the effectiveness of social assistance interventions in developing countries;
- focus on programmes seeking to combine the reduction and mitigation of poverty, with strengthening and facilitating household investments capable of preventing poverty and securing development in the longer term
- select programmes for inclusion in the database on the basis of the availability of information on design features, evaluation, size, scope, or significance;
- provide summary information on each programme in a way that can be easily referenced by DFID staff and others with only a basic level of technical expertise.

Version 4 updates information on existing programmes and incorporates information on the following programmes:

- Conditional cash transfers pilots in Kenya, Zambia, and Malawi
- Integrated poverty reduction programmes in Panama, Uruguay, and the Dominican Republic
- Conditional cash transfer programmes in Paraguay
- CHARS in Bangladesh joining up environment asset accumulation and social assistance interventions

Your comments, corrections, and suggestions are welcomed.

Please contact:

Armando Barrientos,
Brooks World Poverty Institute, The University of Manchester,
Humanities Bridgeford Street Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK
Phone: +44 (0)161 306 6699
Fax: +44 (0)161 306 6428
E-mail: a.barrientos@manchester.ac.uk

USER GUIDE

This database aims to be a user-friendly tool to provide summary information on social assistance interventions in developing countries.

There are two ways in which users can search for information on specific programmes:

- the INDEX OF PROGRAMMES lists interventions by type, for example whether the interventions transfers cash or food, and if cash whether the transfer is conditional on some behaviour by beneficiary households or not;
- the INDEX OF COUNTRIES lists interventions by country.

The summary information for each intervention covers a range of programme dimensions (type, start year, cost, targeting, evaluation results, welfare outcomes, etc.), and links to further information sources.

For definitions of key terms check the GLOSSARY.

For best navigation of the database move the cursor over the relevant headings and a 'hand' icon will reveal the link. A left hand click of the mouse will take you to that part of the database. For example, left click on [USER GUIDE](#).

To search for information, a good starting point is the [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#), from there you can go to the INDEX OF PROGRAMMES and select the programme(s) you are interested in.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| SPECIAL FEATURE: PILOT SOCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES | 5 |
| I INDEX OF PROGRAMMES | 7 |
| II INDEX OF COUNTRIES | 8 |
| III PROGRAMMES (A-Z) | 10 |
| IV GLOSSARY | 93 |
| V LINKS TO COMPARATIVE SOURCES | 96 |
| VI LINKS TO OTHER DATABASES | 98 |

SPECIAL FEATURE: PILOT SOCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMMES

In this new version of the database we have included pilot social assistance programmes. A number of pilot cash transfer programmes have been introduced in Latin America, Asia and Africa in the last year or so, and a few more are in the design stage. Their scale and rationale suggest there is a good chance they will be scaled up in the near future. In theory, pilot social protection programmes should imply experimentation in the face of uncertainty regarding the way forward, but several of the pilots covered in the database, and many of those in the pipeline, represent instead a specific route to the extension of social protection, and as such they merit discussion. The main purpose of this brief note is to provide such discussion, and illuminate on this specific mode of development of social protection in developing countries.

In Sub-Saharan Africa, there are pilot cash transfers schemes in place in [Kenya](#), [Malawi](#) (5), and [Zambia](#)(1); and in the design stage in Nigeria, Uganda, and Ghana. In Latin America, pilot programmes have been rolled out in [Paraguay](#), [Honduras](#), [Nicaragua](#), [Panama](#), [Argentina](#) (3), and the [Dominican Republic](#). In South Asia, [Bangladesh](#)(5)'s Challenging the Frontiers of Poverty Reduction - Targeting the Ultra Poor programme is in fact a pilot programme, as will be [Pakistan](#) (2)'s Child Support programme.

Why the high number of pilots?

In the context of technocratic models of policy making, pilot programmes would make a great deal of sense if policy makers are uncertain of the feasibility and likely impact effectiveness of interventions. Before introducing innovative, complex, and costly interventions, sensible policy makers would recommend testing the interventions in a small scale experiment. Knowledge from the delivery and impact of the interventions could then inform the desirability and design of a scaled up programme. There is a sense in which the social protection pilot programmes referred to above, and described in the database, do not fit fully into this description.

We have accumulated a large body of evidence and knowledge about the design, delivery, and impact of cash transfer schemes in Latin America to be reasonably confident that, adequately designed, they can achieve their short term objectives. Why is further testing necessary?

The strongest available evidence on cash transfer programmes comes from middle income countries in Latin America, Mexico's *Progresas/Oportunidades*, and to a lesser extent Brazil's *Bolsa Escola/Familia*. Naturally, questions remain over whether similar programmes can work in other environments. Would cash transfer schemes work in Africa? Would they work in low income countries in Latin America? Low income countries have higher incidence of poverty; lower capacity in terms of designing, delivering, and evaluating transfers schemes; and less developed administrative and financial systems. It makes sense to check whether cash transfers are appropriate and effective in these, more adverse, environments. Even then, fewer pilots would still deliver answers to our questions. We know from the Zambia

Kalomo Social Transfer Pilot Scheme that cash transfers are feasible and effective in low income countries, providing that technical support is available and community selection of beneficiaries is feasible.

The spread of pilot social assistance schemes is also explained by domestic policy processes and funding modalities. In countries where policy makers, and perhaps civil society, are reluctant to innovate, pilots provide an opportunity to enable learning from new approaches to poverty and vulnerability. It also provides a well defined time frame in which donors could use existing funding modalities to support the extension of social protection. DFID, for example, is committed to shifting focus from emergency aid to regular forms of support in Africa. In Latin America, IADB support for social protection initiatives normally extends for periods of up to five years. Given the time frame of available international aid, the expectations are that pilot schemes could be instrumental in building learning and support for social protection among domestic policy makers, that they would have strong 'demonstration effects'.

Risks and opportunities

There are significant risks with this strategy, and even more significant opportunities. The risks are to do with pilots failing to generate the expected 'demonstration effects', and with changes in international economic conditions that shift attention to other problems. The opportunities could potentially be very significant, successful pilot transfer schemes could mark the beginnings of a process leading to the implementation of effective anti-poverty programmes at a scale capable of making a large dent on global poverty.

Paying attention to the design of pilots and to associated policy processes could help minimise these risks and maximise opportunities. Designing pilot social assistance programmes as if they are a first phase of a fully scaled up programme is essential. This involves avoiding short cuts in the pilot stage, and making the necessary investment in information systems, delivery institutions, and beneficiary selection. These set up costs can be substantial. Process considerations are important in ensuring the pilots are part of national social protection strategies, and involve a wide range of stakeholders. It is vitally important that pilots achieve a good balance of design and process considerations. As much else in development policy, pilot social transfers are as much about politics as they are about the economic and technical issues of poverty reduction.

INDEX OF PROGRAMMES

INTEGRATED POVERTY REDUCTION PROGRAMME

Chile(1) Panama Uruguay (2)

CASH TRANSFERS - *Unconditional*

Household

Argentina (3) China India (6) Indonesia(3)
Kenya(1) Malawi (5) Mozambique(1) Mozambique(3)
Mozambique(4) Pakistan (1) Zambia(1) Zambia(2)

Child and Family Allowances

India (5) Mozambique(2) South Africa(2)

Social Pensions (Old Age and Disability)

Argentina(1) Bangladesh(6) Bolivia Brazil(4)
Brazil(5) Chile(2) Costa Rica (1) India(3)
Lesotho Namibia Nepal South Africa(1)
Uruguay (1)

CASH TRANSFERS - *Conditional*

Cash for Work

Argentina(2) Ethiopia(2) Ethiopia(4) Ethiopia(5)
India(2) India(4) Korea Malawi(3)
South Africa(3) South Africa(4)

Cash for Human Development

Cambodia (2) Bangladesh(1) Bangladesh(7) Bangladesh(8)
Brazil(1) Brazil(2) Brazil(3) Colombia(1)
Colombia(2) Dominican Republic Ecuador Honduras
Jamaica Kenya(2) Mexico Mongolia
Nicaragua Pakistan (2) Paraguay Peru

FEE WAIVERS FOR HEALTH AND EDUCATION

Cambodia (1) Cambodia (3) Indonesia(1) Indonesia(2)
Thailand Zimbabwe (1)

NEAR CASH TRANSFERS

Gambia India(1) Sri Lanka Malawi(4)

FOOD BASED TRANSFERS

Afghanistan Bangladesh(2) Bangladesh(3) Bangladesh(4)
Costa Rica (2) Ethiopia(1) Ethiopia(3) Gambia
Liberia Malawi(2)

INPUT GRANTS

Bangladesh(5) Malawi(1) Zimbabwe (2)

ENVIRONMENT ADAPTATION AND LIVELIHOOD PROTECTION

[Bangladesh\(9\)](#)

INDEX OF COUNTRIES

Afghanistan: [Afghanistan](#)

Argentina: [Argentina\(1\)](#) [Argentina\(2\)](#) [Argentina \(3\)](#)

Bangladesh: [Bangladesh\(1\)](#) [Bangladesh\(2\)](#) [Bangladesh\(3\)](#) [Bangladesh\(4\)](#)

[Bangladesh\(5\)](#) [Bangladesh\(6\)](#) [Bangladesh\(7\)](#) [Bangladesh\(8\)](#)

[Bangladesh\(9\)](#)

Bolivia: [Bolivia](#)

Brazil: [Brazil\(1\)](#) [Brazil\(2\)](#) [Brazil\(3\)](#) [Brazil\(4\)](#)
[Brazil\(5\)](#)

Cambodia: [Cambodia \(1\)](#) [Cambodia \(2\)](#) [Cambodia \(3\)](#)

Chad: **Error! Reference source not found.**

Chile: [Chile\(1\)](#) [Chile\(2\)](#)

China: [China](#)

Colombia: [Colombia\(1\)](#) [Colombia\(2\)](#)

Costa Rica: [Costa Rica \(1\)](#) [Costa Rica \(2\)](#)

Dominican Republic: [Dominican Republic](#)

Ecuador: [Ecuador](#)

Ethiopia: [Ethiopia\(1\)](#) [Ethiopia\(2\)](#) [Ethiopia\(3\)](#) [Ethiopia\(4\)](#) [Ethiopia\(5\)](#)

Gambia: [Gambia](#)

Honduras: [Honduras](#)

India: [India\(1\)](#) [India\(2\)](#) [India\(3\)](#) [India\(4\)](#) [India \(5\)](#)
[India \(6\)](#)

Indonesia: [Indonesia\(1\)](#) [Indonesia\(2\)](#) [Indonesia\(3\)](#)

Jamaica: [Jamaica](#)

Kenya: [Kenya\(1\)](#) [Kenya\(2\)](#)

Korea: [Korea](#)

Lesotho: [Lesotho](#)

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| Liberia: | Liberia | | | | |
| Malawi: | Malawi(1) | Malawi(2) | Malawi(3) | Malawi(4) | Malawi (5) |
| Mexico: | Mexico | | | | |
| Mongolia: | Mongolia | | | | |
| Mozambique: | Mozambique(1) | Mozambique(2) | Mozambique(3) | | |
| | Mozambique(4) | | | | |
| Namibia: | Namibia | | | | |
| Nepal: | Nepal | | | | |
| Nicaragua: | Nicaragua | | | | |
| Pakistan: | Pakistan (1) | Pakistan (2) | | | |
| Panama: | Panama | | | | |
| Paraguay: | Paraguay | | | | |
| Peru: | Peru | | | | |
| South Africa: | South Africa(1) | South Africa(2) | South Africa(3) | | |
| | South Africa(4) | | | | |
| Sri Lanka: | Sri Lanka | | | | |
| Thailand: | Thailand | | | | |
| Uruguay: | Uruguay (1) | Uruguay (2) | | | |
| Zambia: | Zambia(1) | Zambia(2) | | | |
| Zimbabwe: | Zimbabwe (1) | Zimbabwe (2) | | | |

Return to [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Afghanistan |
| Programme Type | Food based transfer – conditional – food for work |
| Programme Title | WFP Food-For-Work as part of the Afghanistan Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation (PRRO) |
| Agencies Involved | WFP |
| Year started | 2003 |
| Programme Description | The project transfers food to vulnerable people to protect livelihoods and fill food gaps with recovery objectives for construction/rehabilitation of community assets. |
| Programme Objectives | It aims to meet both the immediate food needs of the most vulnerable and enable them to restore their livelihoods. |
| Transfers | Total of 78,974MT. 24 kg per person |
| Targeting | |
| Coverage | 3,256,940 people |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Conducted by WFP evaluations department. |
| Evaluation Results | The first year under-achieved on its targets for food transfer and over-achieved on its targets for numbers of FFW beneficiaries therefore spreading the assistance thinly. Effectiveness in addressing relief needs was also lowered by weak targeting, and as a food transfer, hindrances have included low coverage/participation, short duration of assistance, and indifferent targeting. In terms of asset creation, the project has faced a generally weak connection with livelihood recovery, poor quality/durability of works, and lack of attention to equity issues, especially for irrigation rehabilitation. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The food transfer function was only partly achieved because assistance was thinly spread and because operational plan targets were only 50 percent of assessed need. The average quantity of food received through FFW per benefiting household member (24 kg) was only enough to last 45 days (at 2,100 kcals a day) which was inappropriate for districts with very high to acute food insecurity (8-10 month food gap). |
| Cost | Total cost for WFP PRRO project in Afghanistan 2003-2005 was US\$ 338. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Carloni, A. et al. [2004] A Report from the Office of Evaluation. Full Report of the Evaluation of AFGHANISTAN PRRO 10233. WFP. Posted at: http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/reports/wfp065390.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Argentina(1) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – social pension |
| Programme Title | Pensiones Asistenciales |
| Agencies Involved | Secretaría de Desarrollo Social, Ministerio de Desarrollo Social y Medio Ambiente |
| Year started | Current programme established by the 1994 reform of pension provision, which separated non-contributory from contributory pension programmes. |
| Programme Description | Non-contributory pensions support vulnerable individuals, and individuals who have made a significant contribution to society (war veterans, relatives of disappeared persons, scientific achievement, etc). |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce vulnerability and to provide financial award to specific groups. |
| Transfers | Seven types of benefits ranging in value from around US\$50 to US\$200: (i) old age; (ii) disability; (iii) mothers with 7 children or more; (iv) relatives of disappeared persons; (v) veterans of the Malvinas; (vi) beneficiaries from special legislation; (vii) awards by members of Parliament. |
| Targeting | Categorical, not targeted on the poor. |
| Coverage | 351,000 pensioners by end of 2000, one half from awards by members of Parliament. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | None |
| Evaluation Results | None |
| Welfare Outcomes | No information is available. |
| Cost | 0.23% of GDP |
| Implementation Issues | The criteria for the award of non-contributory pensions are not enforced, in theory conditions for award include that beneficiaries for disability, old age and mothers with 7 or more children cannot be in receipt of social insurance benefits and have no other sources of income. Old age benefits paid from age 70. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Bertranou, F. and Grushka, C. O. [2002] The non-contributory pension programme in Argentina. Assessing the impact on poverty reduction http://www.ilo.org/gimi/RessFileDownload.do?ressourceId=2617&ressFilename=2617.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Argentina(2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers – conditional cash for work |
| Programme Title | Jefes y Jefas ('Male and Female Heads of Household') |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Argentina and World Bank |
| Year started | 2002 |
| Programme Description | Cash transfer programme conditional on labour supply or training. |
| Programme Objectives | The programme was developed as a rapid response to the macroeconomic and financial crisis experienced by Argentina at the end of 2001, and leading to accelerating unemployment and liquidity crisis. |
| Transfers | US\$ 50 (150 Argentinian pesos) per month, or about half mean household income. |
| Targeting | Unemployed heads of household aged 60 or over, or with dependent children aged below 18 or disabled. Initially the programme did not have labour supply conditionalities, these were introduced later on following concerns with leakages. The condition was that participants had to provide 20 hours community service, or training activities, or school attendance or work with a private company for up to six months, but there was no enforcement capacity. |
| Coverage | 2 million households at its peak in late 2002. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | The programme was managed by municipalities with central government funds. There was no reliable monitoring as the number of participants grew from 20,131 in January 2002 to over one million in May 2002 and 1.85m in December 2002. Evaluation was done ex-post with household survey data and using propensity score matching techniques that identify ex-post a control group of non-beneficiaries observationally similar to beneficiaries on a range of household and personal characteristics. |
| Evaluation Results | The programme attenuated the fall in income as a consequence of the crisis and the devaluation of the peso, the mean fall in income in the non-beneficiary control group was US\$83.3, but for the beneficiary group it was only US\$50. The programme absorbed not just unemployed heads of household but also inactive heads, it was estimated that 29% of beneficiaries would have been unemployed without the programme, and 23% would have been inactive. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The programme was effective in protecting very poor households from experiencing greater poverty, taking as the benchmark the food component of the poverty line, without the programme indigence would have been around 10% higher. |
| Cost | Total cost for 2003 was 1% of GDP, financed through a World Bank loan. |
| Implementation Issues | The rapid escalation of the programme did not allow for careful implementation, with monitoring and evaluation and close enforcement of entitlement requisites; but the programme is credited with having reduced acute social unrest. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Galasso, E and Ravallion M. [2003] Social Protection in a Crisis: Argentina's Plan Jefes y Jefas, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3165, November, posted at http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper5.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Argentina (3) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – Conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Programa Familias por la inclusión social (Families for social inclusion) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministerio de Desarrollo Social |
| Year started | 2004 |
| Programme Description | Provides income transfers to families in extreme poverty to support household access to health and education. It has two components, a household transfer and a household and community development programme. |
| Programme Objectives | To promote the development, health and schooling of children in households in extreme poverty, and to avoid social exclusion. |
| Transfers | 150 pesos (US\$48) for the first child and 25 (US\$8) pesos for extra children up to six, paid monthly to the mother |
| Targeting | Households in extreme poverty with children below the age of 19, not in receipt of unemployment or education subsidies. After 2007 youth aged 19-24 not in education or work will also be entitled to the transfer providing they return to education. |
| Coverage | Target population estimated at just below 1 million households, 454,000 households incorporated by end of 2006. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Internal programme monitoring and evaluation |
| Evaluation Results | No information available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Rise in the school enrolment rates of beneficiaries aged 6 to 17 from 76.3% in 2005 to 85% in early 2008; rise in the immunisation rate among beneficiaries aged 0 to 6 from 80.1% in late 2005 to 89.3% in early 2008. |
| Cost | Projected cost in 2007 is 1,261 million pesos (US\$420m) |
| Implementation Issues | Gradual implementation due to capacity and financing constraints, the programme is managed by local centres. The programme allows for the voluntary transfer of beneficiary households with children from the Jefes y Jefas Programme (See Argentina(2)). |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme information posted (Spanish) at www.desarrollosocial.gov.ar/planes/pf/default.asp Progress towards objectives (Spanish) can be access at http://www.mecon.gov.ar/onp/html/proy2007/prog_resultado/7.DESARROLLO.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bangladesh(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Cash for education program in Bangladesh (previously Food for Education) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Bangladesh, USAID |
| Year started | July 1993 as Food for Education, but in 2002 changed to Cash for Education |
| Programme Description | Provides cash transfers to households with children in poor areas on condition that children are enrolled at school and have a minimum attendance level. |
| Programme Objectives | Raise school enrolment and attendance rates, reduce child labour, and reduce dropout rates in primary school. |
| Transfers | Taka 90 per month or US\$ 2.4, equivalent to nearly 4% of total household expenditure for poor households. |
| Targeting | Geographic targeting of poor Unions (economically backward with low literacy rates) in poor Thanas. Then categorical targeting of households with less than 0.5 acres or landless, heads of household who are day labourers, female heads of household (widowed, separated from husband, divorced, disabled husband), and low-income professions (e.g., fishermen, potters, blacksmiths, weavers, and cobblers). Community selection. |
| Coverage | Participation rates per quintile of income, from poorest to richest quintile, have been estimated at 5.3, 4.0, 1.3, 2.0 and 1.1 percent, respectively, with a national average of 2.8%. Limited reach to the extreme poor. In 1994 4,787 schools were covered, with 698,000 students beneficiaries out of a total student population of 1.48 million in participating areas (47% coverage). In 1995-96, over 2 million children participated (13% of total primary enrolment nationally). |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Evaluation of the programme has been undertaken by the Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies, and IFPRI |
| Operational Effectiveness | It costs US\$ 1.6 to deliver US\$1 |
| Cost | US\$ 77m in 2000 |
| Welfare Outcomes | Evaluations register a 9-17 percentage point rise in school enrolment rate (from a base of 55%), and nearly full attendance among beneficiaries, with improvement in long-term opportunities from children. A study has found that the improvement in school attendance has been associated with a less than proportionate reduction in child labour, suggesting a reduction in free/play time. The reduction in the incidence of child labour among boys (girls) was about one-quarter (one eighth) of the rise in school enrolment rate. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Ravallion, M. and Q. Wodon (1999). Does child labour displace schooling? Evidence on behavioral responses to enrollment subsidy, Policy Research Working Paper WPS2116, Washington DC, The World Bank. (Published in Economic Journal 110(462): C158-C175). Working paper posted at: http://econ.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64165259&theSitePK=469372&piPK=64165421&menuPK=64166093&entityID=000094946_99060201584595 Ahmed, A. U. and C. del Ninno (2002). Food for Education Programme in Bangladesh: An evaluation of the Impact on Educational Attainment and Food Security. Washington DC, International Food Policy Research Institute. Posted at http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp138.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Bangladesh(2) |
| Programme Type | Food based transfers – with a complementary package of development services |
| Programme Title | Vulnerable Group Feeding, renamed Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) in 1987 |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Women and Children Affairs, World Food Program and other bilaterals |
| Year started | 1975 onward |
| Programme Description | Programme provides in-kind wheat transfer to enable destitute rural women to improve their economic and social condition. A complementary package of development services was introduced in 1988, including health and nutrition education, literacy training, savings, and support in launching income-earning activities (see Bangladesh(4)). |
| Programme Objectives | The programme enables destitute rural women to improve their economic and social condition. |
| Transfers | Monthly free wheat ration of 31.25 kg for two years. Average monthly transfer to beneficiaries was approximately US\$1 (41 taka) around one fifth of average monthly expenditures. |
| Targeting | Program used geographic targeting, then beneficiary selection done by local committees based on a wide range of categorical indicators (including personal characteristics, assets, family composition). |
| Coverage | 575,000 households. As of 1994, 29% of VGD households received the full development package, while the remainder received only the monthly wheat ration and savings component. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Ministry of Women and Children Affairs, and International Food Policy Research Institute |
| Operational Effectiveness | About 30% to 50% of grain is sold immediately rather than consumed. Around 15% of grain allotted did not reach intended beneficiaries. Quintile participation rates are 8.5, 7.0, 3.9, 2.8, 2.1 percent respectively from poorest to richest, with a national average of 4.9 percent. It costs US\$ 1.68 to deliver US\$1 to beneficiaries, falling to US\$1.44 if all leakages to the non-poor could be eliminated. |
| Cost | At its peak, the annual subsidy was US\$54 million |
| Welfare Outcomes | In-kind transfers of wheat increased wheat consumption dramatically – by 70% for VGD households compared to 13.9% for its cash-based equivalent transfers. This high wheat consumption stems from heavy transaction costs faced by (largely Muslim) female-headed households, in accessing local markets to sell their grain. As a result, VGD wheat distribution generates a greater calorie impact on its target group (16%) than an equivalent cash allocation (10%). There was no noticeable improvement in nutritional status of pre-school children. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | del Ninno, C. and Dorosh, P. [2002] In-Kind Transfers and Household Food Consumption: Implications for targeted food programs in Bangladesh. FCND Discussion Paper 134, IFPRI. Posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp134.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bangladesh(3) |
| Programme Type | Food based transfer – food for work |
| Programme Title | Food-for-Work Program |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Bangladesh |
| Year started | Initiated in 1975 after famine; it is now an integrated rural development programme, supported by World Food Program and bilaterals |
| Programme Description | Provided wages in-kind (usually wheat) to rural labourers for working in labour-intensive public works (water, roads, forestry, fishery) during the dry season. |
| Programme Objectives | Reduce food insecurity |
| Transfers | Average per capita transfer was worth US\$4.5 or around 60% of monthly expenditures. |
| Targeting | Geographic targeting combined with self-targeting to low-income beneficiaries by imposing an arduous work requirement. Primarily targeted at men. |
| Coverage | 100 million workdays of employment per year, directly benefiting about 4 million rural beneficiaries, equivalent to at least 17 days of additional employment for every landless worker in Bangladesh in the construction phase alone. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies and International Food Policy Research Institute; Government of Bangladesh |
| Operational Effectiveness | Successful in reaching those who are landless or near landless. Leakage rates to the non-poor of 30% to 35%. It cost US\$2.1 to transfer US\$1, falling to US\$1.49 if all leakages could be eliminated. 85% of program resources were used during the December-May dry season but with improvements in irrigation this no longer a slack season in many covered areas. |
| Cost | At its peak, annual subsidy of US\$134 million, with food grain distribution of 496,000 MT (over 20% of total national wheat consumption). |
| Welfare Outcomes | Large increase in food consumption and calorie intake at the household level, and improvements in nutrition of the population in the areas covered by the programme, but no noticeable improvement in nutritional status of preschool children. The program had positive effects on agricultural production (via irrigation, change in cropping pattern to high-yielding varieties, and on increases in labour and fertilizer use per unit of land), but these were lower for the small farmers. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Dorosh, P. and S. Haggblade [1995] Filling the Gaps: Consolidating Evidence on the design of Alternative Targeted Food Programmes in Bangladesh, Bangladesh Development Studies (3 and 4): 47-80 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bangladesh(4) |
| Programme Type | Food based - conditional food and asset transfer |
| Programme Title | Income Generation for Vulnerable Group Development Program (IGVGD) |
| Agencies Involved | Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee, World Food Program, Dutch Aid Agency NOVIB, and NGOs |
| Year started | 1987, following evaluation of the Vulnerable Group Feeding and Vulnerable Group Development programmes (see Bangladesh(2)). |
| Programme Description | This programme seeks to extend the outreach of poverty-reduction initiatives beyond the "moderate poor" to the "hardcore poor", who experience the deepest deprivation. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce the chronic food insecurity of extremely poor households. |
| Transfers | Following food support and a period of training, IGVGD participants receive initial loans of about US\$50, rising in year two to finance income generation activities (mainly poultry rearing). |
| Targeting | The poorest and most vulnerable households, including women-headed households. There is a selection of Vulnerable Group Development (VGD) cardholders by locally elected representatives and subsequently vetted by an <i>upazilla</i> -level committee. Recipients should meet three criteria, namely: be widowed or abandoned female heads of household; household owning less than 0.5 acres of land; and earning less than US\$6 per month. |
| Coverage | By 2000, about 200,000 Vulnerable Group Development cardholders were active participants |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Internally by BRAC, and by World Food Program |
| Operational Effectiveness | Upscaling the programme to areas with poor infrastructure and weak communications posed a number of problems, including coordination of government agencies and the delivery of the full development package |
| Cost | It was estimated that by 2000 the subsidy element was US\$135 per household per cycle. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Monthly income of beneficiary households was just under six times larger three years after the start of the programme; percentage of households begging declined from 18 percent at the start of the programme to zero three years later. Beneficiaries reported higher levels of confidence and well-being. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Matin, Imran and David Hulme [2003], Programs For The Poorest: Learning From the IGVGD Program in Bangladesh, World Development Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 647-665. CGAP [2001] Linking Microfinance and Safety Net Programs to Include the Poorest Focus Note 21, Washington DC: CGAP, May. Posted at : http://www.cgap.org/docs/FocusNote_21.html Matin, Imran and Yasmin, Rabeya [2004] Managing scaling up challenges of a programme for the poorest: Case study of Brac's IGVGD programme. Posted at http://www.bracresearch.org/publications_details.php?scat=29&v=0&tid=100 Matin, Imran [2002] Targeted development Programmes for the Extreme Poor: Experiences from BRAC Experiments, CPRC Working Paper 20, IDPM, Manchester. Posted at: http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/20Matin.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Bangladesh(5) |
| Programme Type | Input grants - asset transfers, cash transfers, social development and microcredit |
| Programme Title | Challenging the Frontiers of Poverty Reduction/Targeting the Ultra Poor (CFPR/TUP) |
| Agencies Involved | Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC). Funded by BRAC Donor Consortium (EC, DFID, CIDA, NOVIB, and WFP) |
| Year started | January 2002 |
| Programme Description | The programme extends the 'laddered strategic linkage' approach of IGVGD (Bangladesh(4)) to the very poorest. It builds up the asset base of the poorest, beginning with transfer of income generating assets, health and education support, training, social development and later integrating with microcredit programmes. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty among the poorest and support income generating activities. |
| Transfers | Distribution of income earning assets, cash transfers for limited periods of time, skills training, essential health care support and developing enabling social environment. |
| Targeting | Geographical targeting based on poverty maps to select poorest areas, then selection of villages using BRAC's local knowledge, then participatory wealth ranking exercises to identify locations in villages where the poorest live; then households ranked on targeting indicators, later visually confirmed by BRAC staff. Targeting ensures identification of the poorest but it is also instrumental in developing partnerships with local communities. |
| Coverage | Target coverage is 70,000 households by 2006. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Undertaking by BRAC, involving a baseline survey to be followed by evaluation surveys. Three external assessments completed. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Targeting has been very effective—98% of participants had food consumption below the poverty line at the baseline. More cost effective than IGVGD, and had met its key targets. |
| Welfare Outcomes | At a 2004 mid term assessment study on the 2002 entrants and a comparison group, it was found that: (i) Programme participants fared significantly better in nutrients and in overall calorie intake, with a calorie gap from RDA at 8 percentage points lower for participants; (ii) 97% of participants reported to be in 'food deficit' at the baseline, but this was reduced to only 27% two years later. The corresponding figures for the comparison group of ultra poor households were 82% at the baseline and 75% two years later; (iii) Severe malnourishment (MUAC<125mm) among under-5 children was reduced by 27 percentage points for participants but only 3 percentage points for the comparison group; (iv) An initial asset transfer of US\$ 100 per household in 2002 led to asset value of US\$ 300 in 2005. |
| Cost | Per household cost is \$300. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Towards a profile of the ultra poor in Bangladesh: Findings from CFPR/TUP baseline survey [2004] Research and Evaluation Division, BRAC http://www.bracresearch.org/publications_details.php?scat=29&v=0&tid=94 Imran Matin, Shantana Halder [2004] Combining Methodologies for Better Targeting of the Ultra Poor, Working Paper No. 2, BRAC Research and Evaluation Division http://www.bracresearch.org/working_papers_details.php?scat=28&v=0&tid=89 Results from further evaluations will be posted at www.bracresearch.org |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Bangladesh(6) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers -unconditional - social pensions |
| Programme Title | Old Age Allowance Scheme (OAAS) and Assistance Programme for Widowed and Destitute Women (APWDW) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Social Welfare, Government of Bangladesh |
| Year started | 1997-8 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides a cash transfer to poorest older people and to destitute widows. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce extreme poverty and destitution among older people and widows. |
| Transfers | US\$2 per month |
| Targeting | OAAS targets 10 (5 men and 5 women) oldest and poorest members of each <i>Ward</i> in each <i>Union</i> , the lowest level district. APWDW targets 5 poorest widows and destitute women in each <i>Ward</i> . The selection is done by Ward Committees. |
| Coverage | 403,110 beneficiaries of OAAS and 201,555 beneficiaries of APWDW |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No monitoring and evaluation is planned |
| Operational Effectiveness | Analysis of household data from the 2000 Bangladesh Demographic and Health Survey indicates the percentages of beneficiary households in quintiles of wealth index are (from the poorest to the richest): 6.4; 6.0; 2.5; 0.8; 0.2 respectively. There is a concentration of beneficiary households in the lowest wealth index quintiles. |
| Cost | 0.03% of GDP |
| Welfare Outcomes | No evaluation of the programme is available |
| Other Issues | HelpAge International is collecting information from local networks to assess the implementation of the programme. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Begum, Sharifa [n.d.] Pension and Social Security in Bangladesh, mimeo, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies Barrientos, A. [2004] Cash transfers for older people reduce poverty and inequality, Background paper for WDR06, IDPM, University of Manchester. Posted at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTRANETSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/Pensions_Brazil_Bangladesh_SouthAfrica_Barrientos.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bangladesh(7) |
| Programme Type | Universal conditional cash transfer – human capital development |
| Programme Title | Female Secondary School Stipend Programme |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Education, NORAD, ADB, WB, DFID |
| Year started | First nation-wide programme launched in 1994 |
| Programme Description | The programme pays the school and examination fees and a stipend to all girls in secondary school. |
| Programme Objectives | To increase girl's enrolment and retention in secondary school, to assist them in passing secondary school examination; and to delay girls' marriage. |
| Transfers | Monthly transfers are Taka 25 (US\$3) for grade 6 rising to Taka 60(US\$6) for grades 9 and 10; plus school fees rising from Taka 10/15 to 15/20 according to grade, plus a book allowance and the examination fee. Transfers are conditional on 75% school attendance and a minimum grade of 45% in evaluations and examinations; and on the beneficiary remaining unmarried. |
| Targeting | The programme is universal. |
| Coverage | 4.1 million beneficiaries in 2001. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | There has not been a rigorous impact evaluation of the programme. |
| Evaluation Results | Although it is not possible to isolate the effect of the stipend from all other education related programmes, there has been a strong increase in enrolments at secondary school. Female enrolment at secondary school doubled between 1990 and 1997. However only two thirds of all girls enrolled at primary school transfer to secondary school. This has traditionally been a factor of low incomes, lack of schools, and concerns with vulnerability and security of adolescent girls. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | In 2000 3.9b taka, equivalent to around 15% of secondary school government expenditure and 6 percent of the education budget, of which donors contribute around a quarter. |
| Implementation Issues | Concerns over the sustainability of the programme given ending of donor support; and equity issues in that boys from poor households are not supported while girls from well-off households are. The stipend is paid twice yearly to a bank account created for each of the beneficiaries and with pay points close to school. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Simeen Mahmud [2003] Female secondary school stipend programme in Bangladesh: A critical assessment, posted at http://portal.unesco.org/education/en/file_download.php/6c1807a68c58613a407957a6adb8cc7Female+secondary+school+stipend+programme+in+Bangladesh.doc Raynor, J. and Wesson, K. (2006) The Girls' Stipend Program in Bangladesh. Journal of Education for International Development 2.2 July 2006. http://www.equip123.net/JEID/articles/3/Bangladesh.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bangladesh(8) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development – targeted conditional schooling demand subsidy. |
| Programme Title | Primary Education Stipend Project (PESP) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Bangladesh |
| Year started | 2002 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides a conditional cash transfer to families to keep children in primary education. Families will receive the benefits as long as the child attends 85 percent of school days, and obtains at least 40 percent marks in the annual examinations. |
| Programme Objectives | The main aim of the programme is to keep 40 percent children enrolled in primary schools from poor families throughout rural Bangladesh. |
| Transfers | The transfer is taka 100 (US \$ 1.5) per month to families with one child in primary school and taka 125 per month to families with two or more children. |
| Targeting | Identification of 40 per cent of pupils enrolled in grades 1-5 from the poorest households is conducted at the school level by the School Managing Committee (SMC) with the assistance of head teachers, and reviewed and approved by Upzila education officer. |
| Coverage | Reached one third of children from the poorest socio economic category. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | M&E conducted by Education Watch - Campaign for Popular Education (CAMPE) |
| Evaluation Results | There is a problem with corruption in the management and administration of the programme, whereby “cuts” are taken. 46 percent of beneficiaries did not receive the full amount of stipend - almost forty percent of the recipients received Tk 200 or less instead of Tk 300. Students from poorer family backgrounds, on average, received less than others. There was pressure on SMCs and teachers to influence selection of students and inducement to alter school records to meet eligibility. Leakage is also a problem: 27 percent of children from affluent households received the stipend. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Information not available. |
| Cost | Budget for the year 2002-3 was 6,629,454,000 Taka. The total cost of delivery per Taka is Taka 0.040. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Ahmed, S. [2005] Delivery Mechanisms of Cash Transfer Programs to the Poor in Bangladesh. World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper Series. Posted at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/0520web.pdf Education Watch Report [2003/4] Quality with Equity: The Primary Education Agenda. Posted at: www.campebd.org/download/EWReport20034FullEnglish.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bolivia |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfers - social pensions |
| Programme Title | BONO DIGNIDAD (REPLACES BONOSOL 'Bono Solidario') |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Bolivia |
| Year started | 1997 as BONOSOL, relaunched as BONO DIGNIDAD in February 2008 |
| Programme Description | Universal |
| Programme Objectives | To redistribute to citizens reaching 60 years of age, a cash transfer from the proceeds of the privatisation of utilities, and to increase the incomes of these groups in old age. |
| Transfers | BONOSOL began to be paid in the period leading to a presidential election in May 1997 at US\$248 per year per beneficiary. The payment of BONOSOL was suspended after the elections and re-introduced as BOLIVIDA at a lower level of US\$60 per year per beneficiary. After another presidential election, BONOSOL was re-established at US\$240 in 2002. In 2007 the new President Evo Morales replaced BONOSOL with BONO DIGNIDAD, now as a tax-financed non-contributory pension available from age 60 and paid at two levels, US\$320 for beneficiaries without a contributory pension and at US\$240 for those entitled to one. |
| Targeting | Categorical targeting, population aged 60 and over. |
| Coverage | Universal. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No monitoring and evaluation processes are in place, but the fund for the benefits is subject to annual audits. |
| Evaluation Results | |
| Welfare Outcomes | Studies show that the programme has had significant effects upon poverty and livelihoods in rural areas of Bolivia, through lifting credit and liquidity constraints. |
| Cost | Annual cost is 1.3% of GDP. Until 2008, the pension was intended to be financed from the returns of privatised utilities but in practice sales of shares were required to bridge a growing financing gap due to lower than expected returns. BONO DIGNIDAD is partly financed from the proceeds of energy taxes which go to municipalities to support development projects but which in the view of the new President some municipalities were not spending in full. Municipalities which opposed his administration have resisted this decision. |
| Implementation Issues | The programme was very politicised from the start, as it was tied up to the privatisation process. It was initially presented as a redistribution of the profits from privatisation to the cohorts involved in supporting the establishment and development of state owned utilities. Studies had shown that at current levels of benefits in payment, the fund will run out much earlier than expected. The recent decision to re-nationalise utilities undermined this source of financing and led to a switch to energy taxes. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Martinez, S. [2005] Pensions, poverty and household investment in Bolivia, mimeo. Posted at http://emlab.berkeley.edu/users/webfac/bardhan/e271_f04/martinez.pdf Muller, Katharina [2008] Contested Universalism: from Bonosol to Renta Dignidad in Bolivia, in International Journal of Social Welfare (17) 1-10 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Brazil(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers – conditional – cash for human development - targeted conditional schooling demand subsidy and supply side provision of extended school day |
| Programme Title | Child Labour Eradication Programme (PETI) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Brazil, ILO, World Bank, USAID, UNICEF |
| Year started | Piloted in 1996, then extended to all other areas in 1999. Incorporated into <i>Bolsa Familia</i> in 2006. (See Brazil(3)) |
| Programme Description | The programme provides a cash transfer to households with children of school age working in hazardous or degrading occupations, and funding to school willing to offer an extended school day with activities focused on improving children’s educational attainment. |
| Programme Objectives | Eradicate the worst forms of child labour (e.g. those involving health risk); reduce child labour; and provide remedial education and training. |
| Transfers | US\$11-17 per child per month |
| Targeting | Geographic targeting of municipalities with high incidence of hazardous child labour; then selection of poor households with per capita income below one half the minimum wage. |
| Coverage | Poor households with children aged 7-14 working in hazardous or degrading conditions, 866,000 beneficiary children in 2002. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Brazil’s Audit Office |
| Operational Effectiveness | An evaluation of the programme identified a number of areas for improvement in performance: need for greater uniformity in criteria for inclusion of households in the programme, improvements in the quality of the extended school day, speed up in transfer of resources directly to beneficiaries through the distribution of magnetic cards, priority to be given to the poorest Municipalities. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Fall in the incidence of child labour from 19.6% in 1992 to 12.7% in 2001; rise in completed schooling; rise in school enrolments; participating children have lower probability of working in a risky job. |
| Cost | 0.04% of GDP in 2002 |
| Other Issues | Some municipalities were initially excluded from the program due to budget constraints. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Brazilian Court of Audit [2003] TCU Evaluation of the Child Labor Eradication Program, Brasilia. Posted at : http://www2.tcu.gov.br/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/TCU/PUBLICACOES/PUBLICACAO_LINGUA_ESTRANGEIRA/INGLES/EXECUTIVE_SUMMARIES_3.PDF Yap,Y, Sedlacek,G. and Orazem, P. [2002] Limiting child labor through behaviour-based income transfers: An Experimental evaluation of the PETI Program in rural Brazil, Washington DC: The World Bank. Posted at: http://www.iadb.org/res/publications/pubfiles/pubS-223.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Brazil(2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers – conditional – cash for human development - targeted conditional schooling demand subsidy |
| Programme Title | <i>Bolsa Escola</i> , (upscaled to <i>Bolsa Familia</i> in 2003. (See Brazil(3)) |
| Agencies Involved | Brazilian Government, decentralized programme with strong local control and financing |
| Year started | Upscaled to federal programme in 2001, initiated in Campinas in 1995 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides cash transfers to poor households with children of school age conditional on school attendance |
| Programme Objectives | Raise school enrolment, reduce chronic poverty |
| Transfers | US\$ 5 - US\$ 15 per household |
| Targeting | Participation of municipalities is demand driven; then geographic targeting within municipalities; then selection of poor households with per capita income less than one half the minimum wage. |
| Coverage | Poor households with children aged 6-15; 8.2m children covered in 2002, living in 5m households or 4.7% of population. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | To date evaluations have been undertaken by independent researchers. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Before 2001, decentralisation strengthened local ownership of the programme, but produced large differences in programme design and benefit provision across municipalities. In 2001, <i>Bolsa Escola</i> became a federal programme, largely funded by central government. |
| Welfare Outcomes | An evaluation based on 2000 Census data finds that school attendance rates among poor children have risen by 4 percentage points from a high base of 95%. The evaluation does not find strong evidence that the programme has reduced child labour. |
| Cost | US\$ 800m or 0.13% of GDP |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Cardoso, E. and Souza, A. P. [2004] The Impact of cash transfers on child labor and school attendance in Brazil, mimeo, University of São Paulo. Posted at: http://www.vanderbilt.edu/Econ/wparchive/workpaper/vu04-w07.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Brazil(3) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - conditional - cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Bolsa Familia |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Brazil – central, state, and municipal agencies |
| Year started | October 2003 |
| Programme Description | Bolsa Familia consolidates several existing cash transfers programmes: Bolsa Escola (a cash transfer conditional on schooling. (See Brazil(2)), Bolsa Alimentação (an unconditional cash transfer to indigent households), and Auxilio-Gás (an unconditional cash transfer subsidising poor households' consumption of gas), into a single programme targeted on households in extreme poverty, and poor households with children. |
| Programme Objectives | The programme has two main objectives: (1) to reduce hunger, poverty and inequality through a cash transfer conditional on guaranteed access to education, health and nutrition services; and (2) reduce social exclusion by facilitating the empowerment of poor and vulnerable households. |
| Transfers | Households in extreme poverty (with per capita incomes below US\$ 30 (R\$60) or a quarter of the minimum wage) receive R\$50 a month plus US\$7.5 (R\$15) per child below 16 years of age up to three. Households in poverty (with per capita household income between R\$50 and R\$100) receive R\$15 per child below 16 years of age up to three. |
| Targeting | Targeted through a means test, at registration with Cadastro Único, a database of vulnerable households applying for support. |
| Coverage | 9 million households by April 2006 (19.5% of population). |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Monitoring by central government, state and municipal agencies and through an Audit Network; but no explicit evaluation has been set up. |
| Evaluation Results | Too early in the life cycle of the programme. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Too early in the life cycle of the programme, but conditionalities applied to primary health care, schooling, and nutrition education are expected to result in improvements in these areas. |
| Cost | US\$ 3.1 billion or R\$6.5 billion by December 2005. 0.33% of GDP. |
| Implementation Issues | Gradual implementation of the programme, and consolidation of existing programmes. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Government of Brazil – Bolsa Familia website at http://www.mds.gov.br/bolsafamilia/ |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Brazil(4) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – social pension |
| Programme Title | Beneficio de Prestação Continuada |
| Agencies Involved | Federal Government of Brazil |
| Year started | Established in 1993 following the 1988 Constitution, replaced and upgraded the ‘Renda Mensual Vitalícia’ (RMV) programme - a social assistance pension. |
| Programme Description | The programme supports poor individuals aged 65 and over with a monthly cash transfer. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty and vulnerability among poor older people excluded from social insurance schemes. |
| Transfers | One minimum wage, US\$55 in 2002 per month per beneficiary |
| Targeting | Individuals aged 65 and over living in households with per capita household income below a quarter of the minimum wage. The means test is reviewed every 3 years. |
| Coverage | 0.7 million beneficiaries in 2002 (including RMV beneficiaries). |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Monitoring and evaluation by the implementing Ministry. |
| Evaluation Results | Studies have shown the programme is reasonably well targeted on poorer households. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Studies have shown the programme has important effects in reducing poverty and vulnerability among older people excluded from social insurance and their dependants. |
| Cost | 0.3% of GDP annually. |
| Implementation Issues | Selection of beneficiaries is by application and means test (beneficiaries selected have per capita household income below one quarter of the minimum wage). |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Schwarzer, H. and Querino, A.C. [2002] Non-contributory pensions in Brazil. The impact on poverty reduction http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper11.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Brazil(5) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – social pension – informal workers in rural economy |
| Programme Title | Prêvidencia Rural |
| Agencies Involved | Federal Government of Brazil - INSS |
| Year started | Established in 1991 following the 1988 Constitution, but replaced and upgraded existing programmes such as FUNRURAL going back to the early 1970s. |
| Programme Description | The programme supports informal workers in the rural economy with cash transfers on reaching the age of 55 if women and 60 if men, or disabled. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty and vulnerability among older people engaged in rural employment and excluded from social insurance schemes. |
| Transfers | One minimum wage, US\$55 in 2002 per month per beneficiary. |
| Targeting | Older informal workers in rural areas not covered by formal social insurance. |
| Coverage | 4.6 million beneficiaries in 2002. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No monitoring and evaluation system are in place, but subject to parliamentary and national audit court scrutiny. |
| Evaluation Results | Studies have shown the programme is reasonably well targeted on poorer regions and poor households. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Studies have shown the programme has important effects in supporting the household economy and rural livelihoods, the absence of means and activity tests facilitate these effects. |
| Cost | 0.7% of GDP annually. |
| Implementation Issues | Selection of beneficiaries is by application accompanied by proof of having worked in informal employment, agriculture, fishing, or mining, such as a supporting letter from farmers unions. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Schwarzer, H. and Querino, A.C. [2002] Non-contributory pensions in Brazil. The impact on poverty reduction http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper11.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Cambodia (1) |
| Programme Type | Fee waiver for school fees – targeted |
| Programme Title | Priority Action Program (PAP) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Cambodia with some components integrated with donors. |
| Year started | 2000 |
| Programme Description | PAP provides schools with public resources that partially compensate for the removal of school charges for registration, learning materials, and tests – particularly at the primary level. There are 12 PAPs in total, four of which specifically refer to the basic education sector, and include a cash school subsidy programme. These are expected to run through the 2005-06 school year. |
| Programme Objectives | The aim of PAP is to reduce the cost burden on the poorest families to increase primary school enrollment through removing registration and other school fees, providing remedial classes, and grants to schools for pre-determined operational expenditures to replace school charges previously imposed on households. |
| Transfers | |
| Targeting | |
| Coverage | Nationwide coverage to 24 provinces and 183 districts. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | M&E conducted on pilot phase December 2000. An impact evaluation of PAP primary education is being undertaken based on data collected as part of the Public Expenditure Tracking Survey. |
| Evaluation Results | Played an important role in the improvement of primary net enrolment rates, but the effectiveness of PAP has been impaired by payment delays from the provincial treasury. School operational budgets have been utilised as intended, but schools report a lack of flexibility in using funds to address specific local needs. Roughly 150,000 students received an additional 100 to 120 hours of instruction, representing an incremental gain of 20% to 25% on the normal school year. An additional 86,000 students moved to the next grade. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Household direct costs have been reduced as a result of the introduction of PAP in 2000, but they do remain substantial, particularly in the form of pocket money, transport and supplementary tutoring. |
| Cost | Total cost of PAP CR 75 billion. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | World Bank [2005] Cambodia: Quality Basic Education for All. Human Development Sector Unit, East Asia and the Pacific Region, World Bank. Posted at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEAPREGTOPEDUCATION/Resources/cambodia_efa_jan05.pdf Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport [2001] Priority Action Program For Improving The Quality And Effectiveness Of Basic Education. Kingdom of Cambodia. Posted at: http://www.moeys.gov.kh/details-directions01-02/PAPPlan2001/pap.htm |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Cambodia (2) |
| Programme Type | Conditional cash transfer for human development |
| Programme Title | Targeted Assistance for Education of Poor Girls and Indigenous Children |
| Agencies Involved | Funded by the Japan Fund for Poverty Reduction (JFPR) |
| Year started | 2002 |
| Programme Description | Families receive cash transfers provided their daughter is enrolled in school, maintains a passing grade, and is absent without "good reason" fewer than 10 days in a year. The girl receives a scholarship for the three years of the lower secondary cycle. |
| Programme Objectives | Improve equity and increase access and retention of poor girls and children of ethnic minorities in lower secondary education through the provision of scholarships. |
| Transfers | Scholarships are classified into three categories: i) \$45 per year for those who live less than 4 km in non-ethnic minority areas and less than 3 km in ethnic minority areas ii) \$60 per year for those who live further than 4 km in non-ethnic minority areas and those who live from 3 km to 7 km in ethnic minority areas and iii) \$90 per year for those who live further than 7 km in ethnic-minority areas. |
| Targeting | 75 secondary schools located in the poorest communes of 17 provinces. Special scholarships are also offered to ethnic minority children (boys and girls). The selection process is based on four categories: 1) poverty and socioeconomic status, 2) risk of dropout 3) distance to school and 4) parents' attitudes towards education |
| Coverage | 15,000 children including 13,500 girls and 1,500 boys and girls of ethnic minorities receive a scholarship. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | Program impacts are largest among girls who come from poorer households, have parents with less education, and live farther away from a secondary school. The program appears to have dramatically reduced socioeconomic gradients in enrolment and attendance. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | \$3 million |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Filmer, D. and Shady, N. (2006) Getting girls into school :evidence from a scholarship program in Cambodia http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/ Asian Development Bank Cambodia case study "Japan Fund For Poverty Reduction (JFPR) 9028-CAM: Targeted Assistance for Education of Poor Girls and Indigenous Children, 2002" Posted at: http://www.adb.org/gender/practices/education/cam002.asp |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Cambodia (3) |
| Programme Type | Fee waiver for health services |
| Programme Title | Health Equity Fund (HEF) |
| Agencies Involved | Various donors, local NGOs |
| Year started | 2000 |
| Programme Description | Health Equity Funds compensate providers for their income forgone due to waivers and may also help provide payment for other costs related to health care, such as transport, lodging, and food for the patient and for his/her relatives. Waivers to poor patients may be partial or full. |
| Programme Objectives | To compensate health providers for the cost recovery revenue forgone from waivers and provide exemptions poor patients. |
| Transfers | In Sotnikum, the cost of supporting each hospitalized patient was, on average \$10.00, making it possible for poor and near poor patients to receive medical services worth \$45.00 (\$5.00 co-financing by the HEF; \$40.00 financed by the government on average, through the support of recurrent hospital expenditures) |
| Targeting | Patients wishing to be waived from fees are subject to a means test to determine their eligibility. |
| Coverage | Areas include Thmar Pouck, Sotnikum, Phnom Penh, Takeo |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | HEFs are reported effectively target poor individuals. The initial operation of HEFs has been characterized by under-coverage. Further dissemination of HEFs may lead to greater demand for their assistance. HEF is also deemed a fiscally efficient policy and there was virtually no leakage of benefits to the non-poor. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Enables access by the poor to timely and good quality care. Such a payment confers an economic benefit to providers which makes them indifferent between treating HEF beneficiaries and regularly paying patients. The project effectively protected the poor against the high costs of health care, and also prevented people from falling into poverty as a consequence of high health care costs. |
| Cost | 8.6% of hospital costs (in Sotnikum) |
| Implementation Issues | Not all HEFs operate in exactly the same way. Differences include the management of the waiver process; who holds the responsibility to establish eligibility; the method used to pay the provider; the insertion of HEF in referral system; and the type and extent of financial protection. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Bitran, R., Turbat, V., Meessen, B. and Van Damme, W. (n.d.) Preserving Equity in Health in Cambodia: Health Equity Funds and Prospects for Replication. Bitran and Associates, World Bank and Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium. Posted at: http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/48614/oj_bitran.pdf Hardeman, W., Van Damme, W., Van Pelt, M., Por, I., Kimvan, H., and Meessen, B. (2004) Access to Health Care for All? User fees plus a Health Equity Fund in Sotnikum, Cambodia. Health Policy and Planning 19(1): 22-32. Oxford University Press. Posted at: http://heapol.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/19/1/22 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Bangladesh(9) |
| Programme Type | Environmental adaptation and livelihood protection |
| Programme Title | CHARS Livelihood Programme (CLP) |
| Agencies Involved | DFID |
| Year started | 2004 |
| Programme Description | The programme combines a range of interventions to strengthen environmental adaptation and livelihood protection, including infrastructure development, cash for work, asset building and community development |
| Programme Objectives | The programme aims to improve the livelihood security of the very poorest people living in the riverine areas of Kurigram, Gaibandha, Jamalpur, Bogra and Sirajganj districts; north-west Bangladesh. |
| Transfers | |
| Targeting | The chars are sandy islands and low-lying flood-prone areas at the river's edge that are deposited, eroded, and re-deposited by the Jamuna River in Bangladesh. Around 3.5 million people inhabit chars in the CLP's intervention areas; with around 1 million actually living on island chars that are surrounded by water for the majority of the year. It is the poorest households living on these island chars who are the main target group of the CLP. |
| Coverage | 0.8 million ultra-poor |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Operational Effectiveness | |
| Cost | The programme has been funded with a US\$100 grant from DFID |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme website is at: http://www.clp-bangladesh.org/ |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Chile(1) |
| Programme Type | Integrated Extreme Poverty Eradication |
| Programme Title | Chile Solidario |
| Agencies Involved | Ministerio de Cooperación y Planificación (MIDEPLAN) and FOSIS (Social Fund) |
| Year started | 2002 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides an integrated programme of support to households in extreme poverty in Chile to overcome their situation. In an initial period of six months, participating households work intensively with a social worker to identify and address their deficits in seven dimensions: registration, work, health, employment, income, education, and household dynamics. In addition there is a cash transfer to support this activity. In the following phase, the social workers must ensure that households have access to the relevant public programmes. Minimum levels are set as targets for each of the different dimensions (common to all households in the programme). The expectation is that after households achieve these minimum levels, they would overcome extreme poverty. |
| Programme Objectives | To eradicate extreme poverty in the country. |
| Transfers | Equivalent to fixed and variable costs of water and sewage up to a ceiling paid to the household; plus a schooling subsidy for each child from 7 th grade in primary education to 4 th grade in middle education paid to the schools subject to retention of the children. Cash transfers of US\$20/first 6 months, US\$15/second 6 months, US\$10/third 6 months, US\$7/for next 42 months. |
| Targeting | Selection of households based on whether they have incomes below that required to pay for a basic basket of foodstuff, also referred to as indigence in Latin America. |
| Coverage | 165,000. Target is 225,000 households in extreme poverty – gradual incorporation of households into the programme. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | CEPAL did an evaluation study during 2002 using secondary information and a random sample of households in the programme. The University of Chile did a 'perception of the programme' survey evaluation – further evaluation will be undertaken with household data. |
| Evaluation Results | The programme has good vertical efficiency as only 2.7% of households in the programme are considered to be in the target population. Also high degree of satisfaction with the programme. In terms of the minimum levels for each of the dimensions targeted, by end 2002 17.5% of targets had been achieved, and 1.7% of households had overcome extreme poverty. |
| Welfare Outcomes | See above in terms of minimum levels of achievement under the seven dimensions identified. |
| Cost | 0.02% of GDP. |
| Implementation Issues | Slow deployment of the programme, given its labour intensive character. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | See MIDEPLAN Chile Solidario website with some material in English: www.mideplan.cl Also see www.chilesolidario.gov.cl |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Chile(2) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – social pension |
| Programme Title | Programa de Pensiones Asistenciales |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Chile - INP |
| Year started | 1975 |
| Programme Description | A non-contributory pension programme supporting old or disabled individuals without other sources of income. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty and vulnerability among old and disabled poor. |
| Transfers | Around US\$60 per month per beneficiary. |
| Targeting | Categorical. Individuals aged 65 and over, or disabled aged 18 and over, with household income below US\$60 per month. Applicants are interviewed and allocated a poverty ranking based on an index of demographic, housing and income variables (Ficha CAS). Provided the index value is below a regional poverty threshold they are placed on a waiting list. The total national budget for assistencial pensions is capped. |
| Coverage | 358,813 beneficiaries in 2000. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | There is no explicit monitoring an evaluation system. |
| Evaluation Results | The pensions programme has a significant impact on poverty reduction. Subtracting pension income from household income and recalculating poverty incidence would raise extreme poverty (indigence) by 7.5 percentage points from a base of 12.8% percent, and poverty by 2.5 percentage points from a base of 25%. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | 0.38% of GDP annually. |
| Implementation Issues | Rationing of entry into the programme based on a budgetary cap reduces the insurance properties of the pension programme. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Bertranou, F.; Solorio, C. and van Ginneken,W. [2002] Pensiones no contributivas y asistenciales. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica y Uruguay, book available in Spanish at: http://www.oitchile.cl/pdf/publicaciones/pro/pro012.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | China |
| Programme Type | Public assistance |
| Programme Title | Minimum Living Subsidy Scheme |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Civil Affairs and City authorities (civil affairs departments) |
| Year started | The first MLSS was launched in Shanghai in June 1993, then gradually spread to other cities, numbering 207 by July 1997. In 1997 the Chinese State Council agreed that each city should have an MLSS. Full coverage was probably achieved at the turn of the century. |
| Programme Description | The scheme pays the difference between the monthly income of poor households and a minimum level set at the city level. |
| Programme Objectives | To assist poor households in urban China, especially in the context of structural adjustment and the marketisation of SOEs. |
| Transfers | Vary by benefit line (poverty line) and by depth of poverty. In principle the benefit line is the costing of 20 items in a basic food and non-food basket (does not include medical costs or education user fees). In practice different cities use different methods of arriving at this benefit line, and financial capacity is an important influence. Transfers to childless and elderly people can reach US\$10 a month in Guangdong, but only US\$6 in western regions. |
| Targeting | Poor households need to register with the civil affairs departmental office, where a means test is done, and should in principle be reviewed at regular intervals. In practice the process is not stringently applied. |
| Coverage | Coverage rate was 0.44 of the urban population in 1998, doubling to 0.88 in 2000, and trebling to 2.44 in 2001. In 2004 coverage rate was 4.05 percent. It only covers registered residents, and therefore excludes unregistered migrants. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | The benefit line has been monitored quite closely by the Ministry of Civil Affairs, but there are no rigorous evaluations of the impact on poverty. |
| Evaluation Results | Assuming the benefit line closely tracks a poverty line, and that there are insignificant leakages to the non-poor, the impact of the MLSS is to eradicate the poverty gap up to the benefit line. The impact on poverty headcount is, under these assumptions, equivalent to the coverage rate above. However, the ratio of benefit recipients to the numbers estimated to be poor ranges from a low of 4.9% in Shandong to a high of 92.1% in Tibet. For the country as a whole the rate is 17.9 percent. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The MLSS is an income supplement public assistance programme, but the introduction of user charges in education and health and the fact that these are not included in the calculation of the benefit lines suggests that other important deficits are not addressed. |
| Cost | In 2003, the central government contribution to the MLSS was 9.2b yuan or 61% of total MLSS expenditure. |
| Implementation Issues | Decentralised implementation of the MLSS is essential given the heterogeneity of social economic conditions in China, but this also implies inequalities in assistance based on local financial capacity. Systems of registration and review of the means test are an issue. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Salomon, C., Yuan, R., Fei, X., and K. Maher [2004] Urban Poverty, Childhood Poverty and Social Protection in China: Critical issues, CHIP Report 3. Posted at: http://www.childhoodpoverty.org/index.php/action=documentfeed/doctype=pdf/id=83/ Social Security White Paper [2004] China.org.cn Posted at: http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN019944.pdf Hussain, A. [2003] "Urban Poverty in China: Measurement, Patterns and Policies" ILO. Posted at http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/download/docs/china.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Colombia(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers – conditional – cash for human development - targeted conditional cash transfer - schooling and health demand subsidy |
| Programme Title | <i>Familias en Acción</i> |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Colombia and Inter-American Development Bank |
| Year started | 2001/2002 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides a cash transfer to poor households with children in poor areas conditional on school attendance and use of primary health centres. |
| Programme Objectives | Reduce poverty among households with children; raise school enrolments; provide a safety net. |
| Transfers | US\$6 schooling subsidy for children in primary school, and US\$12 for children in secondary school; US\$20 to households with children below 7 years of age; benefits paid to the mother. |
| Targeting | 622 municipalities with fewer than 100,000 inhabitants, with a bank and health and education infrastructure, then households with children 0-17 identified as poor by proxy means test. |
| Coverage | 4.6% of total population in 2005. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Undertaken by the Institute for Fiscal Studies, through a baseline household survey and repeated evaluation surveys. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Only households registered with SISBEN, a targeting instrument used in Colombia to rank poor households, are eligible for participation in the programme. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Raised school attendance by 13% in urban sector and 5% in rural sector; raised household consumption by 19.5% in rural areas and 9.3% in urban areas; reduced incidence of undernourished infants, 12 month-old boys are 0.44 centimetres taller among beneficiary households; raised incidence of immunisation. |
| Cost | US\$100m (2004) or 0.12% of GDP |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Attanasio, O.; Battistin, E.; Fitzsimons, E.; Mesnard, A. and Vera-Hernandez, M. [2005] How effective are conditional cash transfers? Evidence from Colombia, IFS Briefing Notes, London: IFS. Posted at: http://www.ifs.org.uk/edepo/publications.php?publication_id=3214 See also the list of evaluation papers on the World Bank page: http://go.worldbank.org/J48604XEU0 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Colombia(2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers for human development – education vouchers |
| Programme Title | Programa de Ampliación de Cobertura de la Educación Secundaria (PACES, 'Programme for the Extension of Secondary School Coverage') |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Colombia and World Bank |
| Year started | 1991 |
| Programme Description | Secondary education vouchers subsidising school fees for children from low-income households. |
| Programme Objectives | To raise secondary school enrolments among low income groups in Colombia in private schools. |
| Transfers | US\$ 191 per year in 1998, renewed every year subject to school performance. |
| Targeting | Geographical targeting through classifying neighbourhoods according to socio-economic conditions into six possible strata, and selection of the bottom two strata. Then targeting pupils in these neighbourhoods about to enter secondary school, but who attended public primary schools. As supply exceeded demand, the final selection was through a lottery. |
| Coverage | 125,000 pupils. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Ex-post evaluation through interviews of a sample of participants. |
| Evaluation Results | The concentration of vouchers in municipalities well served by private school may have skewed participants towards the better off among the poor, but the fact that selection had involved a lottery strengthens the evaluation results among participants. Evaluation results suggest that lottery winners (including those that took up the voucher and those that did not to avoid sample selection bias) showed 0.8 additional years of schooling compared to non-lottery winners; and their probability of repeating a grade was 5-6 percentage points lower. Lottery winners interviewed three years after entering the programme showed higher mathematical, reading and writing test scores than non-lottery winners. |
| Welfare Outcomes | It was also found that lottery winners had significantly lower rates of early marriage and cohabitation than non-lottery winners. Lottery winners showed higher household expenditure on education. |
| Cost | Subtracting the cost to the government of providing secondary education through the public sector, the additional cost was estimated at US\$ 24 per pupil per year. |
| Implementation Issues | Typically, municipalities better served by private schools were more likely to participate in the programme, thus excluding the poorest pupils. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | King, E. et al [1997] Colombia's targeted education voucher program: Features, coverage and participation, WP3 Series on Impact Evaluation of Education reforms, The World Bank. Posted at: http://rru.worldbank.org/Documents/PapersLinks/1163.pdf Mayer, P. [2004] The use of education vouchers in Colombia, Occasional Paper 92, national centre for the Study of Privatization in Education. Posted at: http://www.ncspe.org/publications_files/OP92.pdf Angrist, J. et al [2001] Vouchers for Private Schooling in Colombia: Evidence from a Randomized Experiment. Posted at: http://www.povertyactionlab.com/papers/Vouchers%20For%20Private%20School%20in%20Columbia.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Costa Rica (1) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – social pension |
| Programme Title | Régimen No Contributivo de Pensiones por Monto Básico |
| Agencies Involved | Caja Costarricense de Seguro Social |
| Year started | 1974 |
| Programme Description | Cash transfer programme supporting older or disabled poorer individuals excluded from social insurance schemes. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty in old age or as a consequence of disability. |
| Transfers | US\$33.5 per beneficiary per month. |
| Targeting | Categorical, older and disabled poor individuals. |
| Coverage | 76,008 beneficiaries. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | There is no monitoring and evaluation system in place. |
| Evaluation Results | Poor targeting is associated with leakages to the non-poor of around 40 percent of benefits, and limited coverage of the poor. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | 0.18% of GDP annually. |
| Implementation Issues | Poor targeting due to limited administrative and operational capacity. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Duran-Valverde,F. [2002] Anti-poverty programmes in Costa Rica. The non-contributory pension scheme http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper8.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Costa Rica (2) |
| Programme Type | In kind transfers – human development |
| Programme Title | SUPEREMONOS |
| Agencies Involved | Instituto Mixto de Apoyo Social, Government of Costa Rica |
| Year started | |
| Programme Description | Provides food coupon to poor households with children aged 6 to 18 conditional on children enrolment in school |
| Programme Objectives | Improve school enrolment and attendance among poor households |
| Transfers | Coupon equivalent to US\$30 per month per household redeemable at any supermarket, for the 10 months of the school year |
| Targeting | The target population is children in poor households aged 6 to 18, selection is based on a proxy means test |
| Coverage | 12,234 households in 2001 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No monitoring and evaluation processes outside internal reports on programme coverage and performance, external ex post evaluation carried out by IADB researchers |
| Evaluation Results | Depending on the methodologies used to estimate the impact of the programme, programme beneficiaries are between 2.7 and 8.7 percent more likely to attend school than comparable non-beneficiaries; but lower than impacts for Mexico's <i>Progres</i> a or Nicaragua's <i>Red de Protección Social</i> . No evidence that the programme reduced child labour. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Increased school enrolment and attendance. |
| Cost | US\$3.4m in 2002 |
| Implementation Issues | After 2002 the programme was replaced by <i>Avancemos</i> |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme information at: http://www1.worldbank.org/sp/safetynets/CCT/CostaRica%20CCT.pdf Dureya, S. and Morrison, A. [2004] The effect of conditional transfers on school performance and child labor: Evidence from an ex-post impact evaluation in Costa Rica. Available from: http://www.iadb.org/res/publications/pubfiles/pubWP-505.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Dominican Republic |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Programa Solidaridad |
| Agencies Involved | Office of the President, UNDP |
| Year started | 2005 |
| Programme Description | Provide income transfers to households in extreme and moderate poverty, conditional on visits to health centres, school attendance of children, and registration |
| Programme Objectives | Promote the human capital of households in poverty, and guarantee the exercise of their rights |
| Transfers | Monthly household transfer is US\$17 plus a school attendance transfer of US\$4.5 for every child between the ages of 6 and 16, up to 4. For a family with four children, the transfers are equivalent to 20% of household expenditure and 40% of food expenditure. |
| Targeting | Households in extreme and moderate poverty, selected through geographic targeting of marginalised communities and proxy means test selection of households |
| Coverage | 252,000 households incorporated by end 2007 (10% of population) |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Planned experimental evaluation, beginning in 2006 with a baseline survey, with follow up surveys in 2008 and 2010 |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | US\$57m in 2006, equivalent to 0.34% of GDP, 1.15% of government expenditure |
| Implementation Issues | The programme consolidates two programmes: <i>Comer es primero</i> involving in kind and cash transfers to poor households, and <i>Incentivo a la asistencia escolar</i> a school attendance subsidy. By June 2007 216,106 households received the household transfer, but only 50,000 received the school attendance transfer. Registration to obtain a magnetic card which guarantees payment has proved problematic. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Summary programme information can be accessed at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SAFETYNETSANDTRANSFERS/Resources/281945-1131738167860/1898367-1150829758165/DominicanRepublic_Solidaridad.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Ecuador |
| Programme Type | Originally began as unconditional cash transfer programmes to poor households with children, elderly and disabled – but conditioning on schooling and health introduced in 2003 |
| Programme Title | Bono Solidario relaunched as Bono de Desarrollo Humano in 2004 |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Ecuador |
| Year started | September 1998 as compensation to the poor for withdrawal of price subsidies on petrol and derivatives. |
| Programme Description | The programme pays monthly means tested benefits to poor households with children, elderly and the disabled. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty. |
| Transfers | Benefits to mothers are around US\$15 per month, and to the elderly and disabled US\$7.5 per month. On average the transfer is equivalent to 11 percent of beneficiary households' expenditure. The transfer is paid to the mother. |
| Targeting | Means tests include a maximum level of household aggregate income (US\$150), that no one in the household is in formal employment, and that no one in the household is covered by social insurance. Targeting has not been applied consistently. |
| Coverage | 1.2 m. beneficiary households by 2004, around 45 percent of all households. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Monitoring and evaluation has been set in place for the 2004 re-launched programme, but some independent evaluation studies are available. |
| Evaluation Results | Analysis of 1999 household data, very soon after the start of the programmes, estimated that two-thirds of beneficiaries failed to meet the aggregate household income means test. Approximately one half of potential beneficiaries fail to receive the transfer. Analysis of a randomised dataset estimated that the programme improved school enrolments by 10 percentage points and reduced child labour by 17 percentage points. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Using the same dataset, evaluation of changes in anthropometric indicators for children involved in the programme fail to find significant improvements in nutritional status among them. The authors of this research suggest this may be a factor of the unconditional nature of the programme before 2003. They also suggest that the mother being the recipient of the support is not crucial in this case. |
| Cost | 0.7% of GDP in 2004. |
| Implementation Issues | Poor targeting, introduction of conditioning in 2003: the oldest school age child must show they have attended school for most of term, and mothers must show they have attended primary health care facilities and nutrition training. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | León, Mauricio and Younger, Stephen D. [2007] 'Transfer Payments, Mothers' Income, and Child Health in Ecuador', <i>Journal of Development Studies</i> , 43(6), pp 1126-1143. Velásquez- Pinto, Mario D. [2004] The Bono Solidario in Ecuador: an exercise in targeting, ESS paper 17, ILO. Posted at: http://www-ilo-mirror.cornell.edu/public/english/protection/socsec/download/esspaper17.pdf Schady, N. and Araujo, M.C. [2006], 'Cash transfers, conditions, school enrolment, and child work: Evidence from a randomized experiment in Ecuador', World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3930, available at http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=917501 . |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Ethiopia(1) |
| Programme Type | Food based transfers – food for work |
| Programme Title | Non-emergency food aid and food-for-work |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Ethiopia |
| Year started | 1980s and 1990s |
| Programme Description | Food security programme with a work component attached. |
| Programme Objectives | Programmes provide food to those in need either as an unconditional transfer or as a cash transfer conditional on work. |
| Transfers | Food-for-work provided approximately 3kg of wheat per day, the value of which was typically higher than the local market wage |
| Targeting | Food aid used categorical targeting based on geography, age, and gender, and especially those unable to work. Food-for-Work used categorical (geographic) targeting as well as self-selection. For food aid, central government oversaw distribution of food to regions, which was then distributed to local peasant associations (PAs) who selected beneficiaries. |
| Coverage | 20% of farm households received either food-aid or participated in food-for-work, 13% received food aid only, and 10% food-for-work only |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Government of Ethiopia |
| Operational Effectiveness | Cereals accounted for 80% of household food security benefits between 1992 and 1995. Food aid had high leakage (78%) and low coverage (49%) rates because age and female-headed households proved to be poor indicators of food insecurity. Also, a geographically targeted region, Tigray, was no longer chronically food insecure. A high percentage of the poor did not receive food aid. Poor targeting may reflect high cost of setting up programs in face of shifting spatial distribution of insecurity over time. |
| Cost | 15 million tons of food per annum in 1990s. |
| Welfare Outcomes | No information is available. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Clay, D.; D. Molla and D. Habtewold [1999] Food Aid targeting in Ethiopia: A Study of who needs it and who gets it? , Food Policy 24: 391-409 Jayne, T., J. Straus, T. Yamano and D. Molla [2001] Giving to the Poor? Targeting of Food Aid in Rural Ethiopia, World Development 29 (5): 887-910 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Ethiopia(2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - conditional – cash for work |
| Programme Title | Cash for Work (CFW) in North and South Gonder Zone |
| Agencies Involved | German Agro Action (GAA); the Organization for the Rehabilitation and Development of Amhara (ORDA); co-financed by German Ministry for Economic Cooperation |
| Year started | 2002 |
| Programme Description | Programmes provide cash to households in need. This can be an unconditional transfer, but in most cases has a work requirement. |
| Programme Objectives | Reduce poverty levels in households through asset-creation and improving food quantity and quality, where women and family members are considered most vulnerable. |
| Transfers | |
| Targeting | Households in need. |
| Coverage | 13,000 recipients, 35% were women. In all, about 50,000 people benefited from the programme if family members are included. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA); Ministry of Agriculture. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Programme is cost-effective, and a preferred option among beneficiaries. In Borana Zone over 65 percent of sample participants preferred cash to food payment. Cash payment also promoted higher participation in the project's employment schemes. Only in areas where supplies of grain in the market are very limited, as it was the case in Meda Welabu, a mixed wage-food payment was considered desirable. |
| Cost | The cash volume disbursed was US \$ 577,367. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Programme contributed to substantial asset creation at household level. Food consumption improved both in quantity and quality. No misuse of cash has been identified. Security in handling large cash amounts was satisfactory. Market prices have not been affected. Food availability in markets was good. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) [2003]; Relief Bulletin: Weekly Humanitarian Highlights in Ethiopia, 22 Aug 2003 Posted at http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/AllDocsByUNID/30084754c2088c4685256d8a005ba1eb |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Ethiopia(3) |
| Programme Type | Food based transfers - conditional – food for work |
| Programme Title | Urban Food for Work (UFFW) |
| Agencies Involved | CARE |
| Year started | 1997 in Addis Ababa through an agreement between CARE and the Municipality of Addis Ababa |
| Programme Description | Provides short-term employment opportunities to the unemployed and underemployed in extremely poor areas. |
| Programme Objectives | Provide basic roads and latrines to marginal urban communities in Addis Ababa; provide short-term unemployment to residents in those communities; and enhance the capacity of community groups to participate in self-help activities. |
| Transfers | Participants paid with food according to productivity. |
| Targeting | Unemployed and underemployed unskilled workers in extremely poor communities, many of whom are often women. Communities selected if households earned less than US\$60 a month. |
| Coverage | |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| Operational Effectiveness | UFFW is a relief rather than a development programme that provides permanent employment. Hardship is greater during the rainy season, but construction activities are also limited, and as a consequence the programme is not effective as a safety net. |
| Cost | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | The infrastructure provided by the programme improved mobility for residents especially in the rainy season, and drains reduced flooding. Food payments reduced food insecurity for participants. Longer term effects appear to be limited, the programme failed to provide long term poverty alleviation or food security. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Garret, J. [2001] Lessons from the urban Food for Work Programme: care-Ethiopia. Notes and observations. Washington DC: IFPRI. Posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/pubs/ib/ib9_ethiopia.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Ethiopia(4) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - conditional - cash for work/cash transfer - targeted |
| Programme Title | Meket Livelihoods Development Project (MLDP) |
| Agencies Involved | Save the Children UK; Funding by Government of The Netherlands |
| Year started | 2003 - 2004 (pilot project). Phase 2 started beginning of 2005 - aimed to run until 2008 |
| Programme Description | The programme uses a mixture of cash-for-work and cash transfers those who cannot, or should not, work. |
| Programme Objectives | The programme has short-term relief and long term goals. Cash is provided to vulnerable households to help them meet essential food expenditure in bad years, and to invest in assets in better years. The longer-term goals are to contribute to the diversification of livelihood options, to enhance community-level assets, and to stimulate the rural economy, in the project area. |
| Transfers | The transfer is seasonal. 30 Birr (US \$3.50) per person is transferred monthly depending on whether they work in meher season or belg season (therefore not all beneficiaries receive cash at the same time of year as it depends on which harvest they rely on). The amount of cash transferred increases with household size. |
| Targeting | Food insecure rural households are targeted and identified through the local Peasant Associations and officials using a number of criteria, including livestock ownership, access to land and performance in the previous harvest. Those who could not or should not work are designated as recipients of the unconditional cash transfer, including pregnant and lactating mothers, older people, children, those with disabilities. |
| Coverage | 46,600 (40,000 who operate in the meher season harvest, and 6,600 in belg season), approximately 5000 receive cash relief. Half of Meket woreda (district) is covered. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | M & E was built into the project and budget. Save the Children and MLDP staff have evaluated the programme. |
| Evaluation Results | The programme enabled households to buy seeds or livestock for the farming season, protect their household assets rather than selling them off and households were in a better bargaining position. Households were also able to diversify their income sources and cease activities which were socially or environmentally disadvantageous. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The frequency of feeding of children increased and most mothers were able to give a wider variety of food to their children. Cash was also used to buy food items, clothing and other domestic items and to repay debt; the availability of cash enabled access to health care when needed, rather than waiting to sell grain before attending the clinics. Women could also spend more time with their children as their need for an income was reduced. |
| Cost | The total project budget was ETB 9.8 million (€898,260), of which 72% was direct to beneficiaries through the monthly cash payment. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Devereux, S., Marshall, J., MacAskill, J., Pelham, L. [2005] Making Cash Count:. Save the Children UK, HelpAge International and Institute of Development Studies. Posted at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/poverty_team/MakingCashCountfinal.pdf Adams, L. and Kebede, E. [2005] Breaking the poverty cycle: A case study of cash interventions in Ethiopia. Humanitarian Policy Group, ODI London. Posted at: http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/HPG_Ethiopia.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Ethiopia(5) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - conditional cash and/or food transfer – targeted |
| Programme Title | Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) |
| Agencies Involved | Collaboration between the Government of Ethiopia and a joint donor group CIDA, DFID, the EC, USAID and the World Bank. |
| Year started | 2005 |
| Programme Description | Provides cash/vouchers or food transfers to chronically food insecure households. Food transfers will be 30 percent of the programme. There are two components: labour intensive public works; and direct support for labour deficient households, over three to five years. |
| Programme Objectives | Address acute food insecurity and encourage households to engage in sustainable productive activities, prevent asset depletion at the household level, promoting market development by increasing purchasing power and creating assets at the community level. |
| Transfers | The value of the cash transfer amounts to about 30 Birr per person per month. Timing of payment disbursement according to seasons. |
| Targeting | The programme is targeted at the chronically food insecure. Eligibility is assessed by administrative and community knowledge, while community identification is through established food security task forces. |
| Coverage | Approximately 5 million people (1 million households) will benefit from the programme, scaling up to 15 million people in an inter-year emergency programme. It will run in eight regions (Tigray, Amhara, Oromiya, SNNPR, Harari, Diredawa, Afar, and Somali). |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Conducted by independent consultants. |
| Evaluation Results | Linkages between the PSNP and other programmes are critical for graduation. The potential for households to graduate is inhibited by a number of design and implementation issues within the PSNP. The PSNP is now reaching the poor. The institutional structures for combined administrative and community targeting are in place in most areas (though not all), and are functioning with varying degrees of success. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Improved food security; protecting productive assets and cash is being used for a range of productive investments including in education, livestock and savings schemes. |
| Cost | |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | <p>UNCDF [2005] Local Development Project (LDP) North Gondar Zone, Amhara National Regional State. Project document - final draft. Posted at: http://www.unctf.org/english/countries/ethiopia/local_governance/project_documents/unctf_eth-prodoc2005.pdf</p> <p>Devereux, S., Marshall, J., MacAskill, J., Pelham, L. [2005] Making Cash Count:. Save the Children UK, HelpAge International and Institute of Development Studies. Posted at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/poverty_team/MakingCashCountfinal.pdf</p> <p>Slater, R., Ashley, S., Tefera, M., Buta, M., Esubalew, D. (2006) PSNP Policy, Programme and Institutional Linkages. ODI, The IDL Group, Indak. http://www.odi.org.uk/plag/resources/reports/psnp_linkages_study.pdf</p> <p>Sharp, K., Brown, T. and Teshome, A. (2006) Targeting Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme. ODI, The IDLE Group. http://www.odi.org.uk/plag/resources/reports/psnp_targeting.pdf</p> |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Gambia |
| Programme Type | Food based transfers - in-kind transfers - household |
| Programme Title | Combines two projects: the Child Survival Project and the Sesame Growers' Association (SGA) Institutional Strengthening Project. |
| Agencies Involved | Catholic Relief Service (CRS) provided the funding and implementation in association with local partners, the National Women Farmers Association (NAWFA) and the Gambian Food and Nutrition Association (GAFNA) |
| Year started | 1990s |
| Programme Description | The National Women Farmers Association (NAWFA) and the Gambian Food and Nutrition Association (GAFNA), through both programmes, share responsibilities in addressing the three food security components of access, availability and utilisation, on the part of the Sesame Growers' Association (SGA) Project and improving health and nutrition on the part of the Child Survival Project. |
| Programme Objectives | The Child Survival Project concentrates on improving health and nutrition by promoting improved infant and child feeding practices, improved maternal health and nutrition, and improved home based care of childhood illnesses. The Sesame Growers' Association (SGA) Project aims to empower women so that they are better able to meet household food security needs. Through the SGA project, CRS/GM promotes sesame as a cash crop for women farmers, providing an alternative food and income source. |
| Transfers | |
| Targeting | Pregnant women, malnourished children, poor households, farmers (female). |
| Coverage | |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | A Final Impact Evaluation was completed in August/September 2000 by the Catholic Relief Service (CRS). |
| Operational Effectiveness | Results of the evaluation recommended project continuation. |
| Cost | 63,534 MT |
| Welfare Outcomes | In FY00, the Child Survival Project (CSP) was able to make substantial progress in achieving its objectives on improving maternal and child health care and nutrition in project areas. Exit surveys showed that chronic malnutrition in project areas decreased, thereby improving long-term food security problems. In addition, more women received iron during pregnancy (98% of women received iron during pregnancy), attended antenatal consultations earlier on in pregnancy (51.3% women had their first prenatal care visit during first or second trimester), and consumed more nutritional food during pregnancy (45% women increased food intake during pregnancy). The CSP has significantly increased community awareness of health-related issues and the benefits of good nutrition. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | USAID/THE GAMBIA RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4) [2001], posted at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdabt641.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Honduras |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional - cash for human development - demand subsidy and supply side support |
| Programme Title | <i>Programa de Asignacion Familiar (PRAF) Phase II</i> |
| Agencies Involved | IADB (US\$45.2m), Government of Honduras (US\$5.1m) |
| Year started | 1990, later re-launched as PRAF II in 2000 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides a cash transfer to poor households conditional on household investment in health and education, and supports institutional and financial provision of education and health. |
| Programme Objectives | Improve school attendance, improve nutrition of children, and improve use of health care. |
| Transfers | US\$3 a month for children under 3, disabled children under 12, plus pregnant mothers and poor elderly; and four monthly benefits to children at school in grades 1-4 (for 10 months only). |
| Targeting | Geographic targeting: municipalities with lowest mean height for age z-scores and with school and health centres are selected for participation; all households within the municipality are covered. |
| Coverage | 4.7 percent of population. Poor households with children aged 0-3 and 6-12 who have not completed 4th grade. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| Operational Effectiveness | Only baseline evaluation is available. |
| Cost | 0.019% of GDP |
| Welfare Outcomes | Evaluation in progress (see website below) |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Monitoring and evaluation documentation and preliminary results are posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/themes/praf.htm#pubs |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | India(1) |
| Programme Type | Food based and cash transfers (rural public works) |
| Programme Title | Jawahar Rojgar Yohana (JRY) |
| Agencies Involved | Central and State Government; District Rural Development Agency |
| Year started | 1989 (merger of the National Rural Employment Program and the Rural Landless Employment Guarantee Programme). |
| Programme Description | Alleviate poverty through creation of supplementary employment opportunities for the rural poor during agricultural slack periods. Other objectives are the creation of social assets and a positive impact on wages. |
| Programme Objectives | To provide food and cash to stave off poverty mainly in rural areas. |
| Transfers | Not available |
| Targeting | Geographic, demographic and self-targeting. Central allocation of budget to states/unions on basis of their share in rural poverty using headcount index. State allocation to districts based on index of backwardness, which takes into account the proportion of the rural castes/tribes population, and agricultural productivity. Preference given to underprivileged groups (scheduled castes/tribes, freed bonded labourers); in addition 30% of the employment opportunities are earmarked for women. |
| Coverage | Two components: In 1993-94, the first component created 952 million person days of employment; the second 7.35 million person days. In total the programme provided 1678 million person days of employment. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Central and State Government |
| Operational Effectiveness | The percentage of beneficiaries that were poor was 31% in 1987 and 24% in 1993. Since the programme wage was higher than the market wage, it tended to attract many of the non-poor to the programme. 43% of budget went to poor rural households. In 1991, it required a public expenditure of US\$1.87 to transfer US\$1. |
| Cost | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Since underemployment is estimated to be about 3,000 million person days, about one-third of the total underemployment may have been reduced by JRY. Yet, the impact of the programme at the household level appears to have been modest. Food grains distributed (as part of wages) were negligible (Rs 0.21 worth of food grains per day per JRY worker). |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Gaiha, R.; K. Imai and P. Kausik (2001) On the Targeting and Cost-Effectiveness of Anti-poverty Programmes in Rural India, <i>Development and Change</i> (32) 309-42 Government of Maharashtra (2002) Chapter 20 "Rural Employment- Employment Guarantee Scheme and Jawhar Rojgar Yohana in the Government Report on Tenth Five Year Plan 2002-2007. Posted at: www.maharashtra.gov.in/pdf/tenthPlan/Chapter20.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | India(2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for work |
| Programme Title | Employment Guarantee Scheme, Maharashtra State |
| Agencies Involved | Central and State Government; Food Corporation of India (FCI) |
| Year started | Introduced as a statutory programme in the mid 1970s |
| Programme Description | The programme generates rural public works employment with the aim of reducing poverty through income gains to participating workers, and the completion of small-scale rural infrastructure projects. |
| Programme Objectives | Poverty alleviation |
| Transfers | On a par with unskilled agricultural wages. |
| Targeting | Geographic placement of schemes followed by self-selection. The State is responsible for the placement of programs. |
| Coverage | By early 1990s average annual attendance reached about 100 million person days. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Central and State Government; Food Corporation of India (FCI) |
| Operational Effectiveness | There is a higher rate of participation among the poor than the non-poor, around 12% to 16% for the poor compared to 6% for non-poor. Other studies argue the programme was not well targeted as it covered mainly the non-poor (See Gaiha and Imai 2002 below). However, the direct impact on poverty incidence was no greater than that of untargeted uniform transfers. It costs US\$1.5 to get US\$1 to beneficiaries. |
| Cost | |
| Welfare Outcomes | Average forgone income due to having to provide work was estimated as 21% to 32% of wages received. The programme has been found to be effective in reducing risks among participants. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Datt, G. and M. Ravallion [1994] Transfer Benefits from Public-Works Employment: Evidence for Rural India, <i>Economic Journal</i> 104:1346-1369 Imai, K and R. Gaiha (2002)'Rural Public Works and Poverty Alleviation - The Case of the Employment Guarantee Scheme in Maharashtra', <i>The International Review of Applied Economics</i> , Vol. 16, No. 2, April 2002, pp.131-151. Imai, K (2002) 'Employment Guarantee Scheme as a Social Safety Net-Poverty Dynamics and Poverty Alleviation' 2002, Department of Economics Working Paper, Ref. 149, March 2003, Department of Economics, University of Oxford. Posted at: http://www.econ.ox.ac.uk/Research/WP/PaperDetails.asp?PaperID=481 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | India(3) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers – unconditional - social pension |
| Programme Title | National Old-Age Pension Scheme (NOAPS) (part of the National Social Assistance Programme) |
| Agencies Involved | Central and State Government |
| Year started | NOAPS began in 1995. |
| Programme Description | NOAPS provides cash payments to destitute elderly households. |
| Programme Objectives | To provide security to elderly and destitute households through a cash transfers |
| Transfers | US\$1.5 per month |
| Targeting | Categorical (beneficiaries are required to be aged 65 or older) and informal individual assessment. Beneficiaries must be a destitute in the sense of having little or no regular means of subsistence from his/her own sources of income or through financial support from family members or other sources. |
| Coverage | One fourth of India's elderly receive some social assistance from the state-level pension schemes or from the National Old-Age Pension Scheme. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Central and State Government |
| Operational Effectiveness | A HelpAge International study of Uttar Pradesh found that cash limits on the funding available for the programme provides a disincentive for government officials to publicise the programme. Criteria for eligibility are poorly understood, and the registration and selection processes are complex and time consuming. Delivery of the benefits is erratic. |
| Cost | In 1999-2000 the value of the benefits distributed was US\$ 9.5m. |
| Welfare Outcomes | In spite of its low value, the pension benefit can make a significant difference to the lives of poor people. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Rajan, S.I. [2001] Social Assistance for Poor Elderly: How effective?, Economic and Political Weekly XXXVI (8): 613-617 HelpAge International [2003] Non-contributory pensions in India: A case study of Uttar Pradesh, London: HAI. |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | India(4) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for work – targeted |
| Programme Title | National Rural Employment Bill |
| Agencies Involved | Government of India and state/local governments |
| Year started | Bill approved in 2005 |
| Programme Description | Entitles every household in rural areas to at least 100 days of guaranteed employment every year for at least one adult member. The programme also entitles beneficiaries to unemployment allowance if the job, under the scheme, is not provided within a specified period; medical treatment in case of injury under the programme; child care in cases where at least twenty women are employed on a worksite; and facilities for the employment of persons with physical or mental disabilities in activities that are compatible with their abilities. |
| Programme Objectives | To provide guaranteed employment at the statutory minimum wage to at least one adult per household who volunteers to do casual manual labour in rural areas. |
| Transfers | Wages will be paid in cash or in kind or both - not less than Rs. 60 a day. |
| Targeting | Targeting will be aimed at every adult who resides in any rural area and is willing to do the work. |
| Coverage | The scheme will first be implemented in 200 districts across the country, and will then be extended to 600 districts. One third of the proposed jobs would be reserved for women. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Information currently unavailable. |
| Evaluation Results | |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | Estimation for the annual expenditure is Rs. 40,000 crores to Rs. 50,000 crores for expansion to the whole country in five years. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | National Advisory Committee [2004] National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. India. Posted at: http://nac.nic.in/communication/draft_rega.pdf Thomas, E.C. [2005] Job Guarantee for the Rural Poor. 6 September 2005. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. Posted at: http://pib.nic.in/release/release.asp?relid=11820 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | India (5) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – Child and Family Allowance |
| Programme Title | National Maternity Benefit Scheme (part of the National Social Assistance Programme) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD), Government of India |
| Year started | 1995 |
| Programme Description | Provides benefits to pregnant women in households living below the poverty line |
| Programme Objectives | Provide cash assistance to pregnant women of households below the poverty line |
| Transfers | Lump sum of Rs. 500 (approx. US\$12) |
| Targeting | Pregnant woman of households living below the poverty line provided she is 19 years of age or above. The benefit is available up to the first two live births. |
| Coverage | (1998-99) 1,152,558 Beneficiaries |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Ministry of Rural Development |
| Evaluation Results | Benefits are reported to be reaching the target group, but findings suggest that more care is needed in areas like selection of beneficiaries and timely disbursement of the benefits so that it can be better utilised for the benefits of the mother and the baby. There are some leakages to non-poor families. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The scheme is reported to be benefiting socially and educationally backward poor women. |
| Cost | |
| Implementation Issues | The benefit is disbursed several weeks prior to the delivery. In case of delay, the benefit may be given even after the birth of the child. In some cases there is extensive delay in sanction as well as disbursement of the benefits. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Ministry of Rural Development, Executive Summary of National Social Assistance Programme, Government of India. Posted at: http://www.drd.nic.in/jry2/esnsap.htm National Social Assistance Programme. Posted at: http://rural.nic.in/book00-01/ch-7.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | India (6) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer - Household |
| Programme Title | National Family Benefit Scheme (part of the National Social Assistance Programme) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Rural Development (MoRD), Government of India |
| Year started | 1995 |
| Programme Description | Households below the poverty line are provided benefits on the death of the primary breadwinner who is defined as the member of the family whose earnings contribute substantially to the total household income. |
| Programme Objectives | To provide benefits to the household in case of death of primary earner. |
| Transfers | Lump sum of Rs. 10,000. (approx. US\$ 246) |
| Targeting | The death of the primary breadwinner due to natural or accidental causes should have occurred while he or she is in the age group of 18 to 62. The family benefit is paid to surviving members of the households of the deceased who, after local enquiry, is determined to be the head of the household. |
| Coverage | (1998-99) 1,962,238 Beneficiaries |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Ministry of Rural Development |
| Evaluation Results | Only a small proportion of the total beneficiary samples felt that the scheme had in a way brought a sense of security to life although the majority of beneficiaries studied were satisfied with the benefit they received. The evaluation suggests that care has to be taken for better and efficient implementation of the scheme especially in selection of beneficiaries, sanctioning of applications, and timely disbursement of benefits to the beneficiaries. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | |
| Implementation Issues | Obtaining benefits, corruption and delays in transfers are key challenges to the implementation of the scheme. The maximum limit of the total number of beneficiaries of a State/UT is prescribed by the Central Government. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Ministry of Rural Development, Executive Summary of National Social Assistance Programme, Government of India. http://www.drd.nic.in/jry2/esnsap.htm National Social Assistance Programme. Posted at: http://rural.nic.in/book00-01/ch-7.pdf Ministry of Rural Development, National Social Assistance Programme: Introduction. Government of India. Posted at: http://rural.nic.in/nsap.htm |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Indonesia(1) |
| Programme Type | Fee waiver for health services - targeted |
| Programme Title | Kartu Sehat Program |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Indonesia - Ministry of Health |
| Year started | 1994 |
| Programme Description | The programme aims to cover all poor families in the country. It distributes cards which entitle the recipients to obtain free services in all government health facilities. A single card is handed out to each recipient family, and up to eight family members can be listed on the card. This programme received additional impetus during the economic crisis of South East Asia. |
| Programme Objectives | To provide poor people free health care services. |
| Transfers | |
| Targeting | Priority is given to villages identified as being the poorest based on information from the Central Bureau of Statistics. Cards are then handed out to beneficiaries according to a selection process by the village or neighbourhood head. |
| Coverage | Data from 1999 shows that 10.6 percent of Indonesian households own a health card. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Various independent studies, and the CIMU (Central Independent Monitoring Unit). |
| Evaluation Results | There are reported problems of usage and quality. Many health card owners do not seem to use the cards when seeking care from a public provider, and card holders perceive the care received through the health card is of a lower quality than services obtained when not using the card. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | |
| Implementation Issues | Two major implementation problems have been the lack of information by consumers, providers, and government officials as well as insufficient training. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Bitrán, R. and Giedion, U. [2003] Waivers and Exemptions for Health Services in Developing Countries. World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0308. Washington. Posted at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SAFETYNETSANDTRANSFERS/Resources/281945-1124119303499/SSNPrimerNote9.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Indonesia(2) |
| Programme Type | Fee waivers for school fees - targeted |
| Programme Title | Scholarships and Grants Programme (SGP) (initially part of the ADB funded SPSDP – see Indonesia(3)) |
| Agencies Involved | Indonesian government agencies and ADB, World Bank, AusAID, UNICEF |
| Year started | 1998 |
| Programme Description | Scholarship and grants are distributed through post offices. |
| Programme Objectives | To keep poor children in school and to keep schools that serve impoverished areas operational throughout the crisis. |
| Transfers | Scholarships per child per year (proportion of enrolled children receiving scholarships): Primary: US\$16 (6%); Junior Secondary: US \$32 (17%); Senior Secondary: US \$40(10%). Grants per child per year (percentage of schools receiving grants) - Primary US\$267 (60%); Junior Secondary US\$533 (60%); Senior Secondary US\$1,333 (60%). |
| Targeting | To deliver funds specifically to school children from poor families and schools most affected by the crisis. The programme used poverty indices and a composite formula to target more funding toward the poorest districts. After the first year, the index was revised to take the impact of the crisis into account. |
| Coverage | The SGP has distributed scholarships to approximately four million students and grants to approximately 132,000 schools per year. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Central Independent Monitoring Unit (Indonesia) created as part of the programme. |
| Evaluation Results | Channelling funds directly from the centre to the school level through the post office reduced leakage and the amount of time it takes for funds to reach recipients. The programme's success has also been due to the close coordination and cooperation between donors and between government agencies. The poor received a greater than proportional share of the scholarships. Almost 63% of scholarship recipients come from families in the lowest two expenditure quintiles, approximately 18% of recipients come from the highest two quintiles. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Drop-outs have not increased markedly and enrolment rates have remained relatively steady. The scholarships were found to have been effective in reducing dropouts at the lower secondary school level by about three percentage points but had no discernible impact at the primary and upper secondary school levels. |
| Cost | Total cost of the programme is US\$654 million, or Rp.4,905 billion. |
| Implementation Issues | Components of the programme included a nation-wide awareness campaign which also aimed at combating fraud; it also implemented a massive training scheme for government officials, school principals and community leaders; and an independent monitoring network. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Cameron, Lisa A. [2000] An Analysis of the Role of Social Safety Net Scholarships in Reducing School Drop-Out During the Indonesian Economic Crisis. Innocenti Working Paper No. 82. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre. Posted at: http://www.unicef-icdc.org/publications/pdf/iwp82.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Indonesia(3) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional transfers for health, food and school scholarships – targeted |
| Programme Title | Social Protection Sector Development Program (SPSDP) / Social Safety Net (SSN) |
| Agencies Involved | Previously funded by ADB as well as other multi- and bi-lateral donors, now continued by the Government of Indonesia. |
| Year started | 1998 |
| Programme Description | The SSN was implemented through four broad categories: food security, public health and education, employment and income generation, and the promotion of small and medium scale enterprises. It provides subsidised rice for the poorest, free health care for the poor and education scholarships for poor children. Payments are provided directly to beneficiaries through the post office. |
| Programme Objectives | To protect the poor affected by the 1997 financial crisis. |
| Transfers | Information not available. |
| Targeting | Poor households only are targeted. Targeting is conducted through local government and village heads. |
| Coverage | |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | Estimates suggest that only half the funding directly benefited the poor. During a participatory evaluation, community participants highlighted targeting problems, including problems with the transparency and fairness of allocations. Leakages were also identified, as better-off and more well-connected people usually benefited first from project initiatives. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The programmes did provide employment opportunities, subsidised rice, free school, and health care. The education parts drew additional and complementary funding, but the more complex design and less specific targets reduced the success of the nutrition component. |
| Cost | The SPSDP together with the Health and Nutrition Sector Development Program (HNSDP) totalled \$600 million. Approximately 55.5% of the development budget (Rp 17.3 trillion) was allocated for SSN scheme although only Rp 9.3 trillion is considered to be pure SSN schemes. |
| Implementation Issues | Implementation of the policy component was slower than expected, due to the extensive conditionalities and the tight 12- month time frame for the second tranche release. The programmes were implemented under the decentralised structure, and faced administrative problems and capacity constraints at lower levels of government. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Operations Evaluation Department [2005] Country Assistance Programme Evaluation for Indonesia. Asian Development Bank. Posted at: http://www.adb.org/Documents/CAPES/INO/cap-ino-2005-16.pdf AUSAID [N.D.] The Impact of the Asian Financial Crisis on the Health Sector in Indonesia. Australian Government. AusAID. Posted at: http://www.usaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/health_indonesia.pdf Operations Evaluation Department (2006) Indonesia: Social Protection Sector Development Program. Asian Development Bank http://www.adb.org/Documents/PPERs/INO/32255-INO-PPER.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Jamaica |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Programme of Advancement through Health and Education (PATH) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Jamaica and World Bank |
| Year started | 2002 |
| Programme Description | The programme provides a monthly cash benefit to households with vulnerable members (poorer older people, mothers, infants, disabled), conditional on school attendance and visits to primary health centres |
| Programme Objectives | Reduce poverty; raise school attainment; reduce child labour; provide safety net. |
| Transfers | US\$ 6.2 (2002) fixed level benefit. |
| Targeting | Poor households by proxy index. |
| Coverage | 236,000 households are the target beneficiary population. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Undertaken by the programme agency supported by the Institute of Statistics of the Government of Jamaica. |
| Operational Effectiveness | The programme brings together separate poverty programmes considered to be underperforming (food stamps, outdoor poor relief, and old age incapacity). Roll out of the programme began with a public information campaign generating a large response, and delays in the administration of registration. Cooperating ministries of education and health have found it difficult to provide timely information needed to check whether conditionalities have been met. |
| Welfare Outcomes | It is too early to assess welfare outcomes. |
| Cost | US\$22m (2003) or 0.29% GDP |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme information available at: http://www.mlss.gov.jm/pub/index.php?artid=23 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Kenya(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash Transfer (in development) |
| Programme Title | The Hunger Safety Net Pilot Programme (HSNP) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Kenya; DFID |
| Year started | 2007 start planned |
| Programme Description | Provide cash transfer to food insecure households in semi-arid lands |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce dependency on emergency food aid and address hunger by smoothing consumption, protecting productive assets, and reducing the impact of shocks |
| Transfers | US\$5 per household plus US\$2.5 for each extra household member paid monthly |
| Targeting | In Phase 1 of the programme (2007-2010), 3 districts with a high incidence of chronic food insecurity will be selected for a pilot, targeting 300,000 people through a mix of community and categorical targeting; scaled up in Phase 2 to 1.5 million people |
| Coverage | Not available |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Planned independent monitoring and evaluation. |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | US\$56m budget for Phase 1 |
| Implementation Issues | Not available |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | DFID briefing available at: http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mdg-factsheets/hungerfactsheet.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Kenya(2) |
| Programme Type | Pilot Cash Transfer |
| Programme Title | Pilot Cash Transfers for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (CT-OVC) |
| Agencies involved | Government of Kenya; UNICEF; DFID; SIDA; World Bank |
| Year started | 2005 |
| Programme Description | Pilot cash transfer (unconditional and conditional comparison) |
| Programme Objectives | Encourage the adoption/fostering of orphans; reduce poverty; and promote take up of merit goods (health care, education), either through conditionality or through increased household income |
| Transfers | Transfers between KShs 1000 and KShs 2000 per household depending on number of OVC |
| Targeting | OVCs affected by HIV and AIDS |
| Coverage | 500 OVCs, currently being scaled up to 7,500 children by end of 2007, in Garissa, Kwale and Nairobi districts |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation results | |
| Welfare outcomes | |
| Cost | The total cost of the grant and delivery for 300,000 OVCs is estimated to be within the range of KShs 2.8 to KShs 3.6 billion (US\$37 million to US\$48 million). This represents between 1% and 2% of total government expenditure (excluding associated costs of conditionality) |
| Implementation Issues | Contingent on a positive evaluation it is hoped to develop a 'national programme' by 2015, although coverage will be limited to only 300,000 beneficiaries, representing only 17% of the total orphan caseload. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | McCord, A., (2006) An Overview of Social Protection Programmes in Kenya. UNICEF Kenya (unpublished) Pearson et al. (2006) The Evolution of the Government of Kenya Cash Transfer Programme for Vulnerable Children between 2002- 2006 and prospects for nationwide scale-up (Draft). UNICEF Kenya. http://www.unicef.org/policyanalysis/files/The_Evolution_of_the_Government_of_Kenya_Cash_Transfer_Programme_for_Vulnerable_Children.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Korea |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - conditional – cash for work |
| Programme Title | Korea Public Works Programme |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Korea, Ministry of Administration and Home Affairs |
| Year started | 1998 |
| Programme Description | Public works programme to support the unemployed. |
| Programme Objectives | To alleviate the impact of rising unemployment. |
| Transfers | Daily wage of 25,000 won per day for unskilled workers rising to 35,000 for professional workers, conditional on participants working eight hours per day 5 days a week, and available for three months only. Extension is based on a review, but is capped at three consecutive three-month periods. |
| Targeting | Unemployed persons between 15 and 65 years of age, excluding those receiving income or public transfers themselves or by a member of their household. Beneficiary selection prioritises those aged 30-55, or main breadwinner, or disabled or entering the labour market for the first time. |
| Coverage | 795,000 in 2000. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Monitoring by local district committees. |
| Evaluation Results | The programme provided an effective short term safety net for skilled workers affected by the crises, but it has the potential to become an alternative employment for the disadvantaged. The programme appears to be well managed and subject to local oversight. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | 0.89% of GDP in 2000. |
| Implementation Issues | In 1998-9 40% of applicants were rejected. In 1999 a score system was introduced to determine priority for selection. The duration of the projects appears to be too short. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Lee, Joohee. 2000. Income assistance and employment creation through public works in Korea. Posted at: http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN020150.pdf Kwon, Huck-Ju [2002] Unemployment and Public Works in Korea 1998-2000. Posted at: http://www.adb.org/Documents/Events/2002/SocialProtection/kwon_paper2.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Lesotho |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer programmes – social pension |
| Programme Title | Non-contributory pension scheme |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Lesotho |
| Year started | 2004 November |
| Programme Description | The programme pays a monthly transfer to older citizens from the age of 70. |
| Programme Objectives | The programme aims to reduce poverty among the very old. |
| Transfers | M150 or US\$25 per month – equivalent to the poverty line. |
| Targeting | 3.6% of the population over the age of 70. |
| Coverage | 69,046 direct beneficiaries – 60% women. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | There is an evaluation study being conducted by the University of Lesotho, with results available from late 2006, or early 2007. |
| Evaluation Results | |
| Welfare Outcomes | Given the high rate of HIV infection in the country, the pension is expected to support some households without missing adults. |
| Cost | US\$20m or 1.43 % of GDP – administration costs are US\$0.5m. |
| Implementation Issues | Registration for the pension is with proof of identity: passport; voters' registration card; affidavit. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Devereux, S., Marshall, J., MacAskill, J., Pelham, L. [2005] Making Cash Count: Save the Children UK, HelpAge International and Institute of Development Studies. Posted at: http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/poverty_team/MakingCashCountfinal.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Liberia |
| Programme Type | Food based transfers - food transfers combined with food-for-work |
| Programme Title | Internally Displaced People Relief Assistance Project |
| Agencies Involved | World Relief Canada; Christian and Missionary Alliance; Mennonite Central Committee; Association of Evangelicals of Liberia (AEL). |
| Year started | October 1, 2002 (for three months) |
| Programme Description | The purpose of the project is to increase the accessibility of acceptable food to the war-affected people through the provision of basic foods over a three-month period. |
| Programme Objectives | The objectives are to provide 1,000 MT food to 41,000 people living in displaced camps; provide 30 MT of food for food-for-work projects; improve the nutritional status of the people; reduce distress related sale of household items; improve the infrastructure of the camps through food-for-work projects. |
| Transfers | 121 MT lentils, 806 MT wheat flour, 101 MT edible oil. |
| Targeting | Poorest people living in the displaced people's camps of Wilson Displaced Centre, Jahtondo Town Displaced Centre, and Blamasee Displaced Centre. All 3 centres are in Montserrado County. Unaccompanied children, disabled, and the elderly are the most vulnerable people living in the camps. |
| Coverage | There will be 41,000 beneficiaries. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | World Relief Canada; Christian and Missionary Alliance; Mennonite Central Committee; but mainly by; the Association of Evangelicals of Liberia (AEL). |
| Operational Effectiveness | The project will be administered by AEL, which will work with community leaders to determine the most needy people in the camps. The wheat flour will be milled in Canada before it arrives in Liberia. |
| Cost | The budget cost is: C\$786,076 |
| Welfare Outcomes | Apart from the fact that this project is one of a series of projects over the past 5 years assisting displaced people in Liberia, no precise welfare outcomes are yet known. |
| Others Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | The Canadian Foodgrains Bank: A Christian Response to Hunger, Canadian Foodgrains Bank. Posted at: http://www.foodgrainsbank.ca/project/169/liberia_internally_displaced_people_relief_assistance_project.aspx |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Malawi(1) |
| Programme Type | Input grants - food security transfer for farming households |
| Programme Title | Starter Pack Program |
| Agencies Involved | Malawi's Ministry of Agriculture, International Donor Agencies |
| Year started | 1998/1999 |
| Programme Description | This programme aims to raise productivity and improve food security of farming households, through the distribution of "starter packs" to all farming households, containing hybrid maize seed, fertilizer, and either groundnuts or soybeans. |
| Programme Objectives | The programme was intended to assist filling in transitory food gaps; promote crop diversification; and promote soil fertility improvements. |
| Transfers | The initial transfers included 15 kg of fertilizer, 1 kg of legume seed, and 2 kg of hybrid maize seed. In addition, the 1999/2000 starter pack program included a pilot project designed to distribute up to 50,000 starter packs of other household items utilising existing private-sector retail outlets. |
| Targeting | Farming Households - particularly smallholder farmers (subsistence farmers), prioritizing female headed farming households. |
| Coverage | In 1999-2000, the 'universal' coverage was estimated at 2,7 million households by Malawi's Ministry of Agriculture. From 2000-1 distribution was restricted to poorest households only (1.5 million in that year, and 1 million in 2001-2). Scaled up in 2002-3 to meet a food crisis. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Malawi's Ministry of Agriculture, the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The programme included a pilot voucher project testing whether vouchers were more effective than the starter packs. Thereafter Starter Pack/Targeted Inputs Programme evaluations have been carried out annually 1999-2001. |
| Operational Effectiveness | With many households in the southern region farming only 0.3 hectares or less, Malawi's most densely populated region has no land in natural fallow systems. Smallholder farmers in areas close to urban centres face the problem of limited land availability. Targeting the programme on to poor households has not proved effective. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Improved food security, in 2003 the programme contributed to a 159 kg of additional maize per beneficiary household. |
| Cost | Not available |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Levy, Sarah [2003] Starter Packs and Hunger Crises. A Briefing for Policy Makers on Food Security in Malawi, mimeo. Posted at http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/0/ec104e782154f9e4c1256dda00385ce7?OpenDocument Gough, Amy E., Christina H. Gladwin, and Peter E. Hildebrand, 'Vouchers Versus Grants of Inputs: Evidence From Malawi's Starter Pack Program.' African Studies Quarterly 6, no. 1 Posted at: http://web.africa.ufl.edu/asq/v6/v6i1a8.htm |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Malawi(2) |
| Programme Type | Food based transfers - in-kind transfers |
| Programme Title | North-Central Food Response |
| Agencies Involved | World Relief Canada; World Relief Malawi |
| Year started | November, 2002 |
| Programme Description | Following the Malawian food crisis the project was put in place to provide food to reduce consumption of green (unripe) maize in advance of harvest. |
| Programme Objectives | The two main objectives are: to provide food for 500 HIV/AIDS-affected families; to improve the nutritional status of children under the age of 5. |
| Transfers | The project will provide a 50 kg bag of corn per month to each of the selected families for 6 months. |
| Targeting | Mothers of children under the age of 5; HIV/AIDS-affected families, in particular, HIV/AIDS orphans that have already lost their parents. |
| Coverage | 3,580 families, 500 of whom have HIV/AIDS patients in the household. The total number of people receiving assistance will be 28,640 (estimated with an average 8 members per household). |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | World Relief Canada; World Relief Malawi |
| Operational Effectiveness | No information is available |
| Welfare Outcomes | No information is available |
| Cost | The budget is C\$514,795. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | The Canadian Foodgrains Bank: A Christian Response to Hunger, Canadian Foodgrains Bank. Posted at: http://www.foodgrainsbank.ca/project/257/malawi_north_central_food_response.aspx |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Malawi(3) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for work |
| Programme Title | Improving Livelihood Through Public Works Programme (ILTPWP) (Part of MASAF) |
| Agencies Involved | DFID, MASAF, CARE, District Assemblies |
| Year started | 2003 (Pilot project) |
| Programme Description | Public works programme with an integrated approach. This includes group formation, savings mobilisation, promotion of economic activities and capacity building for District Assemblies (DAs) in planning, project management, monitoring and evaluation. Public works included road infrastructure, dam projects and afforestation projects. |
| Programme Objectives | Aims to provide opportunities for vulnerable groups in society to graduate towards more improved livelihoods. |
| Transfers | Minimum 10 months work given to beneficiaries. Average wage per beneficiary (MK) varied in each project: Ntchisi - 4,547; Dowa - 6,657; Lilongwe - 5,861; Salima - 3,920. |
| Targeting | Beneficiaries are selected in a wealth ranking and mapping exercise facilitated by a Community Based Facilitator identified by the community. |
| Coverage | Pilot districts of Lilongwe, Dowa, Ntchisi and Salima. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | On-going assessment integrated into Project at 6 month intervals, undertaken by local authorities involved in the implementation of the project. |
| Evaluation Results | The projects' wage rate is low, and also suffered delays in the payment of wages. Group formation training did not effectively facilitate the development of community based groups and social cohesion. Most beneficiaries valued the business management training but its effectiveness was hampered by the lack of capital. Whilst the beneficiaries valued the concept of compulsory savings, except in a few cases, most of the savings were used in the purchase of food items and household durables. The projects, particularly road infrastructure, delivered immediate benefits and most beneficiaries viewed an improvement in the communication with other parts of the area. However, the quality of the roads, particularly for MASAF sponsored projects with no maintenance plans, remains a major concern amongst the stakeholders. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Overall, among the ILTPWP districts, Lilongwe and Dowa show substantial increases in socio-economic status of beneficiaries and effectiveness of value added activities compared to Salima and Ntchisi. |
| Cost | Cost per beneficiary ranges from: MK7,276 in Ntchisi to MK8,824 in Dowa compared to MK6,102 in Mchinji and MK5,605 in Nkhotakota. |
| Implementation Issues | Limited District Authority (DAs) capacity meant problems with certain commitments, particularly, report preparation and submission to CARE and MASAF, and timely payment of wages and compulsory savings. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Chirwa, E. W. et al. [2004] The Evaluation Of The Improving Livelihoods Through Public Works Programme (ILTPWP). Wadonda Consult/MASAF/CARE Malawi. Posted at: http://www.masaf.org/studies/ILTPWP%20Evaluation%20Final%20Report%20-%202004.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Malawi(4) |
| Programme Type | Cash/voucher/in-kind transfer - unconditional – targeted |
| Programme Title | Dedza Safety Nets Pilot Project (DSNPP) |
| Agencies Involved | Concern Universal |
| Year started | 2001 ended in 2002 |
| Programme Description | Cash, vouchers, or in-kind goods are transferred to the work-constrained rural poor. |
| Programme Objectives | The pilot programme was designed to test a system of direct welfare transfers to the work-constrained rural poor which could be upscaled country-wide as part of the National Safety Nets Strategy (NSNS). The programme aims to improve food-security. |
| Transfers | Cash per person per month MK550; or vouchers per person per month MK550; or in-kind transfer - a package of goods worth MK2,750, or five months of transfers, in September which included 2 blankets, 6 plates, 1 metal cooking pot, 1 pail, 10 tablets of washing soap and 10 tablets of bathing soap, followed by maize flour worth MK 550. |
| Targeting | Work constrained/disadvantaged people. Potential beneficiaries were defined as disabled; orphaned (under the age of 18); orphans caring for fellow orphans; the aged caring for orphans; the poorest widows (only those unable to work); the mentally ill; the chronically sick; and the poorest households which care for those listed above. |
| Coverage | 7,150 beneficiaries in 386 villages |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | M&E component is an integral part of the pilot to learn lessons on scaling up. Concern Universal - Malawi, Calibre Consultants UK, and the Statistical Services Centre at The University of Reading, UK. |
| Evaluation Results | Village committees successfully managed the transfers and kept the records required by the project, but problems with the delivery of transfers. Most of the transfers reached the beneficiaries. There was some confusion in understanding how to use the vouchers by some beneficiaries, and there is little choice given of which shops to buy from, the choice of items available. |
| Welfare Outcomes | During severe food shortages all types of transfer helped to prevent extreme food insecurity but were not enough to lift the households out of extreme poverty. |
| Cost | \$ MK 5,809,597. Cost of delivery (excluding the transfer) per beneficiary per month: \$ MK29 for in-kind transfers; \$ MK14 for cash transfers; and \$ MK103 for vouchers. Total costs per beneficiary per month (including transfer): \$ MK795 for in-kind transfers; \$ MK780 for cash transfers; and \$ MK869 for vouchers. |
| Implementation Issues | The logistics of the vouchers are more complicated than the other types of transfer, especially for scaling up where large numbers of additional staff would be required to deal with retailers. In Dedza there was also a lack of retailers who fulfilled the basic requirements to participate in a voucher scheme, and if scaled up, there may not be sufficient retailer capacity to deal with the beneficiaries without serious congestion and supply shortages. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Nyasulu, G., Kuyeli, J., Levy, S. and Barahona, C. [2002] Dedza Safety Nets Pilot Project: learning lessons about direct welfare transfers for Malawi's National Safety Nets Strategy. Interim Report. Posted at: http://www.personal.rdg.ac.uk/~snsbarah/dsnpp/Dedza%20Safety%20Nets%20Pilot%20Project%20Interim%20Report.pdf Concern Universal (2006) Lessons from a Direct Welfare Transfer Intervention: A Pilot Project by Concern Universal in Malawi. http://www.eldis.org/fulltext/Concern%20Universal_Direct%20Welfare%20Transfers.pdf |

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Malawi (5) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - Household |
| Programme Title | Mchinji Social Cash Transfer Pilot Scheme |
| Agencies Involved | UNICEF; Government of Malawi; Malawi District Assemblies |
| Year started | July 2006 |
| Programme Description | Cash is transferred to households and a bonus is given to households with children of school-going age to encourage school enrolment and attendance and to discourage child labour and premature drop outs. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty, hunger and starvation in all households living in the pilot area which are ultra poor and at the same time labour constrained; increase school enrolment and attendance of children living in target group households; generate lessons learned |
| Transfers | Transfers between MK 600 (approx. US\$ 4) to MK 1800 (approx. US\$ 13) according to household size. An additional MK 200 is added for children enrolled in primary school, and MK 400 for secondary school |
| Targeting | Targeted at the ultra poor and the labour constrained |
| Coverage | By April 2007, 7,480 children from 2,442 households were targeted. Expansion is planned to 6 districts, and by the end of 2007 will reach 6,000 households. By the end of 2008 12,000 households will be reached. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | Initial findings indicate that targeting has been effective, monthly payments have been mostly been delivered regularly and on time. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Initial findings indicate that money has been used to meet basic needs in terms of food, clothing, education materials and access to health services. Some have invested in improving their shelter and in acquiring small livestock. People living with AIDS who are on treatment are better able to cope with the intake of drugs as now their nutrition has improved. Reduction of social obligations, and child- or female-headed households no longer need to expose themselves to risky behaviours in order to survive. |
| Cost | Costs for Pilot scheme for one year is US\$ 371,000. If the programme is scaled up to cover 10% of all households (250,000 ultra poor and labour scarce households), it is estimated to cost US\$ 41 Million. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Schubert, B. and Huijbregts, M. (2006) The Malawi Social Cash Transfer Pilot Scheme, Preliminary Lessons Learned. Paper presented at the conference on "Social Protection Initiatives for Children, Women and Families: An Analysis of Recent Experiences" New York, 30-31 October 2006 http://www.globalaging.org/elderrights/world/malawi.pdf Project Profile (2007) Social Cash Transfer Pilot, Malawi http://www.crin.org/docs/CashTransfer_FS5.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Mexico |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development - demand subsidy and supply side support |
| Programme Title | <i>PROGRESA (Programa de Educacion, Salud y Alimentacion)</i> , then in March 2002 renamed OPORTUNIDADES and extended to urban areas |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Mexico, World Bank |
| Year started | 1997 |
| Programme Description | PROGRESA was developed as a cash transfer programme for poor rural households in Mexico, aimed at poverty reduction and prevention. OPORTUNIDADES extended the programme to urban areas with training and micro enterprise support components. |
| Programme Objectives | Poverty reduction and prevention, improving school attendance and nutrition of children and improving take up of primary health care provision. |
| Transfers | US\$12.5 per family consumption supplement; US\$ 8-16.5 per child in primary school per month and US\$15.5 school materials per year; US\$ 24-30.5 per child in secondary school per month plus US\$20.5 school materials per year; up to a maximum of US\$75 per household per month; average household benefit is 21% of household consumption. |
| Targeting | Geographic targeting, small rural communities with a high marginality score and access to education and health providers, then proxy means test based on household variables. |
| Coverage | Initially rural households with children 7-14 in school, 3.2 m. households (2001); 40% of rural households, 3.38 % of population. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Strong monitoring and evaluation built into the programme, with a baseline survey in 1997, followed by evaluation surveys every six months, conducted by International Food Policy and Research Institute. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Evaluation shows improvement in all objectives, with varying degree of success. It costs US\$1.1 to deliver US\$1. Issues raised include the effectiveness of participatory inputs into targeting process; the effectiveness of conditionalities; and the extension of the programme to urban areas. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Improved enrolment rates for girls between 7.2 and 9.3 percentage points (from a base of 67%) and between 3.5 and 5.8 percentage points for boys (from a base of 73%); stronger impact on secondary school enrolments; 70% of households show improved nutrition; reduction in incidence of illness among children below 5; increase in child weight; and improved adult health status, 16% fewer days with difficulty from illness. |
| Cost | US\$ 1.8b or 0.32% of GDP in 2000. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Coady, D. and S. Parker [2002] A Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Demand- and Supply-side Education Interventions: The Case of PROGRESA in Mexico, FCND Discussion Paper 127. Posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp127.pdf Skoufias, E. and McClafferty, B. [2001] Is PROGRESA Working? Summary of the Results of An Evaluation by IFPRI, Discussion Paper 118, IFPRI. Posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp118.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Mongolia |
| Programme Type | Conditional cash transfer |
| Programme Title | Child Money Programme (CMP) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Mongolia |
| Year started | CMP started as a targeted transfer in January 2005 which turned into a near universal transfer in July 2006. |
| Programme Description | A targeted cash transfer paid to households with it conditional on investing in children's human capital development - children had to be up-to-date on mandatory vaccinations, living with their parents (or officially authorised guardians) and not engaged in harmful forms of child labour. If they were eight years or older, they had to be enrolled in school or non-formal education. |
| Programme Objectives | Programme objectives are not well articulated, but include the reduction of short-term income poverty, the reduction of inequality, child well-being and human capital development. |
| Transfers | The targeted CMP transferred Tog3,000 (\$2.49) per child |
| Targeting | A cash allowance per child to all families with three or more children living under the Minimum Subsistence Level (MSL), an official measure defined annually by the National Statistical Office of Mongolia (NSOM) by proxy means testing. |
| Coverage | By the end of 2005, 647,500 children (63% of the country's children) from 292,400 households were registered to receive payment |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | The targeted transfer experienced high leakage levels |
| Welfare Outcomes | The programme was found to make a real contribution to poverty reduction as measured by household consumption expenditure per capita, in particular among children, due to the larger number of children living in poor households It makes a major contribution to household consumption expenditure in the lower expenditure deciles. There is evidence that the intra-household distribution of 'child money' does benefit children in particular, although the newness of the programme and the lack of robust monitoring systems make it impossible at this stage to draw any firm conclusions about the effects on the non-monetary dimensions of child poverty, such as school enrolment. |
| Cost | |
| Implementation Issues | The targeted transfer had high leakages due both to the bluntness of the proxy means test and deep-seated institutional factors that hinder proper implementation. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Hodges, A. et al (2007) Child benefits and poverty reduction: evidence from Mongolia's Child Money Programme. Maastricht University (Maastricht Graduate School of Governance) - UNICEF Policy research paper. |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Mozambique(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – unconditional - household |
| Programme Title | Cash Payments to War-displaced Urban Destitute households (GAPVU) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Social Action; Ministry of Planning and Finance. |
| Year started | September 1990 |
| Programme Description | Improve nutritional status of poorest households in urban areas. |
| Programme Objectives | Target nutritional needs and prevention of malnutrition in urban areas. |
| Transfers | Around \$US 1.14 (or Mt. 10,353) per month equivalent to 13% of beneficiaries' per capita consumption expenditures. Cash transfer increases less than proportionately with household size. |
| Targeting | <p>Categorical targeting of households:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • with children less than 5 years old with nutritional problems • with pregnant women with nutritional problems • with unemployed elderly persons over 60 years old living alone or in households without working-age children • with persons with physical disabilities who are over 18 years and suffer from some incapacity to work, who are employed, and who live alone or are heads of household without working-age persons • with a head of household who is chronically ill • with a female head of household with 5 or more children with no working-age persons <p>Identification is followed by a household assessment means test (must prove that household income is less than Mt 32,000 per person per month and have lived in respective cities for over 1 year, and have no working age persons absent working in South Africa or Mozambique). Beneficiaries must provide proof of income and disability status, reviewed every year (6 months for pregnant women).</p> |
| Coverage | Around 70,000 beneficiary urban households in 1995 (16% of urban households), in 13 principal urban areas. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | International Food Policy Research Institute; Ministry of Social Action; Ministry of Planning and Finance. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Limited analysis of targeting shows large leakage rates, only 31% of transfers go to the poor. Households appear to have received much less than their entitlements (around 33% less). |
| Welfare Outcomes | Reduced poverty headcount from 71% to 66%. Poverty would be 27% higher without programme, and severity of poverty 44% higher. |
| Cost | Not available |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | <p>Datt, G., E. Payongayong, J. Garret and M. Ruel [1997] The GAPVU Cash Transfer Program in Mozambique: An Assessment, FCND Discussion paper 36, IFPRI posted at http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/dp36.pdf</p> <p>Devereux, S. [2001] Can Social safety Nets reduce Chronic Poverty?, Development Policy Review 20(5): 657-675.</p> |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Mozambique(2) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – household |
| Programme Title | Minimum Income for School Attendance (MISA) as part of the Action Plan for the Reduction of Absolute Poverty |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Education, Health, Social Action and Natural Disasters |
| Year started | 2002 start of Pilot Study |
| Programme Description | The Programme provides a cash transfer to poor household with children of school age. |
| Programme Objectives | Improve schooling to increase employment opportunities for the poorest people, reduce gender inequalities, promote economic growth by investing in human capital and address the lack of technical skills. Compensate households for the cost of children's schooling thus raising school enrolment rates. |
| Transfers | US\$ 2 a month per member for each family. |
| Targeting | Poorest households in rural areas with children of school age; girls are especially targeted. |
| Coverage | Around 5,000 families. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Internally by the Ministry of education, but also ILO and UNCTAD. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Pilot project has not yet been properly evaluated. There are concerns about sustainability because of the macro economic constraints facing the country. If international aid were withdrawn, the government of Mozambique would find it impossible to allocate long-term budget resources to the programme. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available as the pilot programme has been implemented recently |
| Cost | Not available as the pilot programme has been implemented recently |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Lavinas, Lena [2003] 'Encouraging School Attendance in Mozambique by Granting a Minimum Income to parents', International Social Security Review, vol. 56, July-December 2003, Blackwell Publishing: Geneva, pp. 139-155. |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Mozambique(3) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – unconditional – household |
| Programme Title | Resettlement Grant for flood affected regions |
| Agencies Involved | USAID |
| Year started | December 2000 to April 2001 |
| Programme Description | Provision of time limited cash transfers to households affected by floods in 1999/2000 |
| Programme Objectives | To support households affected by floods to recover their livelihoods |
| Transfers | US\$92 per household |
| Targeting | Beneficiaries targeted on the basis of criteria including location and damage to home and crops; information verified by village elders. |
| Coverage | 106,000 rural households. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | USAID Impact Evaluation done in November 2001 to May 2002 through four surveys (household, village, retailer, wholesaler). |
| Operational Effectiveness | Uncertainty over timing and size of transfers delayed planning and implementation. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The programme helped stabilise households affected by the floods, and jump-start economic activity. |
| Cost | US\$97m distributed |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Impact Evaluation, Mozambique 1999-2000 Floods [2002] USAID. Posted at http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000811/index.php |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Mozambique(4) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – unconditional - targeted |
| Programme Title | Food Subsidy Programme |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Mozambique - The National Institute for Social Action (INAS), under the Ministry for Women and Social Action (MMAS) |
| Year started | 1997 (set up after GAPVU closed. See Mozambique(1)) |
| Programme Description | Monthly cash transfer is given to recipient households. |
| Programme Objectives | The cash transfer is intended to be used by poor Mozambicans to buy food. It aims to support entitlements to food through raising household income. |
| Transfers | The value of the transfer is low and depends on the size of the household, starting at Mzm 70,000 (US\$ 3) per month for a one-person household and rising to a maximum of Mzm 140,000 (US\$ 6) for households with five or more members. |
| Targeting | The transfer is aimed at people who are temporarily or permanently unable to work and unable to satisfy their subsistence needs. There is multiple eligibility criteria which make targeting complex - eligibility is determined by a combination of proxy indicators (age, disability), means testing (per capita monthly income below Mzm 70,000), and health status ('chronically sick' or malnourished). |
| Coverage | The national scheme has previously focused on urban and peri-urban areas, but expansion to rural areas has recently been approved. In 2005 it aimed to reach 92,300 direct beneficiaries, and actually reached 69,095 direct beneficiaries and 91,411 indirect beneficiaries. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | Reported uses of the transfer include investment to increase purchasing power, and investing in local saving schemes and support systems during the harvest season when their fields yield sufficient food. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The value of the transfer is low – originally set at one-third of the minimum wage, it has fallen to just 9 per cent of the minimum wage, and will soon fall further to just 5 per cent when the minimum wage is raised. At the household level beneficiaries complained the transfer was “insufficient” or even “insignificant”. |
| Cost | The programme is financed entirely through the state budget. It costs INAS US\$ 66 to provide beneficiaries in Quelimane with Mzm 840,000 per year, which will purchase 168-280kg of maize. |
| Implementation Issues | The Food Subsidy programme's coverage is limited due to limited geographical scope and capacity/funding constraints. The Ministry for Women and Social Action is weak and has limited bargaining power with the Ministry of Finance, and limited implementation capacity outside of urban centres. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Devereux, S., Marshall, J., MacAskill, J., Pelham, L. [2005] "Making Cash Count: Lessons from cash transfer schemes in east and southern Africa for supporting the most vulnerable children and households" Save the Children UK, HelpAge International and Institute of Development Studies. Accessed at http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/poverty_team/MakingCashCountfinal.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Namibia |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – unconditional - social pension |
| Programme Title | Pension |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Namibia |
| Year started | Program extended to black population in 1990 |
| Programme Description | Old-age universal pension |
| Programme Objectives | Preventing poverty among older people |
| Transfers | US\$26 per month |
| Targeting | Categorical: individuals must be 60 or older to qualify |
| Coverage | In 2001 there were 96,767 beneficiaries. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No arrangements for monitoring and evaluation |
| Operational Effectiveness | Approximately 95% of eligible individuals received the pension in 2001, up from 48% in 1993-94. Coverage is lower in remote northern provinces, and the likelihood of receiving the pension falls when social worker posts are unfilled. About half of individuals eligible for pensions are regarded as non-poor. Private contractors delivering pension payments are economizing on the number of delivery points, making it difficult (and costly) for individuals to access their pensions. The cost of delivering pensions by private contractors is 9% of benefits, and the cost of administration is a further 15%. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Pensions account for 14% of rural incomes and 7% of urban incomes. |
| Cost | Just under 2% of GDP |
| Other Issues | Legislation to make pensions means tested has been approved but the Government has not implemented it. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Schleberger, E. (2002), Namibia's Universal Pension Scheme: Trends and Challenges, ESS Paper 6, Geneva: International Labour Organization. Posted at: http://www3.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/489sp1.pdf Devereux, S. [2001] 'Social Pensions in Namibia and South Africa', IDS Discussion Paper 379. Posted at http://www.ntd.co.uk/idsbookshop/details.asp?id=603 Subbarao et al. [1996] Namibia's Social Safety Net: Issues and Options for Reform, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 280. Posted at http://www.worldbank.org/html/dec/Publications/Workpapers/WPS1900series/wps1996/wps1996.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Nepal |
| Programme Type | Cash transfers - unconditional - social pension |
| Programme Title | Old Age Allowance Programme (OAP); Helpless Widows Allowance (HPA); Disabled Pension (DP) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Local Development, Government of Nepal |
| Year started | 1995 |
| Programme Description | The OAP provides a cash transfer to all over 75 years of age. The HWA provides a cash transfer to destitute widows aged 60 or over; and the DP provides a cash transfer for individuals with physical infirmity and unable to work |
| Programme Objectives | To ameliorate poverty among the very old, widows and disabled groups. |
| Transfers | US\$2 for OAP beneficiaries. Average benefit for HWA beneficiaries was US\$1 in 2002, and for DP beneficiaries US\$1.2 |
| Targeting | Categorical for the very elderly and disabled, but a means test is applied to widows, and a disability test to the disabled. |
| Coverage | In 2002, OAP beneficiaries were 191,953; HWA beneficiaries were 227,694; DP beneficiaries were 3,667 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No monitoring and evaluation is planned. |
| Operational Effectiveness | The application process and benefit payments have worked OK, only 2% of applications for the OAP are rejected. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available. |
| Cost | In 2002, the total costs of the programmes was US\$7.4 million. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Rajan, S.I. [2003] Oldage Allowance Program in Nepal, Conference Paper. Posted at: http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/2003conferencepapers/rajan.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Nicaragua |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development - demand subsidy and supply side support |
| Programme Title | <i>Red de Protección Social</i> |
| Agencies Involved | Inter-American Development Bank and Fondo de Inversion Social de Emergencia (FISE) |
| Year started | 2000, as extension of an existing Social Fund |
| Programme Description | The programme has been successfully transformed from a social fund established to deal with an emergency into a medium term conditional cash transfer programme. Cash transfers to poor households are made conditional on household investment in education and health. |
| Programme Objectives | Rise in rates of school enrolment and attendance for children in grades 1-14. Improvement in care for children aged 0-4 (nutrition, hygiene, health, and early childhood development). Income gains for households in extreme poverty. |
| Transfers | US\$ 9.2 per household per month and US\$ 21 school materials per year to help with schooling; US\$ 18.7 per household per month to support health; and US\$4.6 per year subsidy to school per child covered; maximum transfer is 17% of household consumption. |
| Targeting | Geographic targeting selects poorest departments, then poorest municipalities within them with access to health and education and transport infrastructure; and then proxy means test to identify poor households within municipalities. |
| Coverage | Poor households and poor households with children 7-13 who have not completed 4th grade; 10,000 households, 60,000 individuals; 1.21% of population. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | International Food Policy Research Institute |
| Operational Effectiveness | Enrolments have risen by 22 percentage points (from a base of 69%); reduction in child labour is 8.8 percentage points from a base of 27% for 10-13 year olds; reduction in working hours of children continuing in work. It costs US\$1.1-US\$1.5 to deliver US\$1. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The Pilot Programme provided a supplement to household income in the communities targeted of around 18% of their total expenditures. In addition to improvements in enrolment rates, the pilot has also been associated with a rise in immunisation rates and improvements in nutrition. The measured decline in stunting, 5 percentage points for children under 5 years of age, is 1.5 times the decline that took place between 1998 and 2001. |
| Cost | US\$5m (2002) or 0.021% of GDP |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Maluccio, J. and R. Flores [2004] Impact Evaluation of a Conditional Cash Transfer Program: The Nicaraguan Red de Protección Social, FCND Discussion Paper 184, IFPRI. Posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp184.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Pakistan (1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer and food subsidy schemes – unconditional - household |
| Programme Title | Pakistan Bait-ul-Maal (PBM) which incorporates Individual Financial Assistance (IFA) Scheme and the Food Subsidy Scheme. |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Pakistan |
| Year started | 1992 (under Bait-ul-Maal Act of 1991) |
| Programme Description | The programme is a combined food subsidy and cash transfer. |
| Programme Objectives | To assist in improving the welfare of widows, orphans, disabled, needy and poor persons. |
| Transfers | Funds for the Bait-ul-Maal essentially come in the form of non-lapsable grants from the federal government. |
| Targeting | Disabled persons, invalids, widows, orphans and households living below the poverty line. |
| Coverage | Under the Individual Financial Assistance (IFA) scheme Rs 14 million was disbursed in 1997-98 to about 5,000 beneficiaries, and under the Food Subsidy Scheme (FSS) about 240,000 families were provided with a monthly cash stipend at Rs 200. Of the beneficiaries, 29 per cent were widows, 19 per cent were disabled people or invalids and the remaining 52 per cent were families living below the poverty line. The total disbursement was Rs 0.6 billion. Until 1994, the PBM ran a food stamp scheme, now abandoned, which reached 4.2 million people. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Ministry of Social Welfare and Special Education |
| Operational Effectiveness | The Pakistan Bait-ul-Maal reaches only a minority of the destitute and deserving, with a high leakage rate. Applying for assistance from the PBM is a time consuming procedure. Three local people (including a local Zakat committee member) must support the application form, which is then processed both at the district and provincial levels. However, the Prime Minister and other high-level functionaries can sanction amounts in open kutcheries (public gatherings) or elsewhere for individual financial assistance. PBM's limited coverage is one of its biggest problems. Transparency also appears to be a serious problem in terms of the level of discretion exercised by functionaries in allocating funds. |
| Welfare Outcomes | With only 240,000 people receiving the <i>atta</i> subsidy, transfers have a very limited impact on poverty. |
| Cost | Funding dropped sharply from Rs.1 billion in 1996-97 to Rs 0.2 billion in 1998-99. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | International News Network [2005] 'Foolproof monitoring system for PBM funds' disbursement voiced', International News Network - the Internet Edition, posted at http://www.onlinenews.com.pk/details.php?id=71485 Pasha, Hafiz A., Sumaira Jafarey and Hari Ram Lohano, EVALUATION OF SOCIAL SAFETY NETS IN PAKISTAN, Research Report No.32 Posted at the Social Policy and Development Centre, http://64.224.68.11/pubs/rr/rr32.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Pakistan (2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Child Support Programme (Pilot) |
| Agencies Involved | Bait-ul-Maal in Ministry of Social Welfare and Special Education, World Bank, DFID |
| Year started | 2006 |
| Programme Description | This is a pilot programme designed as an add on to the Food Support Programme delivered by Bait-ul-Maal, with the purpose of testing whether linking cash transfers to school attendance could achieve improvement in primary education coverage. |
| Programme Objectives | Provide cash transfers to poor households with children, promote investment in human capital, and raise primary school attendance. |
| Transfers | US\$3.5 per child per month, rising to US\$6 if two or more children, conditional on children attending school and passing examinations. This transfer is paid quarterly together with the Food Support Programme transfer. |
| Targeting | Chronically and extreme poor households with children aged 5-12, beneficiaries of the Food Support Programme. |
| Coverage | In pilot phase, 10% of Food Support Programme beneficiaries, 125,000 households, in 5 districts of every province in the country. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Planned quasi-experimental impact evaluation by Bait-ul-Maal supported by the World Bank |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | US\$7 million for fiscal year 2006-7 |
| Implementation Issues | Not available |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme website is at: http://www.pbm.gov.pk/new/Projects/Ongoing/CSP/Introduction.html |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Panama |
| Programme Type | Integrated poverty reduction |
| Programme Title | Red de Oportunidades |
| Agencies Involved | Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank |
| Year started | 2006 – Pilot phase |
| Programme Description | Integrated poverty reduction programme for households in extreme poverty involving four components: a conditional household transfer; guaranteed household access to basic services; household support, and infrastructure development. |
| Programme Objectives | To get integrated households in extreme poverty back within the dynamics of economics and social development, through the strengthening of their capabilities and satisfaction of their basic needs. |
| Transfers | US\$ 35 monthly to beneficiary households, paid to mothers, conditional on visits to health centres, attendance to school, mothers participation in school meetings and in human development sessions. |
| Targeting | Households in extreme poverty, through geographic selection of communities and a proxy means test to select households. |
| Coverage | 10,000 households in the Pilot phase, with a further expansion to 50,000 households in 2007. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Supported by technical assistance from the World Bank, to support capacity building and the implementation of monitoring and evaluation processes. |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | US\$ 46.9m World Bank support; IADB loan of US\$ 20m |
| Implementation Issues | Not available |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme website (Spanish) is at: http://www.mides.gob.pa/index.php?option=com_content&task=blogcategory&id=48&Itemid=75 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Paraguay |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Red de Protección y Promoción Social (Social Protection and Promotion Network) |
| Agencies Involved | Social Action secretariat under the President's Office, Inter-American Development Bank |
| Year started | 2005 – 2006 Pilot Phase |
| Programme Description | Provide transfers to households with children in poverty |
| Programme Objectives | Extreme poverty reduction and improvement in human and social capital |
| Transfers | Consumption subsidy US\$10 plus health and education subsidy US\$5 per child aged 0 to 14, for up to 4 children; conditional on visits to health centres for children and mothers, and attendance to pre-school centres and schools. |
| Targeting | Geographic selection of communities and proxy means test for the selection of households in extreme poverty and with children aged 0-14. |
| Coverage | Pilot covers three separate programmes reaching 5,350 households in all |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Internal monitoring of performance |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | Budget allocated for 2006 was US\$1.7 m |
| Implementation Issues | Not available |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme website (Spanish) is at: http://www.sas.gov.py/html/rpps.html Programme information can be accessed at: http://go.worldbank.org/Y4E6BL2330 |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Peru |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – cash for human development |
| Programme Title | Programa Juntos |
| Agencies Involved | Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, UNDP, World Bank |
| Year started | 2005 |
| Programme Description | Provides income transfer to poorest households with children, conditional on health, schooling, and registration. |
| Programme Objectives | Ensure beneficiary households access to education and health services, and are registered, through a household transfer and transfers to health and education providers. |
| Transfers | Monthly US\$ 33 per household; and food supplements |
| Targeting | Geographic selection of poorest communities, then proxy means test and community validation to select household with children in extreme poverty. Target population is 1.5 million in extreme poverty (28.2% of the population). |
| Coverage | By August 2006, the Pilot Phase reached 124,139 households in 67 provinces of the poorest 9 departments. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Planned quasi-experimental evaluation; and regular reports on progress. |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | August 2005 to May 2006, increase in school enrolment among beneficiaries of 19.6%; also increase in visits to health centres and immunisation (33.3 increase among children aged 0-1; 60.7% increase in children aged 1-5); 38,000 persons registered |
| Cost | Approved budget for 2007 is US\$170m |
| Implementation Issues | Administration costs are 18 percent, US\$1.18 to transfer US\$1. Agreements with <i>Oportunidades</i> and <i>Bolsa Familia</i> to provide technical cooperation. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Programme website (Spanish) is at: http://www.juntos.gob.pe/intro.php |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | South Africa(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – unconditional - social pension |
| Programme Title | Social Pension |
| Agencies Involved | Central Government Administration; Pvincial Authorities |
| Year started | Early 1990s; evaluation examines performance around 1993 and 2002/3 |
| Programme Description | Old-age pension; programme extended to black majority population gradually over 1980s and 1990s. |
| Programme Objectives | To prevent poverty in old age. |
| Transfers | Maximum benefit in 2002 was US\$75 per month, reduced if income sources of the beneficiary and his/her spouse are over the means test threshold. |
| Targeting | Categorical – age of entitlement is 60 for women and 65 for men and means tests are applied to self-reported income and assets of the beneficiary and spouse. |
| Coverage | 1.9 million beneficiaries in 2002. Take up is nearly universal among blacks. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Central Government Administration monitors implementation |
| Operational Effectiveness | The social pension is widely shared within beneficiary households; it reduces poverty; improves nutrition and health status; facilitates household investment; improves school enrolment and reduces child labour. It is costly to get benefits to remote rural areas. Benefits are suspended or delayed when provincial authorities have fiscal or administrative problems. Registration process can take up to a year. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Beneficiary household members show lower poverty headcount and gap, and improved health status and school attendance. |
| Cost | 1.4 % of GDP in 2002 |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | <p>Barrientos, A. and P. Lloyd-Sherlock (2003), Non-contributory pensions and poverty prevention. A comparative study of Brazil and South Africa, Report, Manchester: IDPM and HelpAge International. Posted at http://idpm.man.ac.uk/ncpps</p> <p>Case, A. (2001), Does Money Protect Health Status? Evidence from South African Pensions, NBER Working Paper 8495. Posted at http://www.nber.org/papers/W8495</p> <p>Case, A. and A. Deaton (1998), 'Large Scale Transfers to the Elderly in South Africa', <i>Economic Journal</i>, vol. 108, no. 450, pp. 1330-1261.</p> <p>Devereux, S. [2001] 'Social Pensions in Namibia and South Africa', IDS Discussion Paper 379. Posted at http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/dp/dp379.pdf</p> <p>M. Samson <i>et al</i>, 'The Impact of Social Security on School Enrolment in South Africa', EPRI Research Paper No. 25, (Cape Town, 2001). http://www.epri.org.za/rp25.doc</p> |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | South Africa(2) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer - unconditional - child and family allowance |
| Programme Title | Child Support Grant (There are two other grants in South Africa, a Foster Care Grant paid to guardian of children who are legally placed in the care of someone who is not their parent; and a Care Dependency Grant paid to carers of children with severe physical or mental disability). |
| Agencies Involved | Government of South Africa |
| Year started | 1998 |
| Programme Description | Cash transfer to children aged 13 or less in poor households. |
| Programme Objectives | To ameliorate poverty among children in poor households. |
| Transfers | Around US\$20 (R160 in 2002) per month paid to carers of children or guardians. |
| Targeting | Means tested on the income of parent/carer/guardian. |
| Coverage | 2.5m children (2003) |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | No monitoring and evaluation of the grant is planned, but the central government undertakes regular reviews of its implementation. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Preliminary studies indicate high levels of registration among potential beneficiaries. Administrative constraints meant the introduction of the grant was done in stages: children up to age 8 were registered in 2003, 9 and 10 year olds in 2004; and 11 to 13 year olds in 2005. A study has found that receipt of the grant is less likely for children with absent mothers. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Receipt of the grant is associated with lower socio-economic status measured by assets and household variables. |
| Cost | 0.7% of GDP |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Woolard, I. [2003] Social Assistance Grants (Impact of Government Programmes using Administrative Data Sets). Report. Posted at http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000946/index.php Case, A.; Hosegood, V.; Lund, F [2003] The reach of the South African Child Support Grant: Evidence from Kwa-Zulu Natal', CSDS Working Paper 38. Posted at: http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000582/P538_Child_Support_KZN.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | South Africa(3) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – targeted cash for work |
| Programme Title | Zibambele (KwaZulu Natal) |
| Agencies Involved | Provincial Department of Transport (South Africa) |
| Year started | 2000 |
| Programme Description | Provides permanent employment through labour-intensive road maintenance. Workers are employed on a part-time basis (8 days per month). The contract is given to a household rather than to an individual, so that if the primary worker is unable to work employment in the shifts to another household member. |
| Programme Objectives | The creation of sustainable job opportunities for poor rural families through the maintenance of rural roads. |
| Transfers | R5.57 per hour (minimum construction industry wage). R334 per month. |
| Targeting | The programme targeted the poorest members of communities, particularly female household heads with no other means of support. Selection is by community representatives who identify the poorest. |
| Coverage | 14,000 workers |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | |
| Welfare Outcomes | Even with the support, 99% of households still fell below the poverty line, using an adjusted per capita poverty line of R486 a month, but the programme did contribute to a reduction in the poverty gap, and therefore in the intensity of poverty experienced in workers' households. Food purchase was the main use of additional income accounting (reported by 100% of households), followed by clothing and education (over 80%), transport costs and debt repayment followed in importance. 64% of households reported increased financial assets since joining the programme. |
| Cost | Budget in 2002/3 was R56 million. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | McCord, A. [2004] Policy Expectations and Programme Reality: The Poverty Reduction and Labour Market Impact of Two Public Works Programmes in South Africa. ESAU Working Paper 8 ODI, London. Posted at: http://www.odi.org.uk/esau/publications/working_papers/Esau_8_South_Africa.pdf |
| | Phillips, S. [2004] The Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP). Overcoming underdevelopment in South Africa's second economy. UNDP, HSRC and DBSA. Posted at: http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000986/P1102-Phillips_Public_Works_Oct2004.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | South Africa(4) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – conditional – targeted cash for work. |
| Programme Title | Gundo Lashu (Limpopo) |
| Agencies Involved | Roads Agency Limpopo, with support from DFID and the ILO. |
| Year started | 2000 |
| Programme Description | The project focused on both employment creation and the training of contractors and consultants in labour-intensive road rehabilitation. The period of employment ranges between less than one month and four months, and labour is recruited on the basis of the Special Public Works Programme targeting objectives and conditions of employment. |
| Programme Objectives | Sustainable poverty reduction and improved labour market performance. |
| Transfers | A task rate of R30 was negotiated, which in most cases translated into a daily wage of R30.36. |
| Targeting | In line with the Special Public Works Programme (SPWP) targeting objectives, targeted groups include: women, female-headed households, youth, the disabled and households coping with HIV/AIDS, people who have never worked, and those in long-term unemployment. Participation targets are set at 60% women, 20% youth and 2% disabled. |
| Coverage | 1700 labourers. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | |
| Evaluation Results | On average 51% of workers have been women, 58% youth and 1% disabled. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Even with PWP income 89% of households still fell below the poverty line - on the basis of an adjusted per capita poverty line of R486 a month. However, it did contribute to a reduction in the poverty gap, and reduce the intensity of poverty experienced in workers' households. Food purchase was the main use of additional income accounting for 79% of households, over 50% households spent it on clothing, and over 40% reported expenditure on transport and burial societies. 36% households reported increased financial assets. |
| Cost | 2003/4 budget for the programme was R50 million. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | McCord, A. [2004] Policy Expectations and Programme Reality: The Poverty Reduction and Labour Market Impact of Two Public Works Programmes in South Africa. ESAU Working Paper 8 ODI, London. Posted at: http://www.odi.org.uk/esau/publications/working_papers/Esau_8_South_Africa.pdf Phillips, S. [2004] The Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP). Overcoming underdevelopment in South Africa's second economy. UNDP, HSRC and DBSA. Posted at: http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000986/P1102-Phillips_Public_Works_Oct2004.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Sri Lanka |
| Programme Type | Near cash transfers - conditional food stamps |
| Programme Title | Food stamps |
| Agencies Involved | The Food and Nutrition Policy Planning Division of the Ministry of Health; International Food Policy Research Institute |
| Year started | 1979 |
| Programme Description | Food and kerosene stamps subsidise purchase of these goods |
| Programme Objectives | To subsidise consumption of basic goods for poorest households. |
| Transfers | In 1982, households received monthly stamps worth US\$2 for each child under 8; US\$1.5 for each child 8-12; and US\$1 for each member over 12. In addition, households receive stamps worth US\$0.5 for kerosene. These transfers were equivalent to 15% of per capita expenditures of the poorest quintile. Unused stamps could be deposited in the Post Office Savings Bank. The real value of these stamps fell by 50% between 1979 and 1982. For four-fifths of the population earning less than 400 rupees (around US\$27) per month, this subsidy amounted to 20 per cent of their total caloric intake and 14 to 15 per cent of their average income |
| Targeting | Means tested based on self-reported household income with marginal adjustments for household size; Households were required to apply for food stamps through a declaration of income and household composition. |
| Coverage | Precise estimates unknown, but the scheme had a large impact as a safety net for the poor because of its extensive coverage and high value of benefits. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | The Food and Nutrition Policy Planning Division of the Ministry of Health |
| Operational Effectiveness | The programme reached the poorest, the contribution to calories from food stamps declines from 11.6% for the lowest quintile to less than 0.7% for the highest. Analysis based on 1990-1991 household-level survey data concludes that the programme is well targeted, and food stamp receipts are progressive. It takes US\$2.5 to transfer US\$1. Primary criticism of the food-stamp programme within the Government relates to its high cost, and to abuses in programme operations. As a result, the Government has considered the replacement of the food-stamp programme with some form of welfare payment to needy families. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The programme is partly responsible for a reduction in inequality. Simulations suggest that poverty with food stamps is lower than it would be under uniform transfers of the same gross budget. |
| Cost | Not available, but research noted that the government spends 98 cents for each 100 calories provided through the food stamp scheme. This is over 250 per cent of the actual cost of 38 cents per 100 calories. In 1982 the programme budget was US\$128m. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Subbarao K., Jeanine Braithwaite and Jyotsna Jalan [1995] 'Protecting The Poor During Adjustment And Transitions', HCO WORKING PAPERS, Number 58' posted at: http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/2000/11/11/000009265_3970619110744/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf 'Toward Success in Combating Malnutrition: An Assessment of What Works', UN ACC Subcommittee on Nutrition, posted at: http://www.unu.edu/unupress/food/8F043e/8F043E07.htm |

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Thailand |
| Programme Type | Fee waiver for health services - targeted |
| Programme Title | Low Income Card Scheme (LICS) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Thailand, Ministry of Health |
| Year started | 1975 (it is being gradually substituted by the 30 Baht Health Care Scheme) |
| Programme Description | Qualified beneficiaries are given a beneficiary card valid for three years. This card specifies one or two designated health facilities usually local health centres or district hospitals, where beneficiaries can visit in case of illness or injury. |
| Programme Objectives | To protect the poor against paying user fees for health services. |
| Transfers | Information not available. |
| Targeting | Eligibility criteria is based on income (single persons with a monthly income of less than 2,000 baht (US\$47) and households with a combined monthly income of less than 2,800 baht (US\$66)) as well as including groups of the elderly, children below 12, veterans, the handicapped, and monks. The identification of the poor is conducted at the community level, primarily by village and Tambon (sub district) leaders. |
| Coverage | 37% of the population in total; 80 percent of the target population. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Evaluation has been conducted by various independent studies. |
| Evaluation Results | There are serious problems of both coverage and leakage. One survey showed that about one-third of responding households were poor, and only 32 percent of them had the low-income cards. According to the family income criteria only 55 percent of beneficiaries were poor. There is also a problem of quality, there is a negative perception of public service quality by the poor and many cardholders prefer not to use LICS. Card holders also feel that health workers discouraged them from using their cards, making them feel inferior. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The poorest have been protected against the cost of both minor and more serious illness and for higher income groups it provides a safety net. |
| Cost | Special funds are set aside by the Government of Thailand to compensate facilities for waived services. A budget is allocated to the provincial level and is financed through general revenue using a number of criteria for allocating the budget to provinces, including population size, number of health facilities, and number of card holders, standardised mortality ratios, and workload. In 1999 the government budget for LICS was 8 billion baht. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | <p>Bitrán, R. and Giedion, U. [2003] Waivers and Exemptions for Health Services in Developing Countries. World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0308. Washington. Posted at: http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Safety-Nets-DP/0308.pdf</p> <p>Donaldson, D., Pannarunothai, S., and Tangcharoensathien, V. [1999] Health Financing in Thailand: Technical Report. Management Sciences for Health. Boston. Posted at: http://www.msh.org/resources/online_reports/pdf/thaihf0.PDF</p> |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Uruguay (1) |
| Programme Type | Unconditional cash transfer – social pension |
| Programme Title | Programa de Pensiones No-Contributivas |
| Agencies Involved | Banco de Previsión Social |
| Year started | Current legislation enabling the programme was approved in 1986, but similar programmes have been in place since the 1960s. |
| Programme Description | Cash transfer to support older or disabled poor, excluded from formal social insurance schemes. |
| Programme Objectives | Reducing poverty and vulnerability among targeted groups. |
| Transfers | US\$135 per month per beneficiary |
| Targeting | Categorical, selection for the programme is through a means test of family group's resources. Direct relatives, whether or not co-residents, are expected to provide support. |
| Coverage | Around 64,000 beneficiaries. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | There is no monitoring and evaluation system in place. |
| Evaluation Results | Low horizontal efficiency, as only 10% of poor households in Montevideo received the benefit, but significant reduction in poverty among beneficiaries. |
| Welfare Outcomes | |
| Cost | 0.62% of GDP. |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Bertranou, F.; Solorio, C. and van Ginneken, W. [2002] Pensiones no contributivas y asistenciales. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica y Uruguay, book available in Spanish at: http://www.oitchile.cl/pdf/publicaciones/pro/pro012.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|--|
| Country | Uruguay (2) |
| Programme Type | Integrated poverty reduction programme |
| Programme Title | Plan de Atención Nacional a la Emergencia Social – PANES (National plan to address the social crisis) |
| Agencies Involved | Ministerio de Desarrollo Social, Government of Uruguay |
| Year started | 2005 |
| Programme Description | Integrated anti-poverty programme including a household transfer (<i>Ingreso ciudadano</i> , citizen income), food transfers, public works, and micro-enterprise development. |
| Programme Objectives | Alleviating poverty and strengthening household productive capacity |
| Transfers | US\$65 per month per household |
| Targeting | Lowest quintile of the population below the poverty line, 8% of the population; selection of beneficiaries through a proxy means test. |
| Coverage | 83,000 households, with 75,000 receiving the transfer |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Evaluation planned for 2007/8 |
| Evaluation Results | Not available |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | |
| Implementation Issues | This is a two year programme, October 2005 to November 2007 aimed at addressing the rapid rise in poverty and vulnerability in Uruguay following the 2003 crisis; but building on existing Family Allowances (in place since 1942) which proved inadequate to prevent a rise in child poverty; and leading to a more permanent programme beyond 2007 currently being designed. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Description of the programme and a proposal for ex-ante evaluation is at: http://www.pep-net.org/NEW-PEP/HTML/Meetings/Fichiers%20pdf/pmma-11083-Amarante.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Zambia(1) |
| Programme Type | Cash transfer – unconditional - household |
| Programme Title | Pilot cash transfer scheme Kalomo district |
| Agencies Involved | Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and GTZ |
| Year started | 2004 |
| Programme Description | Cash transfer for critically poor households |
| Programme Objectives | Reduction of extreme poverty, hunger and starvation, with a focus on households headed by the elderly and caring for orphan and vulnerable children. To generate information on the feasibility, costs and benefits of a social cash transfer scheme as a component of a social protection strategy for Zambia. |
| Transfers | Households receive US\$ 6 per month (ZMK 30,000), paid to the head of household. Estimated to cover the cost of a meal a day, not expected to lift people out of poverty but to preclude critical poverty. |
| Targeting | Community targeting. Multi-stage identification of the 10% poorest households by village, area, and district committees. |
| Coverage | 1027 households including 3856 individuals, 66% female headed, 54% elderly headed, 54% affected by AIDS, 61% children (of which 71% are orphan). Target population is 10% of population in area covered by pilot, 100% of critically poor, 20% of the poor. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Independent monitoring and evaluation by consultant, who delivers quarterly reports based on baseline dataset and repeated survey data collection. Programme implementation has been more difficult in low density, remote rural areas. Payment is through the banking system and ad hoc payment points in remote areas. |
| Operational Effectiveness | Low leakage rate to the non-poor, but low coverage of the poor. This is a consequence of capping transfers to the 10% poorest households. Beneficiaries are reported to abandon “erosive” coping strategies like piecework and begging when receiving monthly cash transfers and develop and use investment strategies thus other destitute households also benefit from the cash transfers. Households have also gained more self-confidence over time. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Improved household consumption and investment by beneficiary households, improved nutrition and school attendance by children in beneficiary households, reduction of debt. |
| Cost | The cost of covering all destitute households in Zambia has been estimated at US\$16 million, or 0.4% of GDP, or 4% of annual aid flows. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Schubert, Berndt [2004] The Pilot Social Cash Transfer Scheme Kalomo District – Zambia’, Lusaka. Posted at http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0001054/index.php Up to date information can be accessed at the programme website: http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org MCDSS, GTZ (2006) Evaluation Report: Kalomo Social Cash Transfer Scheme, http://www.gtz.de/en/themen/soziale-entwicklung/soziale-sicherheit/19881.htm Wietler, K. (2007) The Impact of Social Cash Transfers on Informal Safety Nets in Kalomo District, Zambia. A qualitative study. http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/Impact_of_cash_on_traditional_safety_nets.pdf |

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Zambia(2) |
| Programme Type | In-kind transfer – unconditional - targeted |
| Programme Title | Public Welfare Assistance Scheme (PWAS) |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Zambia; Department of Social Welfare under the Ministry of Community Development and Social Services. (Funded by GRZ, GTZ, UNICEF, DANIDA) |
| Year started | It started in the 1950s, providing support to Zambian war veterans, but almost ended by the early 1990s. It was evaluated and re-designed in 1997 and launched in 2000. |
| Programme Description | Offers social assistance to the most vulnerable to meet basic needs, which can include food, shelter, education, health, and warm clothing. The programme is community-based. Communities help identify clients, prioritise needs, and allocate resources. This approach is unique amongst national Government programmes in Africa. |
| Programme Objectives | There are two main objectives: to assist beneficiaries to fulfil their basic needs and to promote community capacity to develop local and externally supported initiatives to overcome the problems of extreme poverty and vulnerability. |
| Transfers | Transfers in kind are equivalent to around US\$ 1.33 per year per beneficiary. |
| Targeting | Beneficiaries are people who are not capable of meeting their own basic needs, usually due to youth, old age, sickness or disability. Communities identify beneficiaries using a matrix which provides a range of social, economic and other criteria which all indicate vulnerability to extreme poverty and destitution. Beneficiaries usually include orphans and vulnerable children, and households affected by HIV/AIDS. |
| Coverage | PWAS works in every province in Zambia. It reaches 90,059 beneficiaries, (under 2% of population) but only 45% of potential beneficiaries are actually reached. |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | The M&E unit of PWAS is currently piloting a new M&E system (2005). |
| Evaluation Results | In some communities beneficiaries were not fully informed about the criteria used for assistance as well as the types and amounts of help going to the community. PWAS is supposed to provide support quarterly but in reality assistance is based on availability of resources. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Assistance given in the form of money and goods is reported to be inadequate and have limited reach. |
| Cost | Equivalent value of \$5 million per year (approximately 0.5% of annual expenditure, or 1% of domestic revenue). |
| Implementation Issues | Low and erratic funding limits impact - PWAS needs more partners to increase support to target beneficiaries. |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | PWAS Booklet [no date] Posted at: http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/PWAS_Booklet.pdf Milimo, J. et al. [2004] The Incapacitated Poor in Zambia. Report on a Study by Participatory Assessment Group and Public Welfare Assistance Scheme. Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and GTZ. Lusaka. Posted at: http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/Incapacitated%20Poor%20Study.pdf [2005] An Assessment Study in the Framework of the Development of a Social Protection Strategy. Case Studies Final Draft Summary Report. Republic of Zambia Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and German Technical Cooperation. Posted at: http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/Social%20Protection%20Assessment%20Study.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Zimbabwe (1) |
| Programme Type | Fee waiver for medical treatment, and waivers for school and examination fees |
| Programme Title | Public Assistance |
| Agencies Involved | Government of Zimbabwe, Department of Social Welfare (DSW); Department of Policy, Planning and Development, |
| Year started | 1988 onward |
| Programme Description | Public assistance is designed for destitute people who are unable to work, are aged over 65, or who have disabilities or chronically illnesses, and have no known family who can provide care. |
| Programme Objectives | To reduce poverty by lowering restrictions on access to basic services. |
| Transfers | Not available |
| Targeting | Targeting is passive in that individuals must apply at a DSW office. There are few offices, and because individuals must make several trips to fill out forms, many potential beneficiaries never bother to apply or are discouraged from completing the application process. Social workers are supposed to complete a home visit before recommending the individual receives assistance. |
| Coverage | 69,000 in 1994, dropping to 20,500 by 1998 |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Undertaken by the Department of Policy, Planning and Development |
| Operational Effectiveness | No figures available, though one study suggests that given the tightness of the targeting method, errors of inclusion are likely to be very low while errors of exclusion are likely to be high. Funds are provided by central government. |
| Welfare Outcomes | Not available |
| Cost | In 1998, about 0.1% of GDP. |
| Other Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Munro, Lauchlan, 2005, 'A social safety net for the chronically poor? Zimbabwe's Public Assistance Programme in the 1990s', The European Journal of Development Research, 17(1), pp.111–131. An earlier version of this paper is posted at: http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/2003conferencepapers/Munro.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

| | |
|---|---|
| Country | Zimbabwe (2) |
| Programme Type | Inputs grants |
| Programme Title | Protracted Relief Programme |
| Agencies Involved | DFID; various NGOs |
| Year started | 2004-2006 First Phase |
| Programme Description | A range of activities to boost food production by the poor and provide care to the chronically ill, including agricultural inputs, promotion of low input technologies (such as conservation farming, micro irrigation and improved water points) and limited targeted food assistance with particular emphasis on AIDS-affected households. |
| Programme Objectives | Support community-based safety nets that promote production as well as support basic consumption needs, promote food security and improve livelihoods. |
| Transfers | Inputs, vouchers, targeted food aid as required |
| Targeting | Poorest communities in Zimbabwe, particularly those affected by HIV/AIDS |
| Coverage | National. 1.5 million beneficiaries |
| Monitoring and Evaluation | Independent Output to Purpose Review (OPR) 2005 |
| Evaluation Results | The OPR found that the majority of the interventions are appropriate to the beneficiaries and their circumstances. The indications are that the programme is cost-effective and better value for money than large-scale food distribution. |
| Welfare Outcomes | The OPR found that the programme is starting to make a significant contribution to stabilising food security and protecting livelihoods. |
| Cost | £18m for the whole programme (initial 2 years) |
| Implementation Issues | |
| Programme and Evaluation Sources | Jones, S., Matiza, G., Mlalazi, B. and Wiggins, S. (2005) Zimbabwe Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) Output to Purpose Review. http://www.livelihoods.org/post/Docs/ZimPRPOPRRepV2-1.doc Devereux, S. (2006) Social Protection Mechanisms in Southern Africa. RHVP http://www.wahenga.net/uploads/documents/reports/Social_protection_in_Southern_Africa.pdf |

Return to [INDEX OF PROGRAMMES](#)

GLOSSARY

- Beneficiaries** Direct recipients of support from social assistance programmes.
- Cash for Work** Cash transfers distributed to vulnerable individuals or households in exchange for labour.
- Cash Transfer** Money distributed to individuals and households.
- Categorical Targeting** Selection of programme beneficiaries based on individual or household characteristics or assets, e.g. age, disability, landlessness.
- Conditional Cash Transfer** Cash distributed to individuals or households on condition that these undertake specified activities, e.g. that children attend school or that mothers attend primary health centres.
- Coverage** The population reached by a programme. Coverage rate measures the extent to which programmes reach their target population.
- Displaced People** Those who have been forced to flee from a region or country to settle elsewhere due to war, conflict, or natural disasters.
- Disability** The condition of being unable to support oneself due to mental or physical unfitness.
- Errors of Exclusion** Refers to programmes in which some of the population targeted by a programme are not able or permitted to participate.
- Errors of Inclusion** Refers to programmes in which some of the beneficiaries were not targeted by a programme.
- Evaluation** Process of assessing whether a programme is fulfilling its objectives.
- Fee Waiver** Exemptions from payment of fees, e.g., school fees, exam fees or fees for medical treatment, for selected individuals or groups.
- Food Based Transfer** Food distributed to individuals and households to alleviate poverty or malnutrition.
- Food For Work** Food distributed to individuals or households in exchange for labour.
- Food Stamp** A type of redeemable stamp or coupon issued by government to low-income households and individuals.
- Geographic Targeting** Selection of beneficiaries on the basis of their residence in poorer regions or locations.
- Gini Coefficient** Is a number between 0 and 1, where 0 corresponds with perfect equality (where everyone has the same income) and 1 corresponds with perfect inequality (where one person has all the income, and everyone else has zero income).
- Grant** A sum of money or in-kind subsidy awarded to compensate for specified contingencies, e.g. resettlement, old age, or disability.

Gross Domestic Product (GDP) A measure of the value of all the resources produced by a country in a year.

Independent Monitoring Monitoring conducted by an organisation or individual outside of the agency or organisation responsible for a particular programme.

In-kind Transfer Non-cash transfers, e.g. wheat, flour (see Food Based Transfer).

Integrated Rural Development The integration of agricultural and other productive activities together with the provision of complementary social and infrastructure investments considered essential for successful development.

Leakage The extent to which a programme includes beneficiaries not in the target group. The leakage rate of a poverty programme measures the proportion of beneficiaries that are not poor.

Means or Income Test A test applied to determine eligibility for programme benefits. It usually defines a threshold above which applicants are not eligible for support. The threshold can be based on the income or assets, or both, of the applicant and her immediate family (spouse, household). The test also determines the value of the benefit paid, for example the difference between current income and the threshold.

Micro-credit Loans provided by government or voluntary organisations to fund micro-enterprises.

MT Metric tonnes

Near Cash Transfer A non-monetary transfer that can be exchanged for goods or services, e.g. food stamps or school vouchers.

Operational Effectiveness Measures the extent to which programmes are implemented successfully.

Per Capita The amount resulting from distributing a sum across all members of a population, e.g. per capita household income is the amount resulting from distributing total household income equally among the members of a household.

Percentage Points Used to describe a change in a variable by counting the number of percentiles the variable has changed by, e.g. if the school enrolment rate before the introduction of a food-for-work programme was 40% and after the introduction of the programme is now 50%, the programme can be associated with a 10 percentage point increase in the enrolment rate, or a 25% percent change (the enrolment rate has risen by a quarter of its original value).

Pilot Project A small-scale project undertaken in an effort to determine whether a larger-scale project should be undertaken at a later date.

Poverty Gap The difference between the current income or expenditure of the poor and the poverty line.

Poverty Headcount The proportion of a population who are poor.

Primary Health Care Health care that emphasises preventive and public health care measures based on low-cost techniques to reach the maximum number of people.

Proxy Index A test of whether individuals or households are eligible for participation in a programme, based on an index calculated from several variables but excluding income or

expenditure. Households are then ranked according to their index value, and programme beneficiaries are selected if their index value is below a threshold.

Public Assistance Government support for individuals or households unable to support themselves.

Quintiles The groups resulting from dividing a population equally into five groups according to a specific variable, e.g. the poorest income quintile is the poorest 20% of a population ranked according to their income.

Relief Assistance Assistance provided on a temporary basis for individuals, households, or communities affected by shocks, such as natural disasters.

Self-Targeting Describes programmes which do not define participation requirements but include design features that attract some target population only, e.g. public works that pay wages lower than the market wage will only attract the unemployed or underemployed.

Social Pensions Term applied to non-contributory pensions in South Africa and Namibia, describing unconditional cash transfers paid to older or disabled people. Social pensions are financed from government revenues.

Targeting The selection of beneficiaries of a programme.

Unconditional Cash Transfer Cash transferred to individuals and/or households without conditions or requirements.

Underemployment Applies to workers working fewer hours than their preferred hours of work.

Unemployment Applies to individuals who are able and willing to work but cannot find employment.

Vulnerability The probability that individuals and households are, or continue to be, poor in the future.

LINKS TO COMPARATIVE SOURCES

For an overview of social assistance programmes in developing countries, and a comparative discussion of specific types of programmes, a good starting point is the World Bank's safety net website at <http://www.worldbank.org/safetynets>
Short primer notes on types of instruments with links to full papers are available from <http://www1.worldbank.org/sp/safetynets/PrimerNotes.asp>.

For comparative information on social protection and security throughout the world and for specific low-income countries, see the International Labour Office (ILO) website at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/publ/index.htm>

For a discussion of the scope and effectiveness of cash transfers see the summary of a paper by S. R. Tabor on *Assisting the Poor with cash: Design and Implementation of Social Transfer Programmes* available at <http://go.worldbank.org/F6GV904FE0>

For a brief note comparing the cost-effectiveness of public works versus human capital subsidies, see <http://www.ifpri.org/themes/mp18/wfp/safetynets.pdf>

For a discussion of price and tax subsidies to meet social protection objectives see a paper by H. Alderman on *Subsidies as a Social safety net: Effectiveness and Challenges* at <http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/79646/Dc%202003/courses/dc2003/readings/subsidies.pdf>

For a discussion of the challenges of extending social protection in low income countries see a paper by J. Smith and K. Subbarao on *What Role for Safety Net Transfers in Very Low Income Countries?* at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Safety-Nets-DP/0301.pdf>

For information on food security and other food-based social protection programs specific to Africa and South Asia, see the United Nations World Food Program's operations at http://www.wfp.org/operations/introduction/index.asp?section=5&sub_section=1

For a review of conditional cash transfer programmes in Latin America see Rawlings, L. and Rubio, G. [2005] *Evaluating the Impact of Conditional Cash Transfer Programs: Lessons from Latin America*, World Bank Research Observer, 20(1), pp. 29-55. Earlier draft available at: <http://go.worldbank.org/L7RZYL07J0>

An evaluation of the redistributive properties of public transfers, and especially social assistance, programmes in Latin America can be found in Lindert, K., Skoufias, E. and Shapiro, J. [2005] *Redistributing Income to the Poor and the Rich: Public Transfers in Latin America and the Caribbean*, available from: http://wwwtest.aup.edu/lacea2005/system/step2_php/papers/lindert_klin.pdf

Information on cash transfers in Africa can be found in Devereux, S., Marshall, J., MacAskill, J., Pelham, L. [2005] *Making Cash Count: Lessons from cash transfers in*

east and southern Africa for supporting the most vulnerable children and households, Save the Children UK, HelpAge International and Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex. Posted at:

http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/poverty_team/MakingCashCountfinal.pdf

The use of cash transfers in emergencies is discussed in Harvey, P. [2005] Cash and vouchers in emergencies, HPG Discussion Paper, Overseas Development Institute.

Posted at: <http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/cash%20discussion%20paper.pdf>

An assessment on public works as a social protection instrument can be found in Subbarao, K. [2003] Systemic Shocks and Social Protection: Role and Effectiveness of Public Works Programs, Social Protection Discussion paper 0302, The World Bank.

Posted at: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Safety-Nets-DP/0302.pdf>

Return to [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

LINKS TO OTHER DATABASES

Social Security Programmes throughout the World. The US Social Security Administration has an online database of social security programmes, including summary information on employment-based programmes and some public assistance. The database is updated twice yearly and can be accessed at:

<http://www.ssa.gov/policy/docs/progdsc/ssptw/>

Family Allowances. A database of family allowances, with information on both employment-based and public programmes can be found in S. Roddis and Z. Tzannatos [1999] *Family Allowances*, Social Protection Discussion Paper 9814, Washington: The World Bank. Posted at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Labor-Market-DP/9814.pdf>

Targeted Programmes. Coady, David , Margaret Grosh, and John Hoddinott, [2004], *Targeting of transfers in Developing countries: review of lessons and experiences* Washington DC: The World Bank. Posted at:

http://www1.worldbank.org/sp/safetynets/Primers/Targeting_Grosh_8-04.pdf

Cash transfers targeted on households with children. Barrientos, A. and J. DeJong [2004], *Child poverty and cash transfers*, Report 4, London: Childhood Poverty Research and Policy Centre, includes an Appendix with summary information on conditional cash transfer programmes. Posted at

<http://www.childhoodpoverty.org/index.php/action=documentfeed/doctype=pdf/id=84/>

Conditional cash transfer programmes. Summary information and links to programme websites for several conditional cash transfer programmes supported by the World Bank. Posted at:

<http://go.worldbank.org/BWUC1CMXM0>

Return to [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, L. and Kebede, E. [2005] Breaking the poverty cycle: A case study of cash interventions in Ethiopia. Humanitarian Policy Group, ODI London.
http://www.odi.org.uk/hpg/papers/HPG_Ethiopia.pdf
- Ahmed, A. U. and C. del Ninno [2002], Food for Education Programme in Bangladesh: An evaluation of the Impact on Educational Attainment and Food Security. Washington DC, International Food Policy Research Institute. <http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp138.pdf>
- Ahmed, S. [2005] Delivery Mechanisms of Cash Transfer Programs to the Poor in Bangladesh. World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper Series. Washington DC.
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/0520web.pdf>
- Attanasio, O.; Battistin, E.; Fitzsimons, E.; Mesnard, A. and Vera-Hernandez, M. [2005] How effective are conditional cash transfers? Evidence from Colombia, IFS Briefing Notes, London: IFS.
http://www.ifs.org.uk/edepo/publications.php?publication_id=3214
- AUSAID [N.D.] The Impact of the Asian Financial Crisis on the Health Sector in Indonesia. Australian Government. AusAID.
http://www.usaid.gov.au/publications/pdf/health_indonesia.pdf
- Barrientos, A. [2004], Cash transfers for older people reduce poverty and inequality, Background paper for WDR06, IDPM, University of Manchester.
- Barrientos, A. and P. Lloyd-Sherlock (2003), Non-contributory pensions and poverty prevention. A comparative study of Brazil and South Africa, Report, Manchester: IDPM and HelpAge International. <http://idpm.man.ac.uk/ncpps> .
- Barrientos, A. and J. DeJong (2004), Child poverty and cash transfers, Report 4, London: Childhood Poverty Research and Policy Centre.
<http://www.childhoodpoverty.org/index.php?action=documentfeed/doctype=pdf/id=84/>
- Begum, Sharifa [n.d.] Pension and Social Security in Bangladesh, mimeo, Bangladesh Institute of Development Studies
- Bertranou, F. and Grushka, C. O. [2002] The non-contributory pension programme in Argentina. Assessing the impact on poverty reduction, available at
<http://www.ilo.org/gimi/RessFileDownload.do?resourceId=2617&ressFilename=2617.pdf>
- Bertranou, F.; Solorio, C. and van Ginneken, W. [2002] Pensiones no contributivas y asistenciales. Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Costa Rica y Uruguay, book available in Spanish at:
<http://www.oitchile.cl/pdf/publicaciones/pro/pro012.pdf>
- Bitrán, R. and Giedion, U. [2003] Waivers and Exemptions for Health Services in Developing Countries. World Bank Social Protection Discussion Paper No. 0308. Washington DC.
<http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SAFETYNETSANDTRANSFERS/Resources/281945-1124119303499/SSNPrimerNote9.pdf>
- Bitran, R., Turbat, V., Meessen, B. and Van Damme, W. (n.d.) Preserving Equity in Health in Cambodia: Health Equity Funds and Prospects for Replication. Bitran and Associates, World

Bank and Institute of Tropical Medicine, Antwerp, Belgium. Posted at:
http://info.worldbank.org/etools/docs/library/48614/oj_bitran.pdf

Brazilian Court of Audit [2003], TCU Evaluation of the Child Labor Eradication Program, Brasilia.
http://www2.tcu.gov.br/pls/portal/docs/PAGE/TCU/PUBLICACOES/PUBLICACAO_LINGUA_ESTRANGEIRA/INGLES/EXECUTIVE_SUMMARIES_3.PDF

Cameron, Lisa A. [2000] An Analysis of the Role of Social Safety Net Scholarships in Reducing School Drop-Out During the Indonesian Economic Crisis. Innocenti Working Paper No. 82. Florence: UNICEF Innocenti Research Centre.
<http://www.unicef-icdc.org/publications/pdf/iwp82.pdf>

Canadian Foodgrains Bank: A Christian Response to Hunger, Canadian Foodgrains Bank [Liberia].
http://www.foodgrainsbank.ca/project/169/liberia_internally_displaced_people_relief_assistance_project.aspx

Canadian Foodgrains Bank: A Christian Response to Hunger, Canadian Foodgrains Bank [Malawi].
http://www.foodgrainsbank.ca/project/257/malawi_north_central_food_response.asp

Cardoso, E. and Souza, A. P. [2004] The Impact of cash transfers on child labor and school attendance in Brazil, mimeo, University of São Paulo.
<http://www.vanderbilt.edu/Econ/wparchive/workpaper/vu04-w07.pdf>

Carlioni, A. et al. [2004] A Report from the Office of Evaluation. Full Report of the Evaluation of AFGHANISTAN PRRO 10233. WFP
<http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/reports/wfp065390.pdf>

Case, A. (2001), Does Money Protect Health Status? Evidence from South African Pensions, NBER Working Paper 8495. <http://www.nber.org/papers/W8495>

Case, A. and A. Deaton (1998), 'Large Scale Transfers to the Elderly in South Africa', *Economic Journal*, vol. 108, no. 450, pp. 1330-1261.

Case, A.; Hosegood, V.; Lund, F [2003] The reach of the South African Child Support Grant: Evidence from Kwa-Zulu Natal', CSDS Working Paper 38.
http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000582/P538_Child_Support_KZN.pdf

CGAP [2001] Linking Microfinance and Safety Net Programs to Include the Poorest Focus Note 21, Washington DC: CGAP, May. http://www.cgap.org/docs/FocusNote_21.html

Clay, D.; D. Molla and D. Habtewold [1999] Food Aid targeting in Ethiopia: A Study of who needs it and who gets it? , *Food Policy* 24: 391-409.

Coady, David , Margaret Grosh, and John Hoddinott, [2004], Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries: Review of Lessons and Experience. Washington DC: The World Bank.
http://www1.worldbank.org/sp/safetynets/Primers/Targeting_Grosh_8-04.pdf

Coady, D. and S. Parker [2002], A Cost-effectiveness Analysis of Demand- and Supply-side Education Interventions: The Case of PROGRESA in Mexico, FCND Discussion Paper 127.
<http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp127.pdf>

Chirwa, E. W. et al. [2004] The Evaluation Of The Improving Livelihoods Through Public Works Programme (ILTPWP). Wadonda Consult/MASAF/CARE Malawi.

<http://www.masaf.org/studies/ILTPWP%20Evaluation%20Final%20Report%20-%202004.pdf>

- CIMU (Central Independent Monitoring Unit) [2000] History and Overview of the Scholarships and Grants Program. Indonesia. http://www.cimu.or.id/full_text_reports/Cimu-SpIssue1-Engl.pdf
- Datt, G. and M. Ravallion [1994] Transfer Benefits from Public-Works Employment: Evidence for Rural India, *Economic Journal* 104:1346-1369.
- Datt, G., E. Payongayong, J. Garret and M. Ruel [1997] The GAPVU Cash Transfer Program in Mozambique: An Assessment, FCND Discussion paper 36, IFPRI. <http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/dp36.pdf>
- del Ninno, C. and P. Dorosh [2002], In-Kind Transfers and Household Food Consumption: Implications for targeted food programs in Bangladesh. FCND Discussion Paper 134, IFPRI. <http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp134.pdf>
- Devereux, S. [2001] Can Social safety Nets reduce Chronic Poverty?, *Development Policy Review* 20(5): 657-675.
- Devereux, S. [2001] 'Social Pensions in Namibia and South Africa', IDS Discussion Paper 379. <http://www.ids.ac.uk/ids/bookshop/dp/dp379.pdf>
- Devereux, S., Marshall, J., MacAskill, J., Pelham, L. [2005] Making Cash Count: Lessons from cash transfer schemes in east and southern Africa for supporting the most vulnerable children and households. Save the Children UK, HelpAge International and Institute of Development Studies http://www.ids.ac.uk/UserFiles/File/poverty_team/MakingCashCountfinal.pdf
- Devereux, S. (2006) Social Protection Mechanisms in Southern Africa. RHVP http://www.wahenga.net/uploads/documents/reports/Social_protection_in_Southern_Africa.pdf
- DFID briefing available at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk/pubs/files/mdg-factsheets/hungerfactsheet.pdf>
- Donaldson, D., Pannarunothai, S., and Tangcharoensathien, V. [1999] Health Financing in Thailand: Technical Report. Management Sciences for Health. Boston http://www.msh.org/resources/online_reports/pdf/thaihf0.PDF
- Dorosh, P. and S. Haggblade [1995] Filling the Gaps: Consolidating Evidence on the design of Alternative Targeted Food Programmes in Bangladesh, *Bangladesh Development Studies* (3 and 4): 47-80.
- Duran-Valverde, F. [2002] Anti-poverty programmes in Costa Rica. The non-contributory pension scheme. Posted at: <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper8.pdf>
- Dureya, S. and Morrison, A. [2004] The effect of conditional transfers on school performance and child labor: Evidence from an ex-post impact evaluation in Costa Rica. Available from: <http://www.iadb.org/res/publications/pubfiles/pubWP-505.pdf>
- Education Watch Report [2003/4] Quality with Equity: The Primary Education Agenda. www.campebd.org/download/EWReport20034FullEnglish.pdf
- Filmer, D. and Shady, N. (2006) Getting girls into school: evidence from a scholarship program in Cambodia <http://www->

wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2007/11/28/000158349_20071128084228/Rendered/PDF/wps3910.pdf

- Gaiha, R.; K. Imai and P. Kausik (2001) On the Targeting and Cost-Effectiveness of Anti-poverty Programmes in Rural India, *Development and Change* (32) 309-42.
- Galasso, E and Ravallion M. [2003] Social Protection in a Crisis: Argentina's Plan Jefes y Jefas, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3165, November, posted at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper5.pdf>
- Garret, J. [2001] Lessons from the urban Food for Work Programme: care-Ethiopia. Notes and observations. Washington DC: IFPRI. Posted at: http://www.ifpri.org/pubs/ib/ib9_ethiopia.pdf
- Gough, Amy E., Christina H. Gladwin, and Peter E. Hildebrand, 'Vouchers Versus Grants of Inputs: Evidence From Malawi's Starter Pack Program.' *African Studies Quarterly* 6, no.1. <http://web.africa.ufl.edu/asq/v6/v6i1a8.htm>
- Government of Maharashtra (2002) Chapter 20 "Rural Employment- Employment Guarantee Scheme and Jawhar Rojgar Yohana in the Government Report on Tenth Five Year Plan 2002-2007. www.maharashtra.gov.in/pdf/tenthPlan/Chapter20.pdf
- Hardeman, W., Van Damme, W., Van Pelt, M., Por, I., Kimvan, H., and Meessen, B. (2004) Access to Health Care for All? User fees plus a Health Equity Fund in Sotnikum, Cambodia. *Health Policy and Planning* 19(1): 22-32. Oxford University Press. Posted at: <http://heapol.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/reprint/19/1/22>
- HelpAge International [2003] Non-contributory pensions in India: A case study of Uttar Pradesh, London: HAI.
- Hodges, A. et al (2007) Child benefits and poverty reduction: evidence from Mongolia's Child Money Programme. Maastricht University (Maastricht Graduate School of Governance) -UNICEF Policy research paper.
- Hussain, A. [2003] "Urban Poverty in China: Measurement, Patterns and Policies" ILO. Accessed at <http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/ses/download/docs/china.pdf>
- International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), [online publication] 'New food security project in Northern Guéra', IFAD. http://www.afrol.com/News/cha001_guera_food.htm
- International News Network [2005] 'Foolproof monitoring system for PBM funds' disbursement voiced', International News Network - the Internet Edition. <http://www.onlinenews.com.pk/details.php?id=71485>
- Jayne, T., J. Straus, T. Yamano and D. Molla [2001] Giving to the Poor? Targeting of Food Aid in Rural Ethiopia, *World Development* 29 (5): 887-910.
- Jones, S., Matiza, G., Mlalazi, B. and Wiggins, S. (2005) Zimbabwe Protracted Relief Programme (PRP) Output to Purpose Review. <http://www.livelihoods.org/post/Docs/ZimPRPOPRRepV2-1.doc>
- Lavinas, Lena [2003] 'Encouraging School Attendance in Mozambique by Granting a Minimum Income to parents', *International Social Security Review*, vol. 56, July-December 2003, Blackwell Publishing: Geneva, pp. 139-155.

- León, Mauricio and Younger, Stephen D. [2007] 'Transfer Payments, Mothers' Income, and Child Health in Ecuador', *Journal of Development Studies*, 43(6), pp 1126-1143.
- Levinson, F. James, 'Toward Success in Combating Malnutrition: An Assessment of What Works', UN ACC Sub-committee on Nutrition.
<http://www.unu.edu/unupress/food/8F043e/8F043E07.htm>
- Levy, Sarah [2003], Starter Packs and Hunger Crises. A Briefing for Policy Makers on Food Security in Malawi, mimeo.
<http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/0/ec104e782154f9e4c1256dda00385ce7?OpenDocument>
- Maluccio, J. and R. Flores [2004] Impact Evaluation of a Conditional Cash Transfer Program: The Nicaraguan Red de Protección Social, FCND Discussion Paper 184, IFPRI. Posted at:
<http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp184.pdf>
- Matin, Imran and David Hulme [2003], Programs For The Poorest: Learning From the IGVGD Program in Bangladesh, *World Development* Vol. 31, No. 3, pp. 647-665.
- Matin, Imran, Shantana Halder [2004] Combining Methodologies for Better Targeting of the Ultra Poor, Working Paper No. 2, BRAC Research and Evaluation Division
http://www.bracresearch.org/working_papers_details.php?scat=28&v=0&tid=89
- Matin, Imran [2002] Targeted development Programmes for the Extreme Poor: Experiences from BRAC Experiments, CPRC Working Paper 20, IDPM, Manchester.
<http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/20Matin.pdf>
- Matin, Imran and Yasmin, Rabeya [2004] Managing scaling up challenges of a programme for the poorest: Case study of Brac's IGVGD programme.
http://www.bracresearch.org/publications_details.php?scat=29&v=0&tid=100
- McCord, A. [2004] Policy Expectations and Programme Reality: The Poverty Reduction and Labour Market Impact of Two Public Works Programmes in South Africa. ESAU Working Paper 8 ODI, London.
http://www.odi.org.uk/esau/publications/working_papers/Esau_8_South_Africa.pdf
- MCDSS, GTZ (2006) Evaluation Report: Kalomo Social Cash Transfer Scheme,
<http://www.gtz.de/en/themen/soziale-entwicklung/soziale-sicherheit/19881.htm>
- Milimo, J. et al. [2004] The Incapacitated Poor in Zambia. Report on a Study by Participatory Assessment Group and Public Welfare Assistance Scheme. Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and GTZ. Lusaka.
<http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/Incapacitated%20Poor%20Study.pdf>
- Ministry of Education, Youth and Sport [2001] Priority Action Program For Improving The Quality And Effectiveness Of Basic Education. Kingdom of Cambodia.
<http://www.moeys.gov.kh/details-directions01-02/PAPPlan2001/pap.htm>
- Ministry of Rural Development, Executive Summary of National Social Assistance Programme, Government of India. Posted at: <http://www.drd.nic.in/jry2/esnsap.htm>
- Monitoring and evaluation documentation and preliminary results [Honduras]:
<http://www.ifpri.org/themes/praf.htm#pubs>
- Morgan, Richard [1991] State pensions as an income safety net in Namibia, *Food Policy* 351-359.

- Muller, Katharina [2008] Contested Universalism: from Bonosol to Renta Dignidad in Bolivia, in *International Journal of Social Welfare* (17) 1-10
- Munro, Lauchlan, 2005, 'A social safety net for the chronically poor? Zimbabwe's Public Assistance Programme in the 1990s', *European Journal of Development Research* 17(1), pp.111–131. An earlier version of this paper is posted at:
<http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/conferencepapers/Munro.pdf>
- National Advisory Committee [2004] National Rural Employment Guarantee Act. India.
http://nac.nic.in/communication/draft_rega.pdf
- National Social Assistance Programme. Posted at: <http://rural.nic.in/book00-01/ch-7.pdf>
- Nyasulu, G., Kuyeli, J., Levy, S. and Barahona, C. [2002] Dedza Safety Nets Pilot Project: learning lessons about direct welfare transfers for Malawi's National Safety Nets Strategy. Interim Report.
<http://www.personal.rdg.ac.uk/~snsbarah/dsnpp/Dedza%20Safety%20Nets%20Pilot%20Project%20Interim%20Report.pdf>
- Operations Evaluation Department [2005] Country Assistance Programme Evaluation for Indonesia. Asian Development Bank. <http://www.adb.org/Documents/CAPES/INO/cap-ino-2005-16.pdf>
- Pasha, Hafiz A., Sumaira Jafarey and Hari Ram Lohano, Evaluation of Social Safety Nets in Pakistan, Research Report No.32 Posted at the Social Policy and Development Centre,
<http://64.224.68.11/pubs/rr/rr32.pdf>
- Phillips, S. [2004] The Expanded Public Works Programme (EPWP). Overcoming underdevelopment in South Africa's second economy. UNDP, HSRC and DBSA.
http://www.sarprn.org.za/documents/d0000986/P1102-Phillips_Public_Works_Oct2004.pdf
- Project Profile (2007) Social Cash Transfer Pilot, Malawi
http://www.crin.org/docs/CashTransfer_FS5.pdf
- PWAS Booklet [no date]
http://www.socialcashertransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/PWAS_Booklet.pdf
- Rajan, S.I. [2003] Old-age Allowance Program in Nepal, Conference Paper.
<http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/conferencepapers/rajan.pdf>
- Rajan, S.I. [2001] Social Assistance for Poor Elderly: How effective?, *Economic and Political Weekly* XXXVI (8): 613-617
- Ravallion, M. and Q. Wodon (1999). Does child labour displace schooling? Evidence on behavioral responses to enrollment subsidy, Policy Research Working Paper WPS2116, Washington DC, The World Bank.
http://econ.worldbank.org/external/default/main?pagePK=64165259&theSitePK=469372&piPK=64165421&menuPK=64166093&entityID=000094946_99060201584595
- Ravallion, M. and Q. Wodon [2000] "Does child labour displace schooling? Evidence on behavioural responses to enrollment subsidy." *Economic Journal* 110(462): C158-C175.
- Rawlings, L. and Rubio, G. [2003] Evaluating the Impact of Conditional Cash Transfer Programs: Lessons from Latin America, Washington DC: the World Bank.
<http://www1.worldbank.org/sp/safetynets/publications/files/rawlings03cct.doc>

Republic of Zambia Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and German Technical Cooperation [2005] An Assessment Study in the Framework of the Development of a Social Protection Strategy. Case Studies Final Draft Summary Report. Republic of Zambia Ministry of Community Development and Social Services and German Technical Cooperation.

<http://www.socialcashtransfers-zambia.org/mediapool/28/282961/data/Social%20Protection%20Assessment%20Study.pdf>

Review of Pilot Study and early information on programme implementation [Jamaica]:

http://www.npep.org.jm/Projects_Programmes/Ministry_of_Labour_and_Social_/P_ATH/p_a th.html .

Roddis, S. and Z. Tzannatos (1999), Family allowances, Social Protection Discussion Paper 9814, Washington DC: The World Bank.

[http://wbIn0018.worldbank.org/HDNet/hddocs.nsf/65538a343139acab85256cb70055e6ed/916eb48f8d5e08d3852567d20065578d/\\$FILE/9814.pdf](http://wbIn0018.worldbank.org/HDNet/hddocs.nsf/65538a343139acab85256cb70055e6ed/916eb48f8d5e08d3852567d20065578d/$FILE/9814.pdf)

Schady, N. and Araujo, M.C. [2006], 'Cash transfers, conditions, school enrolment, and child work: Evidence from a randomized experiment in Ecuador', World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3930, available at

http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=917501.

Schubert, Berndt [2004] The Pilot Social Cash Transfer Scheme Kalomo District – Zambia', Lusaka.

<http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0001054/index.php>

Schubert, B. and Huijbregts, M. (2006) The Malawi Social Cash Transfer Pilot Scheme, Preliminary Lessons Learned. Paper presented at the conference on "Social Protection Initiatives for Children, Women and Families: An Analysis of Recent Experiences" New York, 30-31 October 2006

<http://www.globalaging.org/elderrights/world/malawi.pdf>

Schwarzer, H. and Querino, A.C. [2002] Non-contributory pensions in Brazil. The impact on poverty reduction. Posted at:

<http://www.ilo.org/public/english/protection/secsoc/downloads/publ/esspaper11.pdf>

Skoufias, E. and McClafferty, B. [2001] Is PROGRESA Working? Summary of the Results of An Evaluation by IFPRI, Discussion Paper 118, IFPRI. Posted at:

<http://www.ifpri.org/divs/fcnd/dp/papers/fcndp118.pdf>

Social Security White Paper [2004] China.org.cn

<http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/APCITY/UNPAN019944.pdf>

Subbarao K., Jeanine Braithwaite and Jyotsna Jalan [1995] 'Protecting The Poor During Adjustment And Transitions', HCO WORKING PAPERS, Number 58.

<http://www.worldbank.org/html/extdr/hnp/hddflash/hcwp/hrwp049.html>

Subbarao et al. [1996] Namibia's Social Safety Net: Issues and Options for Reform, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 280.

<http://www.worldbank.org/html/dec/Publications/Workpapers/WPS1900series/wps1996/wps1996.pdf>

Subbarao, K.; A. Bonnerjee; S. Carvalho; K. Ezemenari; C. Graham and A. Thompson (1997), Safety net programmes and poverty reduction. Lessons from cross-country experience, Washington DC: The World Bank.

Thomas, E.C. [2005] Job Guarantee for the Rural Poor. 6 September 2005. Press Information Bureau, Government of India. <http://pib.nic.in/release/release.asp?relid=11820>

- Towards a profile of the ultra poor in Bangladesh: Findings from CFPR/TUP baseline survey [2004]
Research and Evaluation Division, Brac
http://www.bracresearch.org/publications_details.php?scat=29&v=0&tid=94
- United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) [2003]; Relief Bulletin:
Weekly Humanitarian Highlights in Ethiopia, 22 Aug 2003
<http://www.reliefweb.int/rw/rwb.nsf/AllDocsByUNID/30084754c2088c4685256d8a005ba1eb>
- UNCDF [2005] Local Development Project (LDP) North Gondar Zone, Amhara National Regional
State. Project document - final draft.
http://www.uncdf.org/english/countries/ethiopia/local_governance/project_documents/uncdf_eth-prodoc2005.pdf
- UNICEF review of cash transfers in Kenya available at:
http://www.unicef.org/policyanalysis/files/The_Evolution_of_the_Government_of_Kenya_Cash_Transfer_Programme_for_Vulnerable_Children.pdf
- USAID/THE GAMBIA RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4) [2001].
http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/Pdabt641.pdf
- USAID [2002] Impact Evaluation, Mozambique 1999-2000 Floods
<http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000811/index.php>
- Woolard, I. [2003] Social Assistance Grants (Impact of Government Programmes using
Administrative Data Sets) Report. <http://www.sarpn.org.za/documents/d0000946/index.php>
- World Bank [2005] Cambodia: Quality Basic Education for All. Human Development Sector Unit,
East Asia and the Pacific Region, World Bank.
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTEAPREGTOPEDUCATION/Resources/cambodia_efa_jan05.pdf
- Yap, Y, Sedlacek, G. and Orazem, P. [2002] Limiting child labor through behaviour-based income
transfers: An Experimental evaluation of the PETI Program in rural Brazil, Washington DC:
The World Bank. <http://www.iadb.org/res/publications/pubfiles/pubS-223.pdf>

Return to [TABLE OF CONTENTS](#)