

# ANNEX 1: TERMS USED

**Beneficiaries:** Direct recipients of support from programmes.

**Cash Transfer:** Money distributed to individuals and households.

**Categorical/Vulnerable Group Targeting:** Selection of programme beneficiaries based on individual or household characteristics or assets, e.g. age, disability, landlessness. These can sometimes be social categories taken as proxies for income/ consumption poverty

**Conditional Cash Transfer:** Cash distributed to individuals or households on condition that they undertake specified activities, e.g. that children attend school or primary health centres.

**Coverage:** The population reached by a programme. Coverage rate measures the extent to which programmes reach their target population.

**Errors of Exclusion:** Proportion of target group of a programme who, for different reasons, are not able or permitted to participate in the programme or are 'missed' by the targeting procedure.

**Errors of Inclusion:** Proportion of beneficiaries included in the scheme who were not included in design target group (eg better off households in a scheme for the poorest households).

**Geographic Targeting:** Selection of beneficiaries on the basis of their residence in poorer regions or locations.

**Grant:** A sum of money or in-kind subsidy awarded to compensate for specified contingencies, e.g. resettlement, old age, or disability.

**In-kind Transfer:** Non-cash transfers, e.g. wheat, flour, school materials.

**Leakage:** Similar to inclusion error, leakage is the extent to which a programme includes beneficiaries not in the target group. Leakage often refers specifically to diversion of programme funds away from the intended beneficiaries, such as through corruption.

**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.

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

**Poverty Headcount:** The proportion of a population who are poor (under the, usually nationally determined, poverty line)

**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, describing unconditional cash transfers paid to older or disabled people.

**Social protection:** All public and private initiatives that provide income or consumption transfers to the poor, protect the vulnerable against livelihood risks, and enhance the social status and rights of the marginalised; with the overall objective of reducing the economic and social vulnerability of poor, vulnerable and marginalised groups.

**Targeting:** The selection of beneficiaries of a programme.

**Unconditional Cash Transfer:** Cash transferred to individuals or households without conditions or requirements (ie beneficiaries don't have to work for the transfer, or spend the transfer on particular goods and/or services).

# ANNEX 2: STUDY DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

## A2.1 Overall Study Design

### Objective of study

The aim of this UNICEF-led review was to contribute to the scale-up of action for MVC and vulnerable households by providing details of programme design, delivery issues and potential benefits of a scale-up of social protection programmes in ESAR.

### Selection of countries

The focus countries for the review were those countries:

- in the East and Southern Africa region (ESAR);
- with a generalised HIV epidemic (based on the WHO classification of HIV epidemics) i.e. all countries with an HIV prevalence in its general population higher than 5 per cent;
- in which OVC Rapid Appraisal Analysis and Action Planning (RAAAP) process documentation has been completed. Each RAAAP includes a situation analysis of all programmes focusing on OVC within a country.

These criteria give us a list of 15 countries: Botswana, Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Rwanda, South Africa, Swaziland, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

### Stages of the review

The review was completed in 2 stages:

**Stage 1:** A literature review, e-mail survey and telephone interviews focusing on developing: an inventory of safety protection interventions in each sector for the 15 countries; a narrative overview of the types of interventions (based on the inventory), a methodology for Stage 2 (January to May 2005). See section A2.2.

**Stage 2:** Specific case studies for a more in depth review, which were conducted between June and August 2005. See section A2.3.

## A2.2 Stage 1 Methodology

In collaboration with other study teams and UNICEF, a generic questionnaire (table A1) was designed, aimed at capturing basic descriptive information on current (and recently discontinued) cash transfer programmes in all 15 countries. The questionnaire was kept as short and as simple as possible, with just 22 questions, to encourage respondents to complete it at low cost in terms of their time.

Potential respondents were identified through a combination of contact lists provided by UNICEF, SC-UK and HelpAge International country offices, and internet searches on agencies and Government departments. In practice, most of the information reported was elicited in telephone and email interviews with individuals in-country, and from important secondary sources, to complete the questionnaires as far as possible. Over 120 'email interviews' and 60 telephone interviews were conducted with respondents in Africa and the UK. A further 104 individuals and institutions were contacted but failed to respond to our repeated efforts to establish contact with them.

**Table A1: Questionnaire**

1	Title of programme/ project	e.g. National Social Security Fund; <u>or</u> Flexi-voucher Pilot Scheme; <u>or</u> Orphan Support Fund.
2	Type of scheme	e.g. Social pension; <u>or</u> Disability grant; <u>or</u> Orphan support scheme.
3	Objectives of programme	From project documents - list up to <u>three</u> objectives.
4	Name of implementing agency	e.g. Ministry of Social Welfare; <u>or</u> Department of Women's Affairs; <u>or</u> Save the Children UK.
5	Type of implementing agency	e.g. Central Government Ministry; <u>or</u> Local Government department; <u>or</u> Parastatal (government-funded but independent); <u>or</u> Donor agency; <u>or</u> local NGO (including faith-based organisation); <u>or</u> Private trust.
6	Name of funding agency	e.g. World Bank; <u>or</u> Government budget. (Specify the type of agency - e.g. "charity" - if it is unclear.)
7	Programme budget	Budget per annum if possible; if not, state what period it covers (e.g. the project's total lifespan).
8	Additional programme support	Does any other agency support the programme (e.g. with co-funding)? If so, which agency provides this support? What is the nature of this support (e.g. technical advice; or contributions in-kind)?
9	Start date	When did the programme start? (Month <u>and</u> year, if possible.)
10	End date	If the programme has already <u>finished</u> , when did it end? If the programme is <u>ongoing</u> , when is it scheduled to end? (If the programme is continuing <u>indefinitely</u> , write "Permanent".)
11	Documentation available	What documents are available about the programme (e.g. a project proposal; <u>or</u> evaluation report). Can you forward electronic copies of these documents to us? If not, how can we get access to them?
12	Contact details for programme	Programme Manager or another contact person (name; job title; email address; phone number).
13	Value of cash transfer	How much money is given to beneficiaries each time they receive a payment? (e.g. "300 shillings").
14	Frequency of transfer	How often are payments made to beneficiaries? (e.g. "every week"; <u>or</u> "every month"; <u>or</u> "once only").
15	Form of transfer	How are payments made? (e.g. in cash; payments into Post Office or bank accounts; vouchers; cheque).
16	Number of direct beneficiaries	How many people are (or were) registered to receive cash payments?
17	Target group	Who does the programme aim to benefit? (e.g. orphans; <u>or</u> poor households; <u>or</u> the elderly; <u>or</u> people with disabilities; <u>or</u> people living with HIV/AIDS; <u>or</u> care-givers; <u>or</u> farmers affected by drought).
18	Targeting/ eligibility criteria	Who is eligible to receive benefits from this programme? (e.g. orphans under 15 years old; <u>or</u> all citizens over 60 years old; <u>or</u> poor households; <u>or</u> registered blind people; <u>or</u> war veterans).
19	Targeting procedure	How are eligible beneficiaries identified? For example: <u>means tested</u> (households living below the poverty line); or by <u>registration</u> (e.g. people registered as disabled); or by <u>community committees</u> ; etc?
20	Geographic coverage	e.g. National; <u>or</u> Regional; <u>or</u> Provincial; <u>or</u> District, <u>or</u> Ward. (If this is not a national programme, how many provinces or districts are covered?)
21	Consideration of HIV impact	Is the impact of HIV on beneficiaries taken into account in programme design? If YES, how?
22	Additional comments	Any additional points you want to note that aren't covered by the questions above.

Interviewees included staff from:

- **Government Ministries** – Finance; Gender and Community Services; Local Government; Prime Minister’s Office; Social Service Affairs; Social Welfare; Women Affairs and Child Welfare;
- **Multilateral agencies** – European Commission; UNAIDS; UNDP; UNICEF; WFP; World Bank;
- **Bilateral donors** – DFID; GTZ; USAID;
- **International NGOs** – ActionAid; Concern; CRS; HAI; Plan; SC-UK; SOS Sahel; World Vision;
- **Local NGOs/CBOs/FBOs** – Africa Cooperative Action Trust; Incarnate Word Sisters; National AIDS Coordinating Agency; NGO Policy Forum; Pensioners Union of Tanzania;
- **Academic researchers** – from universities in Botswana, Lesotho, South Africa; Tanzania; UK.

## A2.3 Stage 2 Methodology

### Case study aims and approach to selection

The overall objective of **Stage 2** of this study was to examine in detail the design and implementation of selected cash transfer programmes in four African countries.

The case studies selected for the review by the respective organisations were chosen to ensure:

- (1) A geopolitical mix of countries that are Anglophone, Francophone and Lusophone, small and large, in East and in Southern Africa.
- (2) Interesting or innovative social protection programmes including a mix of government and NGO/donor led schemes;
- (3) Programmes that appear to be scalable, replicable and provide evidence of good programming.

The in-country research covered five sets of issues:

- (1) Policy context, policy processes and institutional drivers for cash transfer programmes;
- (2) Programme conceptualisation and design (targeting criteria, delivery mechanisms, etc.);
- (3) Cost-effectiveness (cost per beneficiary, financing, affordability, constraints to scaling up);
- (4) Targeting and reaching children (direct and indirect outreach to MVC);
- (5) Impacts of the programme (economic and social impacts, impacts on children).

### Case study methodology

Fieldwork was conducted at three levels: (1) *national* (the capital city); (2) *programme* (e.g. a district capital); and (3) *local* (community level). The key research sites in each country were the capital city and two or three selected communities where the programme is being implemented. At the national level, interviews were conducted with individuals from government ministries, donors, non-governmental organisations and academics who are actively engaged with safety nets and social protection policies, or programmes dealing with MVCs and/or HIV/AIDS. Key informant interviews were also conducted with senior, middle and junior level officers who have detailed knowledge of different aspects of the programme itself, from design and funding to implementation and evaluation. Two communities were selected for the locality-based fieldwork. The main criterion for selection was that some members of the community must be receiving benefits from the cash transfer programme.

In each country, semi-structured interviews and discussions were conducted with key informants, communities, focus groups, beneficiary households, excluded households, and children. Researchers also observed the cash transfer programme at first hand, for example by attending distributions on programme pay-days.

- **Key informant interviews** with programme staff (from government, donors or NGOs) who conceptualised, designed or implemented the programme, both nationally and locally.

- **Community discussions** and **focus group discussions** with adults and children in areas where the cash transfer programme is operational (groups stratified by wealth, gender and age).
- **Case studies** of households that are receiving cash transfers from the programme (and excluded households).
- **Children's interviews:** In groups or individually, in appropriate contexts such as local schools.
- **Observation:** Attending a distribution point for the cash transfer programme, to observe the delivery process.
- **Review of programme documents** such as Concept Notes, Inception Reports, Monitoring and Evaluation Reports.

Where comprehensive documentation already existed – the case in Zambia and Ethiopia – field work was designed to fill in the gaps rather than duplicate efforts. For details of the methodology adopted in each of the four case studies, please refer to the individual country case study reports.

### **Notes on information availability**

Partly because there are relatively few unconditional cash transfer programmes in East and Southern Africa, and those that are in operation were mostly introduced fairly recently, very few comprehensive impact assessments of these programmes have yet been conducted.<sup>24</sup> One partial exception to this rule is the Kalomo Pilot Project in Zambia, which has generated a wealth of documentation, but even in this case no evaluation has yet been done that includes a control group against which to compare impacts of the social cash transfer. The present review does not claim to add to this limited impact assessment literature as this was not the aim of the work. During community-level fieldwork with programme beneficiaries, qualitative and participatory methods were used, and the findings reported here are anecdotal and indicative rather than statistical. Rigorous and holistic evaluations of unconditional cash transfer programmes in Africa are urgently needed, especially given the current interest among donors and governments to expand, replicate and scale up these programmes. Important issues require further assessment, including whether they are more cost-effective than alternative interventions, whether they have significant growth and poverty-reducing impacts, and to what extent they reach and benefit vulnerable children (particularly those living within foster households).

---

<sup>24</sup> A further factor might be pressures on programme administrators to maximise the 'alpha-ratio' (to transfer as much of the total budget as possible directly to beneficiaries), leaving little budget to allocate to an evaluation of impacts.