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Structure of session

Empirical evidence of impacts on:

1) Poverty
2) Food security
3) Education
4) Child labour
5) Economic growth

Knowledge gaps
"Investment in social protection and social assistance can be extremely effective in reducing current poverty and vulnerability, as well as poverty persistence across time and generations. However, common issues in Programme design are a) Financial sustainability b) capacity c) complementarity"

Armando Barrientos
Positive impacts: Poverty traps

Poverty

Low investment in human capital e.g. children’s education and health

Low earnings and wages

Low productivity

Source: Barrientos 2010
Positive impacts: Poverty headcount

Social protection reduces poverty headcount in rich countries
Positive impacts: Poverty gap

Conditional cash transfers reduce poverty gap in poor countries

Source: World Bank
Cash transfers can cause significant gains in height among children.

- **Colombia**: 0.44
- **Mexico**: 1.0
- **South Africa**: 3.5

**Positive impacts: Food Security**
Positive impacts: Food Security

Cash transfers can cause multiple improvements in household food security.

Food security impacts of Nepal's Child Grant in Karnali region

- 45% Bigger portions/meals
- 27% Greater variety of food
- 15% Greater number of meals a day
- 11% Eating more 'desirable' food
Public works participants in Niger had **lower** BMI than non-participants.
Many social protection instruments can improve education access (school enrolment and attendance rates) and reduce gender gaps in education access:

1. Cash transfers
2. Abolishing school fees
3. School feeding
Positive impacts: Education access

Conditional cash transfers

Source: DFID
Positive impacts: Education access

Abolition of school fees

- Kenya 2002
- Tanzania 2001
- Uganda 1996
- Malawi 1994
Positive impacts: Education access

Take-Home Food Rations in Malawi

Condition: 80% school attendance each month.

- Attendance increased.
- Gender gap narrowed.
Positive impacts: Education access

Evidence from Nepal

Government programmes and donor-supported projects include scholarships for children from ethnic minorities, school feeding programmes, and initiatives to promote girls’ access to education.

- “The primary net enrolment rate increased to 94 percent in 2012 from 87 percent in 2005.”
- “Gender equality in education has also improved considerably.”

Upreti et al. 2012
Positive impacts: Child labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Boys 6-10</th>
<th>Girls 6-10</th>
<th>Boys 11-16</th>
<th>Girls 11-16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>-26%</td>
<td>-25%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td>-16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DFID
Mechanisms:

❖ **Households accumulate productive assets**
  * **Ethiopia**: 8% of households on the Productive Safety Net Programme purchased livestock.
  * **Zambia**: Households on a cash transfer programme owning goats increased from 8.5% to 41.7%.

❖ **Cash transfers are invested in livelihoods**
  * **Mexico**: 12% of Oportunidades cash transfers are invested in micro-enterprises and farming, generating 18% return.
  * **South Africa**: Recipients of social grants use this cash to pay costs of job seeking, such as transport and child care.
1) **Limited impacts of social protection programmes**
   The impact of many programmes is undermined by problems in design (e.g. transfers are too small to make much difference) and implementation (e.g. delayed or irregular payments).

2) **Knowledge gaps**
   There are very few rigorous evaluations of social protection programmes in Nepal, so there is not much evidence on the impacts of these programmes. More evaluations are needed.
IS Nepal's SSA pro-poor

**HH eligibility to SSAs**

By vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quintile 5 (Most) (N=1289)</th>
<th>Quintile 4 (N=1129)</th>
<th>Quintile 3 (N=872)</th>
<th>Quintile 2 (N=891)</th>
<th>Quintile 1 (Least) (N=938)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** OPM Nepal SSA Coverage Survey 2019.

**Note:** Weighted estimates.
China's success in poverty reduction is the result of a combination of factors, including strong economic growth, attention to antipoverty programs, and improved access to social services and social protection. Establishing a comprehensive social protection system has been key for China's successful poverty reduction. The Dibao program, which provides cash to China's needy, is the backbone of the system. It is also the largest program of its kind in the world.

World Bank