EVALUATION OFFICE

CASH TRANSFER AS A SOCIAL PROTECTION INTERVENTION:

EVIDENCE FROM UNICEF EVALUATIONS 2010-2014

unite for children

unicef

JUNE 2015

EVALUATION OFFICE

CASH TRANSFER AS A SOCIAL PROTECTION INTERVENTION:

EVIDENCE FROM UNICEF EVALUATIONS 2010-2014

unite for children

unicef

JUNE 2015

Cash Transfer as a Social Protection Intervention: Evidence from UNICEF Evaluations 2010-2014

United Nations Children's Fund
Three United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017
June 2015

The purpose of publishing evaluation synthesis reports produced by the UNICEF Evaluation Office is to fulfil a corporate commitment to transparency through the publication of all completed evaluations and related products. The reports are designed to stimulate a free exchange of ideas among those interested in the topic and to assure those supporting the work of UNICEF that it rigorously examines its strategies, results and overall effectiveness.

The report was prepared by a team comprising two professionals from the Evaluation Office, and two external experts. Sam Bickel, Senior Advisor–Research and Evaluation, managed and led the process with support from Tina Tordjman-Nebe, Evaluation Specialist in UNICEF's Evaluation Office. The external experts were Uyen Kim Huynh and Olivia Collins.

The purpose of the report is to facilitate the exchange of knowledge among UNICEF personnel and its partners. By annually presenting a synthesis of evaluation findings from one of UNICEF's outcome areas to the Executive Board, the Evaluation Office hopes to promote insight into how UNICEF is working and performing and to help key stakeholders better understand the role of evaluation. The contents of the report do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of UNICEF.

For further information, please contact:

Evaluation Office
United Nations Children's Fund
Three United Nations Plaza
New York, New York 10017
evalhelp@unicef.org

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Cash transfers are one modality among a range of social protection interventions. Predictable direct transfers to individuals or households protect them from shocks and support the accumulation of human, productive and financial assets. UNICEF supports advocacy for national policy development and provides technical assistance to government-led cash transfer programmes in many countries.

The evaluation synthesis is the first exercise of this kind in the social protection programme area and the first evaluation synthesis focusing explicitly on programme impacts. It distills lessons from 42 high quality evaluations and assessments completed by UNICEF offices between 2010 and 2014 and entered into the UNICEF Evaluation and Research Database.

The report provides a brief overview of social protection and cash transfer work in UNICEF, presents the evidence base for the synthesis and examines programme results by sector, by effects on economic productivity and by effects on social inclusion. Cross-cutting issues of particular concern are also scrutinized. The overarching finding is that cash transfers contribute directly to a wide range of sectoral outcomes around education, early childhood development, health, etc.; and that they help advance progress towards equity goals, including in the poorest countries.

Finally, the evaluation synthesis presents conclusions and recommendations to strengthen cash transfer programmes and to improve the quality of the evidence base in social protection.

CONTENTS

SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION - SOCIAL PROTECTION AND CASH TRANSFERS

As per its evaluation plan (2014-2017)[1], the UNICEF Evaluation Office annually presents a synthesis of evaluation findings from one of UNICEF's outcome areas. The syntheses are valuable for a variety of internal and external users and partners as they identify what works in that outcome area and what needs further testing and refinement. This year's evaluation synthesis focuses on the area of social protection.

Social protection

In UNICEF's strategic plan (2014-2017)[2], social protection falls under the social inclusion outcome area. Social inclusion programming in UNICEF is defined as actions "supporting global efforts to reduce child poverty and discrimination against children through improved policy environments and systems for disadvantaged children".[3] UNICEF actively supports the following programme areas through advocacy and programming:

1. Child poverty analysis and social protection
2. Human rights, non-discrimination and participation
3. Public financial management
4. Governance and decentralization
5. Social inclusion in humanitarian situations

The present review focuses on the social protection component under the first programme area, and does not assess the full breadth of social inclusion programming.

UNICEF defines social protection as a "set of public and private policies and programmes aimed at preventing, reducing and eliminating economic and social vulnerabilities to poverty and deprivation"[4]. Social protection is the largest portion of UNICEF's social inclusion work, and is an aspect of 104 UNICEF country programmes.

UNICEF's social protection work focuses on the following core components:

- Social transfers, e.g., cash or in-kind transfers;
- Programmes to ensure economic and social access to services, e.g., health insurance or fee abolition;
- Social support and care services, including family support and counselling and referrals;

[1] United Nations Children's Fund, *Plan for global thematic evaluations 2014-2017*, UNICEF, New York, NY, 2014.

[2] United Nations Economic and Social Council, *UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 – Realizing the rights of every child, especially the most disadvantaged*, UNICEF Executive Board, September 2013.

[3] United Nations Children's Fund, *UNICEF Strategic Plan 2014-2017 (brochure)*, UNICEF, New York, NY, 2014, p. 7. The Evaluation Office plans to undertake an evaluation of UNICEF's work to support policy and systems improvements with regard to social inclusion in 2017.

[4] United Nations Children's Fund, *UNICEF Programme Guidance: Social Protection for Children*, UNICEF, New York, NY, 2012.

- Legislation and policies to ensure equity and non-discrimination in children's and families' access to services and employment/livelihoods, e.g., maternity/paternity leave, equal pay legislation.

Cash transfers are but one component of more complex and globally recognized social protection systems. However, given the evidence profile on social protection work in UNICEF (see section 2), this review focuses specifically on cash transfers delivered in non-crisis settings.

Cash transfers

Cash transfers are one form of social transfer, i.e. predictable direct transfers to individuals or households to protect them from the impacts of shocks and support the accumulation of human, productive and financial assets. With the cash, the recipients can potentially mitigate one or several vulnerabilities.

Cash transfers can take a variety of forms, including pensions, child benefits, poverty-targeted transfers and seasonal transfers. There may or may not be conditions to receiving the transfer. Conditional grants require some qualifying or ongoing action by recipients such as full time school attendance by school-age children. Unconditional grants do not require ongoing action by the recipient.

The effect of such transfers on poverty reduction has received great attention in national and global policy debate. Their impacts are well studied in high income nations and some middle income countries. There has been a significant expansion in the number and coverage of cash transfer programmes in developing countries, including in Africa, where their impact or lack of impact is being established. This synthesis examines cash transfers designed to reduce poverty and vulnerability in low- and middle-income countries. What the recipients choose to spend the cash on, the factors that enable or hinder their plans, and the ultimate impacts are the object of research and policy attention and of this synthesis.

Social protection interventions, including cash transfers, are government led. UNICEF support includes advocacy and support to national policy development, technical aid in designing transfer and other social protection programmes, strengthening linkages between social protection programmes and services, capacity building, implementation assistance in some geographic areas, and monitoring, research and evaluation support. In many countries, UNICEF focuses strategically on evidence generation to support policy decisions, and on supporting programme design and measurement, while implementation is handled directly and fully by governments. Only exceptionally is UNICEF involved in direct funding or implementation of cash transfers, outside of humanitarian settings.

UNICEF has invested heavily in understanding how, why and in what contexts transfer programmes are most appropriate and effective. A core vehicle is a multi-agency research effort titled the Transfer Project[5], which has accompanied large-scale governmental programmes in

[5] The Transfer Project is an initiative bringing together international organizations, national governments, and international and national researchers, led and managed by UNICEF, FAO, Save the Children UK and the University of North Carolina – Chapel Hill. For more information, see http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/transfer.

seven African nations. Benefitting from donor support that allows intensive, large-scale research techniques to be used – including randomized control trials – the Project has generated several highly rated evaluations that are cited frequently in this synthesis. Many other country offices beyond the Project have also invested in well-resourced research and evaluation efforts, which are also represented in the synthesis.

SECTION 2: THE EVIDENCE BASE OF THE SYNTHESIS

The synthesis draws its evidence entirely from evaluations and other assessments that have been completed by UNICEF offices and entered into the Evaluation and Research Database (ERDB). It is therefore limited to the topics contained in those documents.

Overview of the review process

A review of the available evidence showed that over half the social inclusion-related documentation uploaded into the ERDB falls under the rubric of child poverty analysis and social protection (see insert below).

> The area of "child poverty analysis and social protection" benefits from significant investments in studies, evaluations and research. By comparison, other aspects of social inclusion programming are not as well represented in the ERDB. Counting the primary theme only (some documents address multiple themes), the number of reports in the ERDB completed in 2010-2014 (n=426) by programme area are as follows:
>
> - Child poverty analysis and social protection: 230 entries
> - Human rights, non-discrimination and participation: 106 entries
> - Public financial management: 59 entries
> - Governance and decentralization: 25 entries
> - Social inclusion in humanitarian settings: 6 entries
>
> This includes research and studies as well as evaluations.

Within child poverty analysis and social protection, the densest set of evidence explicitly addresses cash transfers. Through quantitative and qualitative content analysis of the 230 social protection-related entries in the ERDB, 69 documents were identified for review. After a thorough quality review process, 42 documents were retained for in-depth analysis.

The 42 documents reviewed for this synthesis included 31 evaluations or research using evaluative techniques. The remainder included costing studies, situation analyses and other efforts to summarize national or regional evidence. 23 documents were from Africa and 19 from other continents. The reports are limited to the 2010-2014 period to allow a focus on the evidence reflecting recent thinking in cash transfer programme goals and design. The review did not seek out cash transfer content contained in other sectoral evaluations, e.g. in the HIV-AIDS sector.

The titles, nations of origin, vulnerable groups targeted, and quality ratings attained are noted in the Annex.

The review was conducted by a team comprising two professionals from the Evaluation Office, and two external experts, one of whom had high level evaluation experience in the Millennium Villages Project and the other had previously reviewed cash transfer evidence in Africa.

Assessing the quality of the methodologies employed was emphasized, in order to ensure that higher quality evidence would be given more weight. Among the 10 components analysed per report were the use of comparison groups; sample size and structure; range of data collected; methodological mastery exhibited by the evaluators; and the standards used to determine effectiveness. The quality reviews showed that the evidence coming from the Transfer Project is among the highest ever produced by UNICEF, for four reasons: the broad scale of the programming in the host nations; the use of gold standard research techniques such as randomized control assignment into beneficiary and control communities; large research budgets allowing abundant and sophisticated data collection; and cooperation among agencies (FAO, others) to pool expertise in research design and analysis.

The team collated and analysed the evidence to see where there was the greatest density, consistency, or contrast in the findings. Discussions with key informants enhanced understanding of the programme intent, programme details and challenges faced.

Strengths and weaknesses

Readers should be aware of certain weaknesses in the synthesis review. The more important include: a high dependence on data from African settings that does not represent other contexts sufficiently; the scarcity of data/research on certain themes (e.g. child protection impacts); the inability to access primary data to verify accuracy of analysis in the evaluations/studies; and the limited visibility of correlated social inclusion initiatives that may accompany cash transfer programmes.

An additional limitation was that the ERDB contains too few evaluations of cash transfer programmes in humanitarian crisis settings to allow summary analysis of their performance in such contexts.[6]

However, the review has strengths that should give readers confidence. Many of the evaluations received 'Excellent' quality ratings for their research design and execution including the use of randomized controls and rigorous household surveys. The large scale of implementation allowed large sample sizes to be drawn to permit refined statistical analysis, complemented by qualitative methods that elicit beneficiary views. Finally, the reviewers have been conservative, both in depending more on the higher quality work and in including many examples of non-impact and challenges faced.

[6] UNICEF has implemented cash transfers in emergencies at least eight times between 2004 and 2014, including in tsunami, political conflict, famine and typhoon crises. When the transfers were assessed, the conclusions were largely favourable (cf. a recent review of evidence from UNICEF and other agencies, and from academic and other sources, including evaluations, policy papers, and key informant interviews titled *Unconditional Cash Transfers for Emergency Affected Populations*, UNICEF, March 2015).

SECTION 3: RESULTS BY SECTOR OF THE STRATEGIC PLAN

The following sections (sections 3, 4, 5 and 6) use a standard template to report results, as follows:

Findings summarize findings made within the evaluations, or counts of how often findings are seen. Most but not all of the findings have a level of statistical significance showing there was a verifiable contrast with the comparison group(s).

Examples illustrate the findings with real life cases. These have been rendered in less technical language for ease of communication.

Analysis presents the conclusions of the review team about the relevance of the findings for UNICEF and the social protection sector.

Section 3A: Nutrition and food security

Findings: Populations receiving cash transfers show a high propensity to invest in food, with these key results:

1. Strong and consistently positive impacts on food expenditure and consumption (purchased and home grown), with a resulting reduction in food stress throughout the year (11 of 12 evaluations that measured this impact found a positive effect).
2. Improved dietary diversity, including more proteins, fruits, vegetables and fats (7 of 9 evaluations found this effect).
3. Some positive impacts on infant and young child feeding and on stunting (4 of 4 evaluations found this effect).

Examples: In **Liberia,** about 90 per cent of the intervention group and 26 per cent of the comparison group reported improved household food intake over the year. Further, about 60 per cent of the intervention group consumed two meals or more per day versus 28 per cent of comparison households. In **Lesotho**, the programme reduced by 1.7 the number of months per year that beneficiary households faced extreme food shortages. The proportion of children and adults that went to bed hungry decreased by 11 and 7 percentage points respectively. In **Kenya**, the cash transfer programme for orphans and vulnerable children led to increased dietary diversity. A simple dietary diversity score showed an impact of 0.81 points compared to the control group, or 15 percent over baseline value. In **Zambia**, the programme positively impacted infant and young child feeding for 0-23 months olds, and weight for height among children aged 3 to 5 years. **South Africa** showed impressive impacts on stunting for girls and for children whose mothers are more educated (effect size = 0.19 SD), but not for other children.

Analysis:

#1: Market supply and instability matter: A key enabling factor for food access is market functionality: the accessibility of supply to meet the improved demand of households receiving

transfers. The market for food is normally widespread, responsive to local tastes, quick to adapt with more or better supplies if demand increases, and accessible with small amounts of money. It is ideally designed to meet transfer beneficiaries' needs. But when the market is constrained, the benefits can disappear. In **Palestine,** decreasing incomes and higher food prices affected all families, and grant recipients did not fare better.

#2: Importance of grant size and predictability: These are crucial factors determining sectoral impacts, not just in nutrition. Transfer Project calculations indicate that if a grant does not add at least 20 per cent to pre-programme consumption, there will be no meaningful impact on food consumption. Further, if grants do not arrive on time, households cannot employ them when and as needed. In **Ghana,** the programme had no durable impact on food or non-food consumption, most likely due to the irregular, unpredictable payments coupled with the low transfer value. Likewise, there was no impact on dietary diversity in **Lesotho** and **Tanzania**, which evaluators linked to unpredictable delivery.

Section 3B: Education

Findings: Households with children that receive cash transfers show a high propensity to invest in education, using cash to pay direct costs (e.g. school fees) and indirect costs (e.g. transport), with these key results:

1. Strong impacts on primary enrolment rates, attendance, and reduction of absenteeism and drop-out rates (7 of 8 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
2. Similar consistent and strong impacts on secondary education (5 of 5 evaluations found this effect).
3. Consistent positive effects in grade completion, learning and performance (4 of 4 evaluations found this effect).
4. Inconsistent gender pattern in education effects: sometimes boys benefitted more, sometimes girls.

Examples: In **Kenya**, unconditional cash transfer had a strong positive impact (19 percentage points) on enrolment among primary school-age children (aged 6-13 years) facing relatively high costs (defined as long distance to school, >2km). In **Ghana**, enrolment of secondary school children aged 13-17 years increased by 7 percentage points. In **Tanzania**, the programme led to a 15 per cent increase in the likelihood of children completing primary school.

Gender specific findings included **Tanzania**, where the effect on primary school completion was striking for girl beneficiaries, who were 23 percentage points more likely to complete primary school than their comparison group counterparts. In **Ghana**, secondary school enrolment increases were particularly marked for boys whereas girls' absenteeism was significantly reduced. In **South Africa,** cash transfers reduced adolescent absences from secondary school, particularly for males, even when the household did not receive the grant specifically for the adolescent.

Only in **Uganda** were any effects on Early Childhood Development (ECD) reported. Cash transfers led to a large increase in ECD attendance (about 2 days more out of 7 days), with large spillover effects on younger siblings. Cognitive development improved only in 5-year-olds through the ECD attendance; no other ages or developmental domains benefitted.

Analysis:

#3: Constraints from supply barriers in public services. The market in this instance is largely public sector provided schooling. Consequently, sectoral capacity issues in education have an indirect impact, including on coverage and accessibility. The **Kenya** example shows the persistence of cost barriers, even in settings where school fees have technically been abolished. As long as the grant is sufficient, these barriers can be overcome.

*#4**:** Both conditional and unconditional grants achieve important impacts:* Most of the impacts reviewed were achieved in the context of unconditional grants, and the magnitudes are in line with the first generation of conditional transfers from Latin America demonstrating that families value education. In a hybrid model, **Malawi** saw first-time enrolment increase among families receiving both an unconditional cash transfer ($2.30–$5.50 per month) and an additional conditional transfer ($0.70 for primary school, $1.40 for secondary school).

#5: Families desire to invest in long-term solutions to exit poverty. While food security is an immediate concern for the poor and is a first call for spending, the evidence shows that cash transfers enable families to think of the medium or long term. This is seen most clearly in the strong engagement with secondary education, where the opportunity cost of schooling is highest due to work opportunity and potentially even bride prices for young women. Cash transfers reduce this opportunity cost and thus allow families to invest in longer-term payoff activities.

#6: The value of sex and related disaggregated data: Regrettably, the evaluations across the transfer programmes have been inconsistent in disaggregating impacts by different demographic factors, an issue discussed later. The education sector is an exception that proves the value of analysing results by gender and other social factors to identify different outcomes whose cause can be investigated with follow-up research.

There was too little evidence to draw conclusions for ECD. This is largely explained by small sample sizes for this very young age group.

Section 3C: Health and HIV-AIDS

Findings: Populations receiving cash transfers show a moderate propensity to invest in health needs including HIV-AIDS and reproductive health services. The investment is less than in education, yet has these key results:

1. The greatest positive impact was on accessing healthcare/vaccinations, including through the use of health insurance (8 of 10 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
2. Mild effects on self-reports of health/recent illness were found in a majority of cases (5 of 7 evaluations found this effect).
3. In the few HIV-AIDS and reproductive health cases studied, risky sexual behaviour and transactional sex declined, and age of sexual debut increased (3 of 3 evaluations found this effect).
4. Adolescent pregnancy rates declined (3 of 3 evaluations found this effect).

Examples: In **Tanzania**, households receiving cash transfers were four times more likely to purchase health insurance than the control group (25 per cent versus 6 per cent) even without this being a condition of the programme. In **Palestine**, insurance coverage rose strongly because insurance was provided as a correlated benefit to the cash. In **Nepal,** transfers led to increased demand, but the health system struggled to adjust supply, resulting in an increase in waiting times, strains on staffing and inadequate beds. Similarly, **Zambia** saw no increased use of health facilities, likely due to poor capacity of the services available.

A special analysis of adolescents in **South Africa** showed that unconditional cash transfers reduced risky behaviour for girls, thereby decreasing the risk of HIV transmission. However, for boys, cash alone had no impact on risky behaviour, but 'cash plus care' halved the incidence.[7] For girls, living in a beneficiary household reduced by two-thirds a girl's likelihood to have sex with a much older man, from 4.8 per cent to 1.7 per cent. A **Malawi** pilot programme reduced pregnancy and early marriage among girls aged 13 to 22, especially those who were out of school. In **Kenya**, an unconditional cash transfer programme delayed sexual debut by 23 per cent among 15- to 25-year-olds, an important HIV protection factor, and pregnancy among 12- to 24-year-old females declined by 6 percentage points.

Analysis:

#7: The critical role of beneficiary perspective: In **Malawi**, a qualitative assessment of service access by vulnerable households found that the main barriers to accessing (health and other) services were low service expectations, lack of knowledge of available services and entitlements, financial barriers, distance and transport challenges, beliefs and attitudes, and corruption. Obtaining this type of beneficiary perspective enables planners to understand the issues confronting beneficiaries and consequently target the barriers, helping to ensure that interventions have a greater impact.

#8: The powerful synergy of cash plus services: The **South Africa** finding of the combined power of cash plus services in limiting risky behaviours, compared to cash alone, suggests that transfer programmes need to coordinate closely with other social protection measures and the service supply side within the social protection field and with health and other broad sectors. Such links can draw out impacts that cash alone cannot attain. The absence of information about the supply environment and correlated actions to improve services such as social work etc. is a consistent shortcoming of the evaluations.

#9: Grant effects may be intensified the earlier they are received: Additional analysis in **South Africa** looking at a second set of risky adolescent behaviors – sexual activity, pregnancy, alcohol use, drug use, criminal activity and gang membership – found significant benefits, particularly for females, with the effect strengthened by early childhood receipt of the grant. Nutrition and ECD are other sectors where receipt at a young age could initiate a strong cumulative impact.

#10: There may be major mental health benefits: A unique **Kenya** analysis demonstrated that transfers improved mental health outcomes among the 15-24 age group reducing the odds of depressive symptoms by 24 per cent, driven by males aged 20 to 24. The finding that cash alone rather than a therapeutic intervention had significant effects is

[7] Risky behaviours were defined as transactional sex, age-disparate sex, sex using substances, multiple partners and unprotected sex.

remarkable. Depression is an underlying factor in weak self-care and school performance by youth, and risk-taking by adolescents. Yet these known associations are rarely programmed for or measured. Further analysis from **Malawi** and **Zimbabwe** will determine if these effects are seen elsewhere.

Section 3D: Child protection

Findings: Populations receiving cash transfers show a major adjustment in child labour, among these measured results:

1. Some instances see a clear reduction in child labour whereas others see a shift from paid to unpaid work but without a reduction (5 of 6 evaluations that measured this impact found these effects).
2. In one instance there was an increase in birth registration (1 of 1) while in others the benefit occurred before the programme due to a pre-requirement to register the birth.
3. Few studies were designed to measure additional child protection outcomes. Consequently, there is little or no information on the potential beneficial impacts of transfers on children's protection from violence, abuse and exploitation.

Examples: In **Liberia**, a greater percentage of children in intervention households were less likely to work over the year than children in comparison households (70 per cent vs. 52 per cent). **Kenya and Lesotho** also saw a large reduction in child on-farm labour. Others saw a shift in the location but not necessarily a reduction. The **Zambia** and **Malawi** programmes saw a switch from off-farm wage labour to on-farm activities for children.

The **Kenya** programme increased the proportion of recipient children with a birth certificate or a birth registration form by 12 percentage points.

Analysis:

#11: Beneficial results of even small grants: The precarious economy of poor households is well known. For example, even negligible user fees can heavily depress service access. The positive result of transfers is that even small additions to household income can lead to large changes. In protection terms, the grants – often in the $4-8 per month range – allow families to bring children out of the cash wage market even if they cannot afford to let the child cease working.

#12: Transfers can empower adolescents to make positive protection choices in the shorter and longer terms. Findings from **Zimbabwe** and **South Africa** on risky behaviours show adolescents engaging in protective behaviour by attending school and avoiding sexual exploitation, and by reducing involvement in gangs (leading to a reduction in violence and juvenile justice encounters). These changes can be long lasting, as a four-year follow-up survey in **Kenya** confirmed.

SECTION 4: RESULTS BY EFFECTS ON ECONOMIC PRODUCTIVITY

Section 4A: Agricultural and non-agricultural investments

Findings: Populations receiving cash transfers show a high propensity to invest in economically productive activities, with these key results:

1. Widespread increase in capital investment in the core economic activity of the household (agriculture among the Africa-centred evaluations) (5 of 5 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
2. Similar widespread increase in labour investment in agriculture from both household and hired sources (7 of 7 evaluations found this effect).
3. Agricultural results include both intensification of own production and some diversification, with net positive impacts on consumption and/or produce for sale (4 of 5 evaluations found this effect).
4. Investments in non-agricultural enterprise showed no consistent pattern (1.5 of 3 evaluations found this effect).

Examples: **Lesotho** saw an 8 per cent increase in the proportion of households using pesticides, **Zambia's** recipients increased fertilizer use, **Ghana's** recipients invested in better seeds, and **Malawi's** recipients invested in hand tools. In **Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho, Malawi** and **Zimbabwe,** households worked more on their own farms and worked less for wages on others.

Much of this increased production led to the nutrition benefits noted earlier (less food stress, shorter hungry seasons). But the grant also led to more market production, and to new options, as in **Malawi**, where livestock ownership (large and small) increased by approximately 50 percentage points. Given that the rural poor were often a priority target group, these frequent and statistically significant agricultural impacts must be considered a successful policy outcome.

In the off-farm realm, **Lesotho** households did not diversify their income base by starting off-farm businesses. **Kenya** saw an increase in female-headed households conducting non-agricultural businesses, but a decrease among male-headed households. **Liberia** had the most consistent increases by households compared to non-recipients (32 per cent versus 12 per cent) with beneficiaries selling eggs, making charcoal, and making and selling food.

Analysis:

#13: Building on 'installed knowledge' is a quick way to obtain benefits: The enormous knowledge families already have about agriculture permits them to make precise, quick, high impact investments that enable rapid (in farming terms) production increases. They can advance to the degree that land access, labour, and market factors like fertilizer costs allow.

#14: Likelihood of missed opportunities: The evaluations did not mention related improvements in extension outreach and training, imported input availability, or market information, to name three powerful agricultural accelerants. It is likely that there were missed opportunities to heighten the effect of the grants.

It is not possible to draw any conclusions about non-farm enterprises. The observed low response may simply be a calculation that greater long-term returns will accrue from improving farm production or educating children. It is a reasonable speculation that a larger grant would initiate larger or more complex off-farm businesses. But conclusions must await a real test of grant size impacts.

Section 4B: Local economic impacts

Findings: The transfer programmes define success by the impacts on households and their members. But impacts at the community level can be a powerful additionality in the eyes of policy makers. In a subset of evaluations, the evaluators sought to define the local economic impacts, with these results:

1. Local multiplier effects occur in some but not all locations, including at levels indicating a strong stimulus was received (4 of 6 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
   Note: Multiplier effects calculate how much the local economy as a whole benefits from each $1 transferred to beneficiaries.
2. There were no reports of socially undesirable spending at levels that disturbed the community.

Examples: Multiplier impacts from $1.34 to $2.52 per $1 in transfers sent to the community were recorded in **Kenya, Zambia** and **Ethiopia**; these are considered strong levels in a multiplier model. Non-specific evidence was seen in **Malawi** where beneficiaries reported that local vendors started selling goods door-to-door on transfer paydays, and in **Zimbabwe** where local shops benefited from increased trade on paydays.

Focus groups and similar qualitative methods asked about socially desirable and undesirable uses of the money. In general, uses categorized as 'vice', luxury or entertainment were seen as socially undesirable, for example alcohol, gambling, tobacco and attracting boyfriends and girlfriends. However, in no country was undesirable spending registered at a level that was considered socially disruptive.

Analysis:

#15: Multiplier effects are correctly not made a measure of programme success: Multiplier effects are variable because the money introduced by the transfers eventually stops circulating in the local economy. Vendors selling items desired by households may send the proceeds out of the area, though often to restock and with benefits where it is sent. Alternately, multiplier effects stop when money is saved rather than spent. However, savings can have a large range of family economic and social benefits as discussed in the next section. Consequently, it is good to register multiplier effects but not to value them more highly than the choices made by the recipients.

#16: Tentatively, socially undesirable spending is not a problem. Although the method used to measure spending – self-reports by recipient households – is open to omitting undesirable spending, there are good reasons to think it is not a problem. These include the many needs versus the low grant levels, watchfulness by neighbours, the messaging about

proper usage that accompanies the programme introduction, and the fact that undesirable spending has not been recorded in many settings.

SECTION 5: RESULTS BY EFFECTS ON SOCIAL INCLUSION

Section 5A: Household economic impacts/resilience

Findings: Households will consistently spend beyond consumption and productive investments, with these key findings:

1. Most households experience a significant increase in consumption (5 of 6 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
2. The grant is spent on an array of items, which can vary over time following price shifts, new problems emerging, and other household income moves.
3. There are positive effects on savings and debt reduction (5 of 5 evaluations found this effect).
4. Grants make households much more creditworthy for both basic necessities and investment items (2 of 2 evaluations found this effect).
5. Grants can displace existing sources of household income (3 of 3 evaluations found this effect).

Examples: **Ugandan** beneficiaries spent the cash on food (53 per cent), non-food goods (23 per cent) and savings (16 per cent). The increases over baseline were 31 per cent for non-food items and 19 per cent for total consumption. The bulk of the **Nepal** Old Age Allowances were spent on personal supplies, medical expenses, household supplies, food, grandchildren and children, and on improving personal income. In **Moldova**, the order of priority in spending was food, shelter, clothes, education and health.

Households in **Ghana** saw an 11 percentage point benefit in increased savings, increased debt repayments and reduced indebtedness. Borrowing, financial risk and asset disinvestment decreased while the capacity to cope increased. In **Palestine,** debt repayment – most of it incurred meeting children's needs – was reported by 64–82 per cent of recipients, trailing only food purchases. The transfers were largely spent on basic and urgent needs, with only a few caregivers able to purchase toys and other treats, or spend on recreational activities.

In **Ethiopia**, cash transfers enabled some of the poorest families to move out of caves and into rented accommodation. In **Palestine Gaza**, the grants allowed 8 per cent more households to maintain electricity services, and to afford house rehabilitation or repairs.

Credit effects were surprisingly strong. The **Ethiopian** beneficiaries accessed increased credit from local shopkeepers, allowing them to maintain consumption of food and household goods such as cleaning products throughout the month. In **Ghana**, households reported that they were becoming more creditworthy as they were viewed as more financially reliable.

In two important instances, the grant had a substitution effect for other income sources. In **Malawi** and **Lesotho**, households receiving cash transfers reported receiving fewer remittances from abroad. **Malawi, Lesotho** and **Ethiopia** reported a reduction in begging.

Analysis:

#17: Families strongly desire to increase their ability to recover from shocks (the concept of resilience): In addition to spending on immediate needs (food, medication) and in longer-term investments (education, productive capacity), families seek to manage risk and become more resilient. Savings, debt repayment and preventing the sale of goods (asset disinvestment) converts the grant into resources available in the future if needed. Likewise, being considered creditworthy is a resource to manage future shocks.

#18: There is value in disaggregating results by several demographics. Nuanced results presented important specific findings for small households, the ultra-poor and those connected to migrants abroad. These can be critical factors in transfer use and impact, and should have been consistently presented in all areas.

#19: Grants can affect other household income sources, not just household expenditure: Policymakers should not assume that a grant will increase the amount of household disposable income. It may allow households to replace some income that is needed elsewhere. In the case of begging, it may allow a voluntary cessation or may induce neighbours to give less. This displacement effect should be studied.

It is not possible to make an analysis regarding the rarely mentioned domicile investments (housing and electricity). These may be more capital intensive than the grant allows, or may have already been secured as a first priority by existing income.

Section 5B: Communal networks

Findings: Populations receiving cash transfers show a high propensity to invest in strengthening informal sharing or safety net arrangements, as seen in these key findings:

1. Significant increase of investment in formal networks (savings, funeral societies) and informal networks, e.g. ceremonies (3 of 5 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
2. Families receiving grants often share the income and resources with extended family or other poorer families as part of a general help-the-weak ethic (5 of 5 evaluations found this effect).

Examples: In **Tanzania**, the poorest half of households receiving cash transfers are significantly more likely to have informal savings (5 percent increase in the rate of non-bank savings). In **Malawi**, beneficiaries became better integrated into networks dependent on participants' financial contributions, such as church groups. In **Zimbabwe**, church offerings and funeral contributions provided beneficiaries with an opportunity for inclusion in social networks. In **Ghana**, beneficiaries contributed to community ceremonies.

In **Ghana**, the grant enabled some beneficiaries to provide first time or increased assistance to family members in need. Sharing was especially strong from female-headed households. In **Liberia**, recipients were more likely than comparison households to share money or food with neighbours. The same pattern appeared in **Malawi**, **Zimbabwe** and **Lesotho.**

Analysis:

#20: Communal networks are a preferred investment because they activate reciprocal obligations. Gifts freely given to neighbours or to communal bodies are a form of insurance against risk, an investment in future resilience through resources beyond the household. This is a logical extension of the earlier lessons on risk reduction. Although the evaluators did not use the construct of 'social capital', they have revealed it as a major resource that is actively managed by families.

#21: Civil society organizations (CSOs) are an important resource for household support: The prominence of churches, funeral associations etc. among the spending choices is a reminder that CSOs deserve recognition as important social bodies for sharing risk and enhancing community life. Households are accessing government, the private sector and CSOs according to their ability to help meet family needs. Future research should check if the transfer impacts are magnified in communities with high trust levels and strong CSO presence; the expectation is that they will be.

Section 5C: Dignity

Findings: Populations receiving cash transfers report strong positive social-psychological effects:

1. Widespread reports of a much greater sense of self-pride/dignity/worth as a result of increased contributions to the community and greater self-sufficiency (10 of 10 evaluations that measured this impact found this effect).
2. The majority of recipients reported a positive outlook on the future owing to a newfound confidence that household basics can be secured.

Examples: In **Ghana**, the programme increased self-reported happiness of household heads by 16 percentage points. The transfers enabled beneficiaries to contribute to ceremonies and social events, thereby improving their self-esteem and social status. In **Ethiopia**, beneficiaries reported that being able to purchase coffee, sugar, soap and new clothes had a positive effect on their social ties and involvement in community life. In **Nepal,** the Old Age Allowance Programme improved household relationships and empowered beneficiaries both economically and socially.

In **Liberia**, beneficiaries were twice as likely (64 per cent versus 33 per cent) to be satisfied or very satisfied with life. Recipients in three countries **(Malawi, Lesotho** and **Ethiopia)** reported a reduction in begging associated with increased dignity.

In **Palestine**, adolescent beneficiaries expressed greater hope about their situation as measured by a scale gauging beliefs in one's ability to complete tasks and reach goals. In **Lesotho** and in **St Lucia**, the programme led to increased levels of self-confidence and self-esteem.

Analysis:

#22: Self-reported happiness and dignity is a strong determinant of spending: Social-psychological goals – an internal feeling of dignity; an external sense of being valued in one's community – are perceived by beneficiaries as absolute benefits: money is invested to attain

them, at the expense of other things that could have been purchased. The global range of the finding and the powerful statements in the evaluations show this to be a central issue for families.

#23: There are 'social multiplier effects' in the desire for dignity: In order to achieve the goals of dignity, or as a consequence of actions taken, the transfers generated social ripple effects via more social engagement and stronger community institutions. Cash was just one of the mediums being exchanged, the others being time, respect and acceptance.

#24: Programmes need to value dignity objectives more highly and measure them more comprehensively: Development programmes and social policies find it hard to set measurable social-psychological goals such as dignity, social status and self-worth, and often simply exclude them. Based on these findings, they should try harder to include, value and measure them. It is of great credit to the evaluators that this was done in so many instances.

SECTION 6: CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES OF PARTICULAR CONCERN

UNICEF has declared an interest in certain cross-cutting priorities. This section highlights those priorities and examines how they are addressed in social protection programmes.

The cross-cutting issues are:
1. Transfers and populations requiring special attention
3. Achieving efficiency in implementation

Section 6A: Populations requiring special attention

Findings: While the evidence regarding impacts on vulnerable groups is somewhat inconsistent, there is a tendency for cash transfers to yield pro-equity effects. Information is available for the following populations:

1. Poor and rural households have been particular targets of the transfer programmes and there is abundant information on the positive impacts.
2. Gender-specific impacts are frequently reported. The trends of such impacts are inconsistent overall. Sometimes males are benefitting more or less than females, and the conditions for gendered impact can vary within and across societies.
3. Education levels of the parents and household size appear rarely as influential variables, perhaps because the sample sizes were too small.
4. Cash transfers sometimes allow beneficiaries to support a disabled household member or relative.
5. The following populations are rarely or never discussed: migrants; sexual minorities; ethnic, racial and religious minorities; persons without full citizenship status.

Examples: Examples regarding poor and rural households were discussed in section 4, above. Gender examples already cited include the variable, often strong, effects of transfers in education (e.g. in **Ghana**, boys benefit more in secondary enrolment, while in **Tanzania**, girls benefit more in school completion); the greater impact of cash plus services on boys than girls (e.g. adolescent risk reduction in **South Africa**); and the fact that women invest more in non-agricultural businesses and men invest less (e.g. in **Kenya**). However, UNICEF also missed necessary gender measures: there was no sex disaggregated data for programmes in **Bosnia and Herzegovina** and in **Nepal**.

In **Zambia**, the impact on primary enrolment was more significant for children of less educated mothers because the children of more educated mothers were nearly universally enrolled at baseline. In **South Africa**, receiving the grant in the first two years of a child's life generated significantly larger impacts among mothers who had more than eight grades of schooling.

In **Palestine**, beneficiaries purchased medical devices and services needed by children with disabilities, although the overall access of such children to services only rose to 1 in 5. An assessment of access to services by disabled children and adults in **Malawi** found that no services were available. **Bosnia and Herzegovina** strengthened policy frameworks for social protection and inclusion, with mixed attention to specific populations. During the policy discourse that influences reforms, UNICEF adequately represented the needs of ethnic minorities including the Roma but did not systematically represent the voice of children affected by disability other than in the water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) sector.

Other demographics were barely mentioned. There were two instances of transfers replacing remittances in the family income stream, and one instance of above average loan repayment reduction by smaller households.

Analysis:

#25: The difficulty of accurately predicting gender impacts: No particular theory of change or tendency drawn from existing data would have predicted the diverse gender results. Qualitative methods to understand gender factors – e.g. the control over household spending – are necessary complements to larger scale quantitative methods. These can be deployed in the design phase to help shape targeting, and in post impact-measurement analysis to uncover causality.

#26: UNICEF is missing out on learning about vulnerable populations through non-measurement. It is conceptually easy to imagine how grants might affect the special vulnerabilities of undocumented residents, families considering or experiencing the migration of a breadwinner, the disabled, and others. Since counterparts are often cooperative in investigating impacts, the failure to do so seems to reflect a UNICEF choice, for whatever reasons.

Earlier lessons about grant effectiveness depending on the service or sellers' market, grant size, and the cash plus services approach are reinforced by the disability examples.

Section 6B: Implementation

Impact depends in part on how well a transfer programme is designed and executed, especially in the pilot phases and early scale-up period. Among the many possible implementation focuses, this section discusses those that generated at least one finding, including targeting and capacity strengthening.

Managers of transfer programmes typically examine implementation issues through field monitoring, review moments and special studies. There may be a rich set of information that did not enter into evaluations. Consequently, this review is cautious about drawing conclusions because the broad evidence base outside evaluations was not examined.

Findings:

Previously noted:

1. Meeting data requirements has been well managed in some aspects, and weakly managed in others (e.g. the lack of disaggregations discussed in section 6A).
2. Failure to deliver grants on time reduces impacts as households and vendors fail to take desired actions for fear the grant will not arrive.
3. Grant size is a critical variable.

Additional findings:

4. Transfer programmes of basically similar design can produce very different outcomes in different areas or among different populations. Fitting the programme to the specific social and administrative context is a consistent design concern.
5. 74 per cent of UNICEF offices say that counterpart bodies managing transfer efforts have intermediate or weak capacities.
6. Conditions can direct beneficiary actions toward public goals such as school attendance. However, unconditional grants will attain a wider range of benefits, and often have strong benefits in sectors where conditionality is frequent (e.g. education)
7. In-kind transfers are rarely included but tend to show efficiency disadvantages.
8. Targeting is a technically complex issue and many methods are used depending on context.
9. There is little information about UNICEF's performance within the programmes.

Examples: UNICEF in **Lesotho** supported the development of the Social Protection Strategy, the scaling up of the Child Grants Programme, and development of a unified registry for all social protection programmes. In both **Uganda** and **Kenya,** responsibility for social protection is fragmented, with little coordination among the relevant institutions. In **St Lucia**, the programme lacked specific criteria for graduation and was not building necessary counterpart capacity.

The **Uganda** ECD programme compared food transfers with cash transfers**.** In addition to having fewer and weaker impacts on beneficiaries, food distribution was relatively inefficient, costing $117 per beneficiary compared to $97 for the cash modality.

There were no instances of both conditional and unconditional transfers being implemented in the same environments, to allow exact comparison. However, cross-country analyses have shown similar levels of impact in areas like school enrolment and attendance. This suggests that the time and cost of the conditionality enforcement may not be necessary to achieve desired behaviours.

Targeting showed some sophisticated problem identification and resolution. In **Kenya**, safety net programmes used several targeting methods, with about half using some form of community participation in identifying the needy. However, the programmes often assigned a uniform transfer for each household regardless of size, and cash benefits were rarely adjusted for inflation. The **Moldova** analysis revealed that 45 per cent of households with children from the poorest quintile did not receive any social transfers. It also demonstrated that when barriers to access increase – including through a means test, lack of information on eligibility, and the frequent need to reconfirm eligibility –many vulnerable households become discouraged and thus do not apply for cash transfers.

Analysis:

#27: Implementation analysis should feature significantly in transfer programme reviews: Implementation issues are best analysed in ways other than through impact evaluations, including programme reviews with partners, field monitoring, focused studies and modelling. For example, UNICEF is planning sensitivity analyses to examine how much cash is needed to achieve a specific target once the spending patterns under different grant sizes, purchasing power, and other variables are understood. These varied analyses should also focus on

UNICEF’s own performance and contributions as evaluations offered very little about UNICEFs own work and how this contributed to impacts.

SECTION 7: CONCLUSIONS

When all the findings and lessons learned are taken together, it is possible to identify a set of broad conclusions about cash transfer-based social protection programming. When reading them, it should be remembered that there are variations and debates and uncertainties in the database.

1. Cash transfers in the hands of poor populations will generate multiple positive outcomes. These outcomes will be balanced among meeting immediate needs, investing in long-term solutions to poverty, risk reduction and resilience, and social-psychological rewards. The investments integrate families into communities and strengthen both. They are pro-equity.

2. Households exhibit highly rational decision-making. Each of the types of spending choices improves household welfare in some way. The rationale is social as well as economic, as seen in the gender differentiated responses, the swiftness with which children are removed from the labour market, and the desire to achieve greater dignity.

3. Enabling factors that increase impacts are evident. Identified factors include the scope and sophistication of the market for goods, services and credit; the bundling of grants with necessary services; and the presence of CSOs and other forms of 'social capital'. Qualitative research can identify these issues and enable supportive programming. Conversely, the failure to understand markets or to ensure necessary services leads to reduced impacts and less desirable outcomes.

4. Unconditional cash grants generate the broadest range of benefits and offer maximum flexibility and respect for beneficiary views, in line with a rights-based approach to programming. If there is an advantage to conditionality, it is the claimed ability to ensure a single over-riding goal is achieved, such as education. But in fact, populations tend to value those goals highly, and will invest to reach them with their unconditional grants. Unconditional grants elicited major changes in education, for example, while also inducing many other important investments and retaining beneficiary freedom of action. This strengthens the argument in favour of unconditional grants.

5. Cash transfers can work well across all contexts, with appropriate modifications. The impact of transfer benefits has long been understood in high- and middle-income countries, including in Latin America, through UNICEF-supported research. This synthesis confirms that even very poor populations and public bureaucracies with major capacity challenges can achieve high benefits.

6. Many smart implementation decisions must be taken for benefits to emerge in any context. This focuses the debate on effective design and execution and not on the fundamental value of transfers. Whether through evaluations or other learning exercises, UNICEF needs to identify and understand what has worked well or not in its strategies and those of its partners, and ensure this institutional learning is available to all offices engaging in social protection and transfer work.

7. Strongly resourced research approaches are suited for these complex programmes, but there are many issues still to investigate. Intriguing questions have arisen for a next round of analysis. These include issues of implementation and UNICEF's particular performance, mental health impacts, building on social capital, and the impact of receiving grants earlier in the child's life. This may require sustained investment in centralized/coordinated support and in additional capacity strengthening for country offices and counterparts.

8. Transfer programmes fit well into UNICEF's forward-looking vision. They match well with the goals of the social inclusion commitments in the strategic plan, including an emphasis on equity and a sound evidence base. They support a move toward national policy leadership and systems approaches, with a limited field implementation role. They build on institutional strengths in transferring knowledge across boundaries and, potentially, across both humanitarian and developmental contexts.

SECTION 8: RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations offered are designed to be actionable. Each would trigger more sophisticated engagement of UNICEF in cash transfer programmes while building on organizational strengths.

The UNICEF New York Programme Division is the expected lead respondent for recommendations. Key partners will include the Division of Research and Policy (recommendations 3 and 4), the Evaluation Office (recommendations 4 and 5) and the Emergencies Division (recommendation 6).

1. Increase programme and evaluation attention to 'Cash Plus' interventions.

The positive effects of 'cash only' transfers are increasingly clear. The effects of cash transfers combined with other complementary interventions are less well known. 'Cash Plus' interventions include, for example, cash plus service extension, cash plus market enhancements, cash plus fees elimination, and cash plus insurance. The review evidence has identified intriguing examples of powerful combinations. More of these combinations need to be established and measured, not just as isolated experiments but as parts of integrated social protection systems. They also offer useful opportunities to tailor approaches to sections of the population that have received little or no analytic attention to date, such as migrants.

2. Consider integrating the cash transfer (or 'Cash Plus') modality into programming addressing each of the outcome areas articulated in UNICEF's strategic plan.

The evaluation synthesis has presented convincing evidence that cash transfers make a direct contribution to a wide range of sectoral outcomes around education, early childhood development, health, etc.; and that they help advance progress towards equity goals. Therefore, increased attention should be paid by programme managers across sectors to cash transfers (or 'Cash Plus') as programming options.

3. Update the technical guidance on evidence of impact to be measured through evaluation and research, and on implementation measurement.

The technical guidance on the evidence to be sought in social protection programmes should be updated to include the range of impacts across several sectors now shown to be influenced by cash transfers. This recommendation is also meant to include the guidance about designing and measuring the implementation approaches that influence the level of impacts achieved. The technical guidance also needs to be easily accessible in a single location for users in any office and in any country.

4. Make technical support available for an evidence-based approach early in the process.

Given that technical expertise in transfer programme design and in the evidence requirements is often weak at the country office and counterpart level, UNICEF needs to promote access to properly skilled technical guidance within and outside the organization. Building on existing capacities will be the most efficient approach.

Issues of particular emphasis include the following:

- Making available sufficient technical support for good programming (based on evidence and analysis) in order to achieve desired results.
- Arranging easy access to experts both in programme design and in evaluation/research design.
- Engaging with offices early enough that poorly evidenced designs and under-budgeting can be detected and corrected.
- Paying attention to the entire evidence plan within which evaluation will be one part.

5. Take action to expand the social protection evidence base beyond cash transfers.

This synthesis has drawn together the rich evidence on cash transfers. However, in reviewing the evidence base on social protection more widely, it became clear that the wider evidence base is relatively weak. Evaluations, research, studies and more generally data collection and analysis beyond cash transfers are scarce. UNICEF should therefore take action to expand and deepen the evidence base to cover other areas of social protection programming.

6. Develop the evidence base on effectiveness of cash transfer programmes in humanitarian action.

UNICEF has engaged in cash transfers in various humanitarian contexts and is considering scaling up such efforts further. However, little is known about the effectiveness of cash transfer modalities in these settings. Experience in non-humanitarian settings could offer important guidance about working successfully in humanitarian or fragile contexts. UNICEF should therefore invest in systematic assessments of the use of cash transfers in humanitarian contexts. Consideration should also be given to drawing evidence and approaches from cash transfer programmes outside the field of humanitarian action and also to ways of developing programming linking different contexts.

ANNEX: EVIDENCE BASE FOR SOCIAL PROTECTION SYNTHESIS

#	DOCUMENT TITLE	COUNTRY	UNICEF REGION	BENEFICIARY POPULATION TARGETED	QUALITY SCORE	CITED IN SYNTHESIS
1	Evaluation of Albania's National Social Inclusion Strategy (2007-2013)	Albania	CEE/CIS	Vulnerable children and youth, Roma community, disabled people, elderly people, victims of gender-based violence	Good	
2	Final evaluation of the UN MDG Achievement Fund sponsored "Securing Access to Water through Institutional Development and Infrastructure" joint UNDP and UNICEF project	Bosnia and Herzegovina	CEE/CIS	Households with lack of access to water	Good	
3	Joint Evaluation of Social Protection and Inclusion	Bosnia and Herzegovina	CEE/CIS	Duty bearers (policy makers and service providers), vulnerable children and their families	Good	X
4	Final Evaluation Report: Urban Centers Platform (Plataforma dos centros urbanos)	Brazil	LACRO	Adolescents	Good	
5	Assessment of Social Safety Nets in Burundi	Burundi	ESARO	Poor, labour constrained households	Good	
6	Estimation of Rates of Return of Social Protection Instruments in Cambodia: A Case for Non-Contributory Social Transfers	Cambodia	EAPRO	Multiple populations depending on type of social protection programme	Good	
7	Enhancing Equity for Children in the Context of the Reform of Energy Subsidies in Egypt	Egypt	MENA	Poor, labor constrained households	Good	
8	Ethiopia Tigray Minimum Social Protection Package	Ethiopia	ESARO	Poor, labor constrained households	Excellent	X
9	Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty Program Impact Evaluation	Ghana	WCARO	Poor households that include an orphan, elderly poor (65+), or person with disability	Excellent	X
10	Evaluation of UNICEF Strategic Positioning in India	India	ROSA	Not specified	N/A	
11	Evaluation of UNICEF's Engagement in the Decentralization Process in Indonesia	Indonesia	EAPRO	Not specified	Good	
12	Kenya Cash Transfers for Orphans & Vulnerable Children	Kenya	ESARO	Poor households that include an orphan or vulnerable child below age 18	Excellent	X
13	Kenya Social Protection Sector Review	Kenya	ESARO	Multiple populations depending on type of social protection programme	Good	

14	Evaluation of Child Friendly Community Initiative	Lebanon	MENA	22 education based stakeholders	Good	
15	Lesotho Child Grant Program	Lesotho	ESARO	Poor households with a child aged 0-17	Excellent	X
16	External Evaluation of the Bomi Social Cash Transfer Pilot	Liberia	WCARO	Poor, labor constrained households	Good	X
17	Situation socioeconomique des menages dans le district d'Ambatondranzaka et impact de la crise sociopolitique au niveau des menages	Madagascar	ESARO	Poor households including children aged 6-17	Good	
18	Malawi Social Cash Transfer: Impact Evaluation Report of the Mchinji Social Cash Transfer Pilot	Malawi	ESARO	Poor, labor constrained households	Excellent	X
19	Qualitative Service Assessment for Beneficiaries of the Government of Malawi's Social Cash Transfer Programme	Malawi	ESARO	Poor, labor constrained households	Good	
20	Costing and Analysis of Transfer Levels for the Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme	Malawi	EAPRO	Poor, labor constrained households	Good	
21	La importancia de un buen comienzo - Pobreza infantil multidimensional y derechos de la niñez y adolescencia en México	Mexico	LACRO	Children in poverty conditions aged 0-17	Good	
22	Impact of cash transfers on poverty and well-being of the most vulnerable families in the Republic of Moldova, within the context of transition from category-based to means-tested social assistance	Moldova	CEE/CIS	Poor, vulnerable households with children	Good	X
23	End of Project Evaluation and Future Programming Entry Points in the Field of Statistics and Evidence-Based Policy Making	Moldova	CEE/CIS	Poor, vulnerable households with children	Good	
24	Impact social de la migration et des transferts de migrants sur les enfants restés dans le pays	Morocco	MENA	Households receiving remittances from family members living abroad	Good	
25	Assessment of Sustainable Funding Options for the Implementation of Universal Child Grants in Namibia	Namibia	ESARO	Poor, vulnerable households with children	N/A	
26	National Social Protection Framework: An Institutional Assessment Report	Nepal	ROSA	Multiple populations depending on type of social protection programme	Good	X
27	Effects of the Palestinian National Cash Transfer Programme on Children and Adolescents	Palestine	MENA	Poor households in Ghaza and the West Bank	Good	X
28	UNICEF Philippines Country Program Evaluation	Philippines	EAPRO	Not specified	Good	
29	Actualisation de l'étude sur la pauvreté et les disparités chez les enfants au Sénégal	Senegal	WCARO	Poor households with children aged 0-17	Good	

30	The South African Child Support Grant Impact Assessment	South Africa	ESARO	Poor households with children aged 10-17	Good	X
31	Determining the Results of the Koudmen Sent Lisi Pilot Programme: A Social Safety Net Programme in St. Lucia	St. Lucia	LACRO	Poor households	Good	X
32	Child Friendly Community Initiative - Evaluation Report	Sudan	MENA	Children in poverty conditions aged 0-17	Good	
33	Community Based Conditional Cash Transfers in Tanzania	Tanzania	ESARO	Poor households with vulnerable children (0-15) and elderly (60+)	Excellent	X
34	Thematic Evaluation of UNICEF's Response to Decentralization in East Asia and the Pacific	Thailand	EAPRO	Not specified	N/A	
35	Children's Rights and Business	Thailand	EAPRO	Poor, vulnerable households with children	Good	
36	Evaluation of the Education Benefit Program of PNAFN in Tunisia	Tunisia	MENA	Poor households with school age children where head of household is unable to work	Good	
37	Defining and Evaluating Child Well Being Domains and Indicators through the Eyes of Children in Turkey	Turkey	MENA	Diverse group of vulnerable and disadvantaged children	Good	
38	Impact Evaluation of Cash and Food Transfers at Early Childhood Development Centers in Karamoja	Uganda	ESARO	All households with a child aged 3-5 participating in an ECD center and with at least 80% attendance rate	Good	X
39	Situation Analysis of Child Poverty & Deprivation in Uganda	Uganda	ESARO	Children in poverty conditions aged 0-17	Good	
40	Zambia Cash Transfer in Monze District	Zambia	ESARO	Poor, labor constrained households	Excellent	X
41	Zambia 36 Month Impact Report 2014	Zambia	ESARO	Poor households with children below age 3	Good	
42	Zimbabwe Harmonized Social Cash Transfer (HSCT)	Zimbabwe	ESARO	Poor, labor constrained households	Good	X