



Strengthening coherence between social protection and productive interventions in four African countries

KEY MESSAGES

Coordination between social protection programmes and rural productive development can help poor and at-risk households escape the poverty trap and break its intergenerational transmission. Although these are studies carried out before the crisis caused by COVID-19, the results are promising in terms of their contribution to increasing the resilience of households in the face of shocks, an argument particularly relevant to promote this kind of strategies given the need to promote processes of re-activation in the rural sector.

This is demonstrated by four studies carried out in Ethiopia, Lesotho, Mali, and Zambia. The impact eval-

uations, in general, show positive effects of the interaction between the analysed programs on productive variables –livestock production, crop production, average herd size, crop diversification, consumption and access to markets–.

Some cases also showed positive effects on food security –Lesotho, Mali and Zambia–, as well as income and poverty –Lesotho and Zambia–.

Political commitment is necessary, but not sufficient to guarantee coordination between programmes. Formal coordination is needed for interventions throughout the pub-

lic policy cycle and at all levels of implementation. Formal coordination mechanisms are more common at the central level than at the local level, where coordination occurred informally.

The analysis showed the need to pool resources to implement joint programmes. Additionally, budgetary aspects could be a key instrument to articulate interventions, especially when the stakeholders involved have different views, and coordination is seen as a cost. Human support in all levels of implementation is also needed. Human resources require training in the importance of multi-sectoral interventions.

RESULTS OF THE IMPACT EVALUATIONS



PRODUCTIVE OUTCOMES

PSNP + IN-SCT

- + livestock
- + production of livestock by-products
- + average herd size
- + crop production

CGP + SPRINGS

- + access to markets

Nioro Cash +

- + livestock production

CASU + HGSE

- + livestock
- + marketing



INCOME, POVERTY & LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

CGP + SPRINGS

- poverty gap
- + income
- + consumption

CASU + HGSE

- + total revenues
- poverty (simulation)
- + income distribution (simulation)



FOOD SECURITY & EDUCATION

CGP + SPRINGS

- + dietary diversity

Nioro Cash +

- + food security

CASU + HGSE

- + food security
- schooling



FINANCIAL

CGP + SPRINGS

- + household savings and borrowings
- + money saved and borrowed
- negative coping strategies
- + willingness to take risks



PSYCHOLOGICAL & SOCIAL

Nioro Cash +

- + aspirations for children's education

RESULTS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

Ethiopia	Lesotho	Mali
Coordination through targeting beneficiaries	Coordination through geographical targeting based on social protection beneficiaries	Formal coordination at the national level was not considered
Lack of formal coordination mechanisms between involved ministries	Formal coordination on different levels. It enabled the coordination between key actors on the local level	Informal coordination with PLIAM programme at the local level
Formal coordination at the local level enable permanent contact between key actors		No coordination with Jigisemejiri programme, but used its participation mechanisms

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The impact evaluation results reveal that synergies between social and productive programmes in Africa that have generated positive effects on productive outcomes, household income, food security, and financial inclusion. These results encourages us to continue the search for these types of synergies between rural livelihood programmes in combination with social protection programmes.
- In the context of Africa, the agricultural sector has greater importance than other sectors, and is reticent with respect to working with social sectors which are the most recently created and in which budgets, along with human and technical resources are all less consolidated. For these reasons, the proposal is **to have one programme with two types of components under the direction of the ministries of agriculture, to take advantage of the institutional and technical capacities of this sector.**
- **The institutional weakness may be an opportunity to incorporate cooperation and coordination arrangements from early stages that can be difficult to promote in contexts of greater institutional strength, but also of greater rigidity.** International Cooperation Agencies and NGOs already play an important role in the design, funding, and even program implementation, promoting coordination processes and solving difficulties associated with a weakness in the technical and budgeting capacity of the region. They should continue opting a strategy of financial and technical support through cooperation agencies, international NGOs, and the public sector to contribute to the strengthening of the ministries and public services, including the design of formal coordination mechanisms that generate the right incentives to promote coordination.

THE COUNTRIES AND PROGRAMMES

Ethiopia

- Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP)
- Improved Nutrition Social Cash Transfer (IN-SCT)

Lesotho

- Child Grants Programme (CGP)
- Sustainable Poverty Reduction through Income, Nutrition and Access to Government Services (SPRINGS)

Mali

- Nioro Cash + Project

Zambia

- Home Grown School Feeding (HGSE) Programme
- Conservation Agriculture Scale-Up (CASU) Project



sinergiasrurales.info

For more information about the Rural Synergies Project, write to:

- **Jorge Maldonado**
jmaldona@uniandes.edu.co
- **Viviana León-Jurado**
dv.leon10@uniandes.edu.co

For more information about the African evaluations, write to:

- **Alejandro Grinspun**
Alejandro.Grinspun@fao.org
- **Christine Legault**
Christine.Legault@fao.org

