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Session Objectives

- Brief Overview of the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP)
- Key Livelihoods Findings within the PSNP
- Overview of USAID’s Graduation Approach
- Systems-based approach to Learning
- Evidence Translation/Consolidation
- Resilience Data Reliability Findings
- A few lessons learned
In 2005 the Ethiopian government put in place the Productive Safety Net Program to address chronic food insecurity and to replace a fragmented systems and duplication of efforts.

PSNP 5 project goal: “End extreme poverty in woredas”
- Reduce food insecurity through direct assistance transfers
- Increase resilience to shocks
- Indirect Benefits (Public Works)
- Livelihoods Transformation and Graduation

PSNP Overview: 7.9 million recipients in 380 woredas
PSNP IMPACT: Reduced Food Insecurity and increased asset creation
2006-2018

- The food gap nearly halved for PSNP households over a 9-year period.
- PSNP transfers contributed to approximately 80% of this improvement.
- The food gap was reduced by 1.3 months between 2006 and 2010 (from 3.6 to 2.3) and decreased by 0.5 months (from 2.5 to 2) between 2016 and 2018.
- Tropical Livestock Units holdings increased from 0.5 in 2006 to 1.7 TLUs in 2014 for the poorest PSNP households.
PSNP IMPACT: Real Household Expenditure Doubled (2005-2018)

- PSNP had a positive impact on households’ calorie consumption, with a 13.4% rise in average per capita daily calorie intake over the period 2011 to 2014.
- A study in the Somali region showed that the PSNP resulted in a 55% (about 1269 kcal) increase in calorie intake.
“PSNP+” 5 USAID Livelihoods Interventions
Poorest of the Poor

- **Focus on the ultra-poor** – target the bottom 10 percent of PSNP PWs participants from each beneficiary community (Kebele) by wealth ranking;

- **Cash grant** – provide a grant equivalent to US$200 for the selected beneficiaries to finance investment in income-generating activities;

- **training and technical support** – offer training for financial literacy and business plan development, support in livelihood pathway selection and business plan development, and follow-up during plan implementation.

- **consumption support** – transfers of food through public work investments
INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLDS

Health
- Healthcare Access
- Health Education

Coaching
- Life Skills
- Accountability & Encouragement

Livelihoods
- Productive Asset

Skills Training
- Managing the Asset

Safety Net
- Cash or Food Consumption Support

Savings Promotion
- Access to Savings Account
Findings – Impact of Livelihoods Interventions

The interventions have **not** lead to statistically significant increase in the beneficiaries’ likelihood of:

- **using modern agricultural input** (improved seeds, chemical fertilizers, irrigation, and pesticides; and

- **engaging in off-farm employment** (casual or irregular wage work, regular wage work for an employer, manage non-farm income generating activities (such as trading, transport, handicrafts, and food processing)

Given the small size of plots cultivated by households and rain-fed agricultural practices in the context of climate vulnerability, subsistence crop-farming may not offer opportunity for income expansion beyond meeting subsistence needs.

Only 7.3% of PSNP (all categories) clients engaged in business.

Before you can run, you need to learn to walk.

- Systems-based monitoring activities are difficult to undertake without certain enabling conditions and skills.
Key Resilience Evidence
Housekeeping Questions

1. What resilience evidence does USAID possess?

2. How is this evidence consolidated and translated?

3. What is the quality of resilience data?

4. How is data used to inform decision making?
Resilience & DRM Document Review

Learning Review Document Type

- Research: 2.8%
- Impact Evaluation: 1.8%
- FEWSNET Bulletin/Alert: 5.1%
- Performance Evaluation: 2.3%
- Meeting Notes: 10.6%
- Annual Report: 11.5%
- Quarterly Report: 20.7%
- After Action Report: 2.8%
- Evaluation: 0.9%
- Monthly Report: 4.6%
- Analysis/Assessment Report: 10.1%
- Design Document: 4.1%
- Other: 21.7%
Appraise evidence to identify quality validity, relevance, and applicability.

In all, the Headlight Team:

- Analyzed 216 documents
- Using a lexicon of 164 codes
- Resulting in 2,774 code concepts

For a total of 10,573 code applications

286 USAID documents and over 24 USAID Activities for Quality.

Strong Quality = 4.5%
Weak Quality = 43.5%

Evidence Mapping--Resilience Causal Chain

(Relatively) discrete actions or tasks during implementation bucketed

- Set up
- Outreach
- Targeting
- Enrollment
- Benefit transfer

...that lead to resilience outcomes

- Change in household outcomes
- Change in community

Facilitated by program Enabling environment

- Human resources
- Financing
- Governance
- Monitoring and eval.
- Grievance

Improved resilience
Identifying evidence gaps in the resilience causal chain...
## Disconnect between Resilience M&E and Research Intermediate Outcomes

### TIGER-OR Proximal Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IR</th>
<th>Sub-IR</th>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Output/outcome</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR 2.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Household food security increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR 2.1.1</strong></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Food productivity, production, and availability at the household level increased</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Value or quantity of benefits disbursed to beneficiaries (e.g., high supply: use of improved seeds and RF MERL indicator indicates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Demand</td>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>Average size of transfer received (per household, per beneficiary) Demand: A cash transfer to PNPS no RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Timeliness</td>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Percent of beneficiaries receiving their benefit according to basics: Households who participate in safety net RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Utilization of inputs</td>
<td>Percent of households using new agricultural technologies Indicator of whether households ask RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Food production</td>
<td>Cultivation of food</td>
<td>Percent of households selling any food production A measure of whether households are Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>Increased purchasing power</td>
<td>Percent of households able to purchase goods beyond basic needs: Households income is sufficient to a RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.1</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Movement of food to markets to meet demands</td>
<td>Number of new sellers in local markets If household demand is increasing, Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR 2.1.2</strong></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Household access to diversified food improved</td>
<td>Food production</td>
<td>Diversified food production</td>
<td>Percent of households with food production from [number of food Measures whether households are Custom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Diversified food delivered to markets</td>
<td>Percent of households selling food production from [number of food Indicator of households' contribution Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.2</td>
<td>Supply</td>
<td>Diversified food sold in markets</td>
<td>Market-level diversity score representing the number of distinct ft Household market access has been Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR 2.1.3</strong></td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Utilization of diversified and nutrient-dense foods improved, increased particularly for pregnant and lactating women (PLW), and female-heade</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Dietary diversity training</td>
<td>Number of people trained or provided with advisory services related to increased knowledge of nutrition-re RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Child nutrition training</td>
<td>Number of people trained or provided with advisory services related to increased knowledge of nutrition-re RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge gained</td>
<td>Percent of people trained or provided with advisory services who served as an initial measure to the Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Knowledge retained</td>
<td>Percent of people trained or provided with advisory services who for knowledge to be translated into Custom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1.3</td>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>Household dietary diversity score Provides a measure of dietary diversity RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR 2.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shock-resilient livelihoods are increasingly adopted and maintained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR 2.2.1</strong></td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Capacity to engage in diversified livelihoods increased</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Receiving or purchasing inputs</td>
<td>Percent of households receiving livelihoods grants investing in proc The beginning of the causal chain he RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Receiving or purchasing inputs</td>
<td>Number of people reporting the use of climate information or imp linking trainings here to utility, it is RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2.1</td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Capacity development</td>
<td>Number of program activities conducted (e.g., demonstrations of This is the first step—capacity builds RF MERL indicator in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges & Opportunities In Resilience Measurement
Learnings

- Activity level baseline, midline and endline evaluations aren’t telling us what’s working and why (USAID speak-- “layering and sequencing and impact”)

- Desire for systems-based monitoring approaches to triangulate findings from traditional USAID M&E approaches.

- Recurring Monitoring Survey (walk before you can run)
Challenges & Opportunities in the Resilience Space (Learnings Continued)

- Ask the question--how will the data be used to solve or program?
  - What type of data is meaningful and cost effective?
  - Where is there political will internally and externally for action?

- Significant variability in the type and quality of evidence from implementing partners makes it difficult to draw conclusions and apply learning. Establish a peer review mechanism (potential link with LASER patterns)

- Evidence variation doesn’t allow for meaningful triangulation (need applied research, learning and traditional evaluation/data collection)

- Create thematic working groups to explore what meaningful data is needed anchored to existing USAID program cycle.
USAID/Ethiopia Resilience Learning Activity

- New activity launched September 2022
- Provide support to Highlands implementing partners
- Translation & Re-analysis
- Sectoral working groups
- Adaptive management
- Testing, incubating and scaling best practices