



## Policy Context: National Social Protection Strategy (2007)

- Developed within context of Ghana Growth & Poverty Reduction Strategy II
- NSPS's vision is "the creation of a society in which the citizenry are duly empowered with the capacity to realize their rights and responsibilities to manage social, economic, political and cultural shocks."
  - SP interventions will allow persons in extreme poverty to contribute to economic growth
- LEAP is a key pillar of the NSPS



## LEAP Programme

- **Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) Social Grants Scheme**

*context specific initiative that provides both conditional and unconditional cash transfers to **Targeted** populations*

- **Dept. Of Social Welfare (DSW) - Implementing Agency**
  - From DSW → To DSD
- **First in W. Africa to Implement**



## LEAP Beneficiaries

- **Care Givers Grant Scheme for Orphan/Vulnerable Children (OVCs) (*Conditional*)**. Emphasis on:
  - Children Affected By Aids (CABAs)
  - Children with severe disabilities
- **Persons with Severe Disabilities (*Unconditional*)**
  - No Productive Capacity
- **Social Grants for the extremely poor above 65 years (*Unconditional*)**
  - No Subsistence Support

## Key Programme Features

- **Affordability** – 5 year pilot < 2% of GDP
- **Payment Amount:** GHC ¢8 – GHC ¢15 (Low Dependency, Duration of 3 years, OVC to benefit until age 15 in some cases)
- **Women preferred recipients** – Maximum impact at HH level
- **Target Group:** 20% of Extreme Poor (18.2%) GLSS 5
- **Community based targeting plus proxy means test**
  - Districts choose villages/locations
  - Community committee complete targeting form on potential beneficiaries
  - Assets, household characteristics, demographics,
  - Final ranking done at DSW

## Key Programme Features

- **Conditionality**
  - WFCL, NHIS, Births/Deaths, School Attendance, EPI
  - Conditionality is developmental rather than punitive
  - Encourage families to prioritize human development of children
- **Single Registry System – Networked/Security Features, In-Line with GSS instruments**
  - Eventually serve as data base for all social programs
- **Linkages with Complementary Services**
  - MOU with Health and Education Sectors
  - Health: automatic enrollment in National Health Insurance
  - Education: fee waiver and uniform bursary programmes

## LEAP Pre-Pilot Programme 2007

- **Pre-pilot to test systems in 2007**
  - **Focus on OVC via Care Givers Scheme**
  - **2000 households**
  - **Scale-up 21 OVC/NHIS Districts to Implement LEAP (All 10 Regions)**
  - **Social Grants- \$8/HH, Bi-monthly Payment**
  - **Payments through Post-Office**
  - **Targeting based on GLSS 5 Data**
- **National Sensitization on NSPS/LEAP- 10 Regions**
- **DSW Institutional Assessment and Capacity Strengthening Plan developed**

## LEAP Pilot Programme 2008-12

- **Coverage (4/2010) is approximately 30,000 household**
  - **76/80 Districts – Every Region Represented**
- **Distribution of participants: 50% OVC, 47% elderly, 3% PWD**
- **Actualizing Capacity Building Plans for DSW and MMYE**
- **TWG and National Steering Committee on SP**
  - **Capacity Building of MDAs to programme for V+E, especially sector programs for women and children.**



## Overview of Impact Evaluation

- Key identification approach: longitudinal propensity score matching (PSM)
- ‘Good fortune’: Evaluation design coincided with timing of national household survey being implemented by ISSER
- Team effort between DSW, ISSER and international evaluation consultant
  - Funding through Institutional Strengthening Programme (DFID and UNICEF)



## Evaluation Implementation I

- ISSER National Survey Sept.-Dec 2009
  - Sample of 800 future LEAP households added to sample to serve as baseline
  - Logistically complex: DSW had to implement targeting and selection in 3 districts prior to ISSER fieldwork
  - Identical questionnaire, fieldwork protocols and interviewers used in both surveys to maintain comparability



## Evaluation Implementation II

- Comparison Group Selection
  - Use PSM to draw comparison group from ISSER National Survey
    - Strengths: Survey instrument identical, so measurement of key outcomes and control variables will be the same
    - Weakness: LEAP sample is very poor and ‘not-typical’ of national population—may be difficulty to find good comparison group from ISSER national sample



## Evaluation Implementation III

- Follow-up longitudinal design
  - For both samples (LEAP and ‘matched’ comparison group), collect follow-up data in 1-2 years (2010 or 2011)
  - Compare changes in key outcomes across the two groups: difference-in-differences impact estimator
  - Longitudinal design allows control for unobserved household characteristics that are ‘fixed’ over time: innate health, ability, motivation



## Key Evaluation Questions

- Household food security, diet diversity
- Household economic status (livestock, housing quality, labor, production)
- Children's human development
  - Nutritional status, sickness, schooling, cognitive development
- Access to complementary services
  - NHIS, other social and economic programs



## Key Operational Features I

- Timing of ISSER survey very important
  - Allows construction of rigorous non- or quasi-experimental comparison group
    - Construction of experimental treatment group politically and logistically very challenging
    - Ethical concerns; operational requirement of targeting now for future program areas
- Human and financial resources
  - Total survey costs and consultant costs around \$600k
  - ISSER survey instrument extremely



## Key Operational Features II

- Human and financial resources
  - Total survey costs and consultant costs around \$600k
  - ISSER survey instrument extremely comprehensive, already contained all relevant outcome indicators and control variables, plus community survey to measure supply side
  - International consultant to ensure rigor, define key research questions, perform analysis



## Key Operational Features III

- Political Commitment to Evaluation
  - DSW interested in rigorous evaluation
    - Learn about how to improve program
    - Provide evidence to support advocacy for program within the country
- In-Country Collaboration
  - UNICEF provided funding for initial design of evaluation
  - DFID ISP flexible enough to accommodate impact evaluation
  - ISSER willingness to expand survey to include LEAP evaluation





Thank You