Productive Safety Net Programme
Basics of the PSNP

The Productive Safety Net Program (2005-2020) aims to:

(i) improve household food security, livelihoods and nutrition; and (ii) enhance household and community resilience to shocks.

This is to be achieved through a safety net system that:

(i) provides appropriate, timely, and accessible transfers to beneficiary households, including in response to drought shock;

(ii) creates productive and sustainable community assets and improves access to social services through public works; and,

(iii) supports livelihood interventions that build assets, promote increased productivity, and encourage diversification at the household level.
Targeting of the PSNP

▪ National program:
  • Eight Regions; 350 *woredas* (districts)
  • 8 million people; 2.5 million households

▪ Federal Government sets:
  • Targeting criteria: Chronic food insecurity (receipt of food aid for the past three years) is key
  • Quota: resource allocate to woreda determine by number of people receiving food aid over past 3-5 years

▪ Communities:
  • Carry-out targeting process through wealth ranking according to guidelines
  • Kebele Appeals Committee (KAC) hear complaints

▪ Impact evaluation:
  • Very well targeted to the poorest households in highlands
PSNP Transfers

- Once selected, households entitled to receive 6 (or 12) months of support over multiple years.

- Transfers are provided to households:
  - In exchange for participation in public works activities
  - Directly (unconditionally) to households without able-bodied adult members

- Transfers are provided in food or cash

- Monthly benefit amount/ beneficiary:
  - Public works: 5 days x wage rate x 6 months
  - Permanent Direct Support: 5 days x wage rate x 12 months
PSNP Public Works Projects

- Integrated watershed/rangelands development with social infrastructure: ‘The whole is greater than the sum of the parts’

- Each year:
  - about 6 million people
  - in 12,500 community watersheds
  - work on 35,000 sub-projects
  - Covering natural resource management, health facilities, schools, roads, and FTCs
Pattern of Watershed Development

Phases:

1. Basic natural resource management; area closure, etc
2. Notable short-term impacts, eg increased ground-water
3. Steady improvements in watershed productivity; more livelihoods-based sub-projects
4. Significant increased resource availability; marked improvement in livelihoods

As time passes the watersheds become more productive, and the sub-projects become more livelihoods-orientated. For example (person-days of work). To illustrate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Water Conservation</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Projects</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-S Irrigation</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons learned

- It is possible to deliver an effective safety net for the poorest people through a public works program, provided that the design and delivery clearly prioritizes the safety net features of the program.
  - Household entitlement: Household chose who to send to work each day
  - Labour “cap” limits total number of days worked each month per household
  - Primacy of transfers principle to ensure the predictability of transfers
  - Gender provisions: work norms for women; types of work
Lessons learned

- A public works program can complement and reinforce the aims of a safety net by addressing the underlying causes of poverty, but this requires clear policy objectives and significant capacity:
  - Vision for transformation of the natural environment & strong political support
  - Sustained engagement in the same communities over time
  - Supported by Ministry of Agriculture systems and structures
  - Front-line staff with skills to apply the CBPWMG
  - Requires continuous training of front-line staff
  - Data collection, reviews and evidence building
Resulting in Impacts

BY 2014,

The food gap nearly halved for PSNP households over a 9-year period.

PSNP transfers attributed to approximately 80% of this improvement.

41% of PSNP households no longer had food gaps, as compared to similar non-PSNP households.

95% in food consumption for an average monthly public works wage of ETB 600.

OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS,

40% of PSNP households no longer have food gaps, as compared to 30% in 2016.

9% in food consumption across PSNP households.
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