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OVERVIEW

On the 13th & 14th Feb 2018, Save the Children UK and the Child Poverty Global Theme held a Cash Transfer Evidence Event which brought together 35 colleagues from across the movement and representatives from external organisations to learn from researchers and practitioners sharing evidence on using cash transfers to positively benefit children.

The purpose of event was to;

- Identify the most pressing evidence gaps and agree on how best to address them, including through collaborative partnerships
- Increase understanding of the role that child-sensitive cash transfers can play in achieving our breakthroughs for children
- Inform Save the Children’s roadmap for cash transfer programming (CTP), and external policy influencing, and
- Identify priority areas for our international and national advocacy and evidence generation, and to understand where Save the Children can make the biggest difference.

This document is a session report intended to highlight key points from the presentations and post-discussion activities. The presentations are available as downloads via the red links provided throughout the report.

In addition to this document, please see the ‘Making Cash Transfers Work for Children’ background paper kindly prepared by Luke Harman (Senior Social Protection Advisor with Save the Children UK). The paper draws together current evidence and learning aimed at increasing awareness of the role of, and need for, child sensitive cash transfers and social protection, increasing understanding of the evidence gaps on cash-plus, as well as enhancing Save the Children’s position as a leading NGO voice on child-sensitive social protection and cash transfer programming.
### List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCC</td>
<td>Behavioural Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCT</td>
<td>Conditional Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDGP</td>
<td>Child Development Grant Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMAM</td>
<td>Community Management of Acute Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Country Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoTD</td>
<td>Cost of the Diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSSP</td>
<td>Child Sensitive Social Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTP</td>
<td>Cash Transfer Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DANIDA</td>
<td>Danish International Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>Department for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EBF</td>
<td>Exclusive Breast Feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCD</td>
<td>Early Childhood Care and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFSP</td>
<td>Emergency Food Security Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFP</td>
<td>Food for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEA</td>
<td>Household Economy Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH</td>
<td>Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDP</td>
<td>Integrated Child Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICDS</td>
<td>Integrated Child Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IFPRI</td>
<td>International Food Policy Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IYCF</td>
<td>Infant and Young Child Feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGIS</td>
<td>Keeping Girls in School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCT</td>
<td>Maternal and Child Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MUAC</td>
<td>Mid-upper arm circumference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODI</td>
<td>Overseas Development Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Oxford Policy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OVC</td>
<td>Orphans and Vulnerable Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDQ</td>
<td>Programme Development and Quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDM</td>
<td>Post Distribution Monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDD</td>
<td>Regression Discontinuity Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBCC</td>
<td>Social and Behavioural Change Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToC</td>
<td>Theory of Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCT</td>
<td>Unconditional Cash Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Emergency Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFM</td>
<td>Value for Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Global positioning on Cash Transfer Programming
- Cash transfers are increasingly popular in both humanitarian and non-humanitarian settings: UN (WFP and UNHCR) positioning themselves as the leading cash provider in emergencies. DfID and ECHO driving sectoral change towards more cash interventions.
- In sub-Saharan Africa cash transfers have doubled from 21 countries to 40 countries since 2010.
- Approx. 30% of humanitarian aid estimated to be delivered by cash by 2030 (currently 6%).

Cash programming for better child outcomes
- Cash Transfer outcomes are dependent on the way cash is financed, who is financing, and the level, frequency, duration, modality, and links to services that accompany the cash.
- Child Sensitive cash programming is critical to meet the needs of children, focusing on improved outcomes and mitigating unintended consequences.
- Cash ‘Plus’ needed for better child outcomes: Cash alone is not as effective as it could be when combined with other interventions such as links/referrals, to services/information, behavioural change communication.

Positive outcomes of Save the Children’s programming
- Cash Plus during the first 1000 days of a child’s life (from pregnancy to their second birthday) has shown to have a positive impact on rates of exclusive breast feeding, stunting rates, and access to health services (See Myanmar and Nigeria case studies).
- Cash Plus has resulted in improved food security during lean seasons, reduction in severe hunger and improved dietary diversity (See Myanmar, Nigeria and Sierra Leone case studies).
- Cash Plus is resulting in reduced school dropout rates of girls (See Malawi case study).
- Cash transfers helping to keep children out of hazardous work and return to school following crisis (See Lebanon case study).
- Cash transfers increasing household expenditure on food, education and healthcare (See Sierra Leone case study).
- Cash transfers enabling quicker rebuilding of assets following crisis (See Nepal and Bangladesh case studies).

Evidence Gaps
- Greater attention needed on identifying and monitoring for unintended consequences.
- Graduation after cash: how do we know if improved outcomes are sustained in the longer term, and where negative or no impact in the short term may actually look different over long term.
- Remaining lack of clarity over whether and when different types of conditionalities required, or if messaging is typically sufficient.
- Cash in humanitarian contexts requires studies with experimental (or quasi-experimental) designs with a robust counterfactual, looking at the long term.
Actions

- **Scaling up** we must learn from SC experience in Myanmar and Nigeria on engaging with Governments to embed cash plus in national policy. (See Day 2: Session 2)
- Work on being better prepared for rapid cash transfer response in humanitarian contexts
- Develop robust monitoring systems to capture planned positive and **unintended impacts** of cash programming
- Develop and improve **child sensitive design** in delivering cash for impacts on children
- Better understand household economy and **impacts of shocks** on households
- Ensure the most **deprived, vulnerable and hard to reach children** are targeted (including ‘invisible’ children who may not live in traditional family structures)
- **Strengthen government systems** to deliver cash transfers/social protection mechanisms
- Recognise limitations of cash alone and look for **integration with other programmes or complementary activities**
- Purposefully seek to generate research around the key evidence gaps
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DAY 1: SESSION REPORTS.

Session 1: The Role of Cash Transfers in Social Protection and Humanitarian Response

**Presenters:**
- Introduction by **Keetie Roelen** - Research Fellow, Institute of Development Studies (IDS)
- Cash in humanitarian contexts, with **Paula Brennan** – Director, Humanitarian Technical Unit at Save the Children
- ‘Cash Plus’ and how it can help to achieve SC’s breakthroughs for children – **Richard Morgan** – Director Child Poverty Global Theme, Save the Children

**Session Objective:** Introduction to critical debates: Measuring Cash Transfer Programmes; Operational Models; Multi-purpose Grants; Financial Inclusion; Social Protection; Capacity Building.

**Why Cash?**
- Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) emphasise the role of social protection in reducing poverty. Non-contributory cash transfers make up one of three social safety nets within social protection interventions.
- Use of cash transfers is continuing to expand. In sub-Saharan Africa cash transfers have doubled from 21 countries to 40 countries since 2010.
- Cash is increasingly popular in humanitarian contexts because it can work at scale, should be more cost effective, can respond to multiple needs and provides wider choice for households in need.
- Cash transfers expected to increase in humanitarian contexts: Approx. 30% of humanitarian aid estimated to be delivered by cash by 2030 (currently 6%). UN (WFP and UNHCR) positioning themselves as the leading cash provider in emergencies. DfID and ECHO are among those driving sectoral change towards more cash interventions.

**Key Takeaways:**

**Cash ‘Plus’ needed for better child outcomes:** Cash alone is not as effective as it could be when combined with other interventions such as links/referrals to services/information; behavioural change communication.

**Child Sensitive cash programming:** Ensuring CTs meet the needs of children, mitigating unintended consequences.

**Five key questions for the future of cash transfers:**
1. How do we improve ‘cash-plus’ interventions for children?
2. How do we develop and improve child sensitive design in delivering cash for impacts on children?
3. How do we better understand household economy and impacts of shocks on households?
4. How do we make sure the most deprived and vulnerable children are reached?
5. How do we strengthen systems to deliver cash transfers/social protection mechanisms?

**Discussion Points Raised**
- What if cash is intended for children but is spent on different needs? How to mitigate unintended negative consequences?
- How can programming ensure cash transfer preparedness for effective response in humanitarian contexts?
- What is the role of NGOs in cash transfers if there is a move towards a single provider?
Session 2: What does global evidence tell us about how cash can help achieve our Breakthroughs for children?

Presenters:
- **Francesca Bastagli** - Principal Research Fellow, Head of Programme - Social Protection and Social Policy, ODI
- **Francesca Battistin** - Humanitarian Cash & Markets Adviser, Save the Children UK

**Session Overview**

**Session Objective:** Introduction of global evidence from ODI systematic review of literature; CT outcomes dependent on the way cash is financed, who is financing, and the level, frequency, duration, modality, and links to services that accompany the cash.

- **Monetary:** CT strongly associated with reduction in monetary poverty among households
- **Education:** Significant evidence of CT leading to increase in school attendance
- **Health & Nutrition:** Strong evidence of increased use of health services and dietary diversity
- **Child Labour:** CT found to decrease prevalence of child labour
- **Empowerment:** Evidence that CT delays marriage of girls and women age 13-26 years (linked to education)

**Cash transfers in Humanitarian contexts**

- Barriers in humanitarian settings will disrupt the casual pathways (e.g., disruptions of services and markets).
- Issues of safety (e.g., families may be scared to send children to school, access services)
- Unreliability of income generating activities, especially in refugee context
- Unconditional and unrestricted cash to increase the speed of delivery

**How to design effective CT meeting the needs of children?**

- ‘**Cash Plus**’: critical to consider complementary and supplementary interventions that focus on the supply side (e.g., social behaviour change, information, training, services), and quality of services.
- Design features for positive impact: higher level of transfers, timing and frequency, effective duration (for example: CT needs to cover the full education cycle to have meaningful impact on attendance).

**What evidence gaps need addressing?**

- **Conditionality:** Most evidence on CCTs rather than UCTs. Now a wave on UCT from Africa to leave from, but we need more
- **Going beyond child grants:** Old age pensions have shown significant benefits for children
- **More humanitarian studies needed:** Current quality issues in difficult data collection
- **Broader thematic evidence:** Most evidence on health outcomes, less so on protection.

**Discussion Points Raised**

- How does introducing cash into a community affect prices also consumption and wider economy? The Transfer Project shows consistently positive effects on the local economy with a multiplier effect.
- How do we set up monitoring systems to capture unintended impacts?
- Conditionality vs nudging/ messaging about use of transfers: few studies comparing modality in the same groups.
Session 3: What does our internal learning and evidence tell us about how to design and implement cash transfer programmes to achieve positive outcomes for children in non-humanitarian settings?

Session Objective: This session presented a series of Save the Children case studies on evidence and learning around the impact of cash transfer programmes on child outcomes in non-humanitarian contexts. The case studies showed evidence across Save the Children Breakthroughs;

- **Survive**: Myanmar (LEGACY), Guatemala (PAISANO), Nigeria (CDGP), DRC (ARCC-II)
- **Learn and Be Protected**: Malawi (KGIS), India (Palanhar Plus)

---

Case Study 1: Myanmar - Maternal and Child Cash Transfer (MCCT)

Presenter: **Nicolas Guillaud** - Child Poverty Advisor, Save the Children

The project covers 8000 pregnant women. It targets women and children during the first 1000 days of a child’s life for positive nutrition and gives monthly transfers of 11 USD plus social and behavioural change communication (SBCC) on key nutrition and Infant and Young Child Feeding behaviours (IYCF).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Cash + SBCC showed difference of up to 30% compared to control villages for key nutritional indicators.</td>
<td>- Need for regular Cost of the Diet (CotD) analysis to flag when cash transfer amount no longer covers the cost of nutritious diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cash + SBCC had significant impact — greater rates of exclusive breastfeeding, greater rate of using health services</td>
<td>- Need to have strong ongoing qualitative monitoring to understand emerging barriers and issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nearly all women-controlled decisions on use of cash transfer. Main use of cash was for food-related purchases and to cover health costs.</td>
<td>- Need to increase the intensity and focus of monthly SBCC component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Government adopted the MCCT, implementing in 2 states</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Points Raised

- What constitutes good quality Social Behaviour Change Communication?
- Considerable spill over in the evaluation: SBCC model needs to be specific to projects within a programme, examine local taboos and behaviours towards food.
- MCCTs are part of the national protection strategic plan, how was ‘Plus’ side adopted by the government? (See page 23)
Case Study 2: DRC - Effects of Unconditional cash transfers on the outcome of treatment for severe acute malnutrition (SAM): A cluster-randomised trial in DRC

Presenter: Aurelien Barriquault – Regional Nutrition Advisor WCA, Save the Children UK

Improving food and nutrition security of most vulnerable population in 3 health zones of Kasai Oriental Province through examining the effect of complementary Community Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) services with cash transfers. 1600 SAM cases without medical complication were enrolled in the programme (800 beneficiaries enrolled in CMAM and receiving 40 USD/month during a six-month period in the intervention arm, and 800 beneficiaries in the control group receiving only CMAM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recovery rate</td>
<td>80.4%*</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relapse rate</td>
<td>3.4%*</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Default rate (during treatment)</td>
<td>1.4%*</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Death rate (during treatment)</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non respondent rate (during treatment)</td>
<td>0.7%*</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weight change (gram/kg/day), mean (SD)</td>
<td>1.86*</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDDS change, mean (SD)</td>
<td>1.53*</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHDS (&gt;3 food groups)</td>
<td>87.7%*</td>
<td>64.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS (acceptable range &gt;42)</td>
<td>92.9%*</td>
<td>65.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of cash (</td>
<td>67% food, 15% IGA, 4% clothing, 3% water and 1.5% health</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Statistically significant

Key Lessons

- Cash transfer should be completed prior to the start of the harvest season to avoid dilution of the effects of the cash distributed on nutrition outcomes.
- Inclusion of existing Infant and Young Child Feeding support group strengthened the promotion of key messages on how to use cash distributed to improve diet diversity.
- Scale up possible due to strong involvement of UNICEF and PRONANUT from start of pilot project.
- Delivery distribution mechanism used paper vouchers instead of electronic cash transfers. It would have been too difficult to have done electronic.

*Save the Children*
### Case Study 3: Nigeria - Evidence and lessons learnt from the Child Development Grant Programme (CDGP)

**Presenter:** Apera Lorwa, National Programme Manager – CDGP, Save the Children

A flagship 6-year cash-plus nutrition programme funded by DFID, operating in 2 states in northwest Nigeria. Provides NGN 4,000 (~11 USD, 8 GBP) monthly and Social and Behavioural Change Communication (SBCC) on nutrition and counselling to beneficiaries. CDGP targets pregnant women from confirmation of pregnancy until their babies reach 2 years of age (first 1,000 days of life). Aimed at reducing stunting, poverty and hunger in children under 5s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| - Improved food security especially during the lean seasons.  
- 52% of 6-23 months were eating from four or more food groups compared to 40% in non-CDGP communities.  
- 6 percentage point reduction in stunting in CDGP communities (65% compared to 71% in non-CDGP communities).  
- Over 60% recalled messages on Exclusive Breastfeeding (EBF), compared to 20% in non-CDGP areas,  
- 70% recalled messages on nutritious foods compared to 20% in non-CDGP areas.  
- 36% attend Ante-Natal Care in CDGP compared to 20% in non-CDGP communities.  
- Exclusive Breast Feeding (first six months) was 70% of mothers in CDGP communities compared to 20% in non-CDGP communities. | - Monthly and predictable cash is preferable to quarterly or every two months payment.  
- Enforcement of conditionalities does not appear necessary for intended impacts (would also be highly costly and penalize the vulnerable who can’t fulfill conditions)  
- SBCC is critical as a component of Cash Plus for Nutrition and it is important to deliver messages through multiple channels for maximum impact. |

### Discussion Points Raised

- How was SBCC design tested? Two clusters, one high intensity and other low intensity. High intensity included one to one counselling and support group meetings.
- What has been the influence on government policy? The entire SBCC is fully taken on board by the government, the evidence of the programme used by the President to justify cash plus. State government in Jigawa have committed over 4m GBP to their own cash transfer programme which will focus heavily on first 1000 days
- The importance of incorporating WASH was highlighted.
Case Study 5: Malawi - Keeping Girls in School Programme (KGIS)

Presenters: Felix Mtonda – Project Manager KGIS, Save the Children and Kalako Mondiwa – Team Leader KGS, Save the Children

Programme objective to increase retention of girls in school and improve transition of girls from primary to secondary school. Cash transfer component to mitigate for financial barriers that girls face in trying to access education. Education Standard 3 – 8 Boys at 41% and girls at 35%. Household cash transfer to provide incentive for parents to keep girls in school. Includes complimentary component dealing with social aspects, e.g. motivation, child protection. Transfer method, Airtel (mobile) transfers. Implemented from Dec 2015 – present.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Significant reduction in girl’s dropout rates. At baseline the dropout rate for girls was 20.6%. At end line the dropout rate reduced to 13.9%</td>
<td>• Mobile money: Importance of proximity of cash out point to beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Social impact: Family and community narrative showed positive change in attitudes to importance of girl’s education</td>
<td>• Mobile transfers and provision of SIM cards. In future it would be best to provide sim and phone, not just sim cards, as easy to misplace, damage and can result in blocked sim if not used regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Protection from pregnancy and early marriage</td>
<td>• Need for provision of agents in remote areas where mobile connectivity issues persist so those in most remote areas have access to mobile cash provision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Points Raised

• Evidence gaps: Due to provision of programme cash transfer and social change components to same beneficiaries it was difficult to distinguish which component responsible for impacts on school attendance.
• National policy has had emphasis on enrolment rates, submission of Keeping Girls in School evidence hoped to change focus to include retention support for girls’ education.

![Image of children in classroom](image-url)
Case Study 5: India - Palanhar Plus Programme: Making a cash transfer scheme child sensitive.

Presenters: Neema Pant – Programme Coordinator, Save the Children; and Sanjay Sharma – State Programme Manager, Save the Children


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Improved parent child relationship – investing time, listening, better communication. Children also reported positive change in their caregivers</td>
<td>• Before starting with parenting and life skill interventions look for interventions which already have proven impact based on robust evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improved life skills of children’s self-confidence, engagement in school, self-awareness and improved health and personal hygiene practices</td>
<td>• Engage with the government at an early stage to receive regular inputs, to assure their buy in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Investing sufficiently in the capacity of field teams through hand holding support is critical: one-off training not enough</td>
<td>• Cost effectiveness is an important consideration in programme design to ensure future scale-up/replication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overcoming issues using mobile money in remote areas where there are connectivity issues</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download Presentation

Save the Children
Case Study 4: Guatemala - Beyond delivering money, Gabriel Santos

Presenter: Gabriel Santos - Cash Transfers Programming Manager, Save the Children

PAISANO is a 6-year USAID/ Food for Peace-funded Development Food Assistance Program, which goal is to reduce food insecurity among vulnerable rural households in 13 municipalities of Huehuetenango, Quetzaltenango and El Quiche in Guatemala’s Western Highlands through:

- Increasing access to food,
- Reducing malnutrition among girls and boys under 5 years and
- Improving community resilience through governance and disaster preparedness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Overview</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95% of participants use their cash transfer to purchase food</td>
<td>To promote financial inclusion the program negotiated special arrangement with the bank such as financial literacy trainings, space to orient beneficiaries without bank accounts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A higher percentage of household consume a diverse diet;</td>
<td>Cash, unlike in-kind food, required some basic orientation on numeracy and appropriate allocation of funds for food and nutrition security. For this the program created a shopping list, as a tool to help families think through what to buy, track prices so they could better negotiate prices at the market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In PDMs, beneficiaries report feeling empowered by the cash transfers, but the program still needs to closely monitor the markets to assess how effective the cash amount is for purchasing intended foods, and whether or not the foods are actually purchased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97% of beneficiaries surveyed as part of PDM activities report feeling safe while travelling to the point of distribution. No difference from results with in kind.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Food Groups</th>
<th>% of HH that consumed HDDS Food Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk and Milk Products</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry, Organ Meat</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roots and Tubers</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Session 4: What does our internal learning and evidence tell us about how to design and implement cash transfer programmes to achieve positive outcomes for children in humanitarian settings?

Presentations of SC case studies of evidence and learning around the impact of cash transfer on child outcomes in humanitarian contexts, across our Breakthroughs:

- Case studies include Somalia, Yemen, Lebanon, Nigeria, Sierra Leone, and a comparative Value for Money study on preparedness for Nepal and Bangladesh.

### Case Study 1: Somalia - More Cash, Bigger Impacts? A Field Experiment of Cash Transfers in Somalia

**Presenter:** Munshi Sulaiman – Research Director, Save the Children

In response to protracted humanitarian crisis due to conflict and droughts (4 consecutive failed rains). Size of cash grants randomised for 800 beneficiaries: 400 each in Mogadishu and Hiraan. Research aimed to answer:

- What is the optimal size of cash grant for household income?
- Is a lump-sum more effective than giving monthly transfers?
- What are the impacts on children?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Overview</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Larger cash grant does not have substantial direct impact on children, especially on nutrition in the time period measured.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No significant effect on children’s dietary diversity</td>
<td>• Higher social return can be achieved by lumping monthly transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No significant effect on children’s nutrition outcomes</td>
<td>• Medium size ($500) cash is more cost-effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Positive impact (6 percentage points) of large cash transfer on school enrolment</td>
<td>• Limited effects of “cash only” approach on child level outcomes is common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The nudge experiment was largely unsuccessful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- However positive effect found on health seeking activities of girls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Discussion Points Raised

- What variations of “Cash Plus” being tested?
  - Child Sensitive Cash Transfer: Cash + Positive Parenting
  - Cash + Psychosocial support
  - Cash + Nutrition training

- Short versus long term impacts on dietary diversity and stunting; The short-term household decision may be about investing in assets so that in the long term one can invest in children. Not surprising that there is lack of short-term impacts on stunting.
Case Study 2: Yemen

**Presenter:** Leslie Mhara – Senior Programme Manager, FFP, Save the Children

Almost 3 years of war created a serious protection crisis, breaches of International Human Rights Law, child recruitment and child marriage and an increase in Gender Based Violence. Primary Objective: to reduce food insecurity. Provision of unconditional monthly cash or electronic voucher transfer (DFID, FFP, Dutch Mofa, DANIDA and DFAT). Coverage: 30,000 households (210,000 individuals including 86,100 children).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Overview</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• End line findings: CTP offers an effective way to meet immediate food needs while strengthening households’ ability to cope with crises and enabling HH’s to have a more nutritious diet.</td>
<td>• Combining Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) component with CTP would increase impact on child malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Post Distribution Monitoring findings: cash transfer amount spent on food (average 60%) while an average of 40% is used to meet child medical needs, water, fuel, hygiene, education, etc.</td>
<td>• Combining cash transfers with other interventions to the same beneficiaries (e.g. related to education and child protection) would enhance impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The end-line showed that only 13% of the children aged six to 23 months were obtaining the Minimum Acceptable Diet. It would have been higher with a combined intervention IYCF + cash</td>
<td>• As donors are prioritising lifesaving and emergency food assistance, SC should systematically advocate for IYCF to be offered with CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Adopt a more systematic method to facilitate collective learning around cash, to improve evidence generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points**

- Activities to improve the nutrition included awareness raising, training on how to store, prepare the food, etc.
Case Study 3: Lebanon - Lebanon Cash Consortium (LCC)

Presenters: Samar Abboud - Deputy Country Director, Lebanon, Save the Children and Etsy Ghanameh – Cash Operations Manager, Save the Children

Lebanon Cash Consortium of 6 NGOs led by SC to deliver a multipurpose cash program. LCC evaluation: a quasi-experimental design, Regression Discontinuity Design. 508 comparable cases at baseline. 40 indicators of physical, material wellbeing. 1.5 million refugees: largest pro-capita concentration of refugee population given that Lebanon has a 4 million population in total.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Overview</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• 32% increase in expenditure on food and improvement in food consumption.</td>
<td>• No impact on school enrolment and child labour, possible explanation being access and other contextual factors. Addresses access but not availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- But! Greater expenditures on food do not translate into lower food insecurity levels or a more diversified diet or lower food-related coping strategy index</td>
<td>• Cash assistance not a once-for-all fix: helps temporarily. If discontinued, a household’s situation worsens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive results in reducing coping mechanisms, reducing debts for rent payment, health and food.</td>
<td>• As income poverty appears not to be the only barrier to child protection outcomes, in future programmes should apply an integrated approach that combines interventions to restore livelihoods and child protection interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 93% of the targeted at-risk children have been removed from hazardous works</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 70.5% of the targeted children have been able to return to school, while another 7.5% have enrolled in vocational training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Points Raised

• Highly functioning markets including financial markets, make cash programming very feasible
• No graduation out of poverty and context does not allow for transition to sustainable livelihoods.
• Need to conduct follow-up survey to see if children are still in school and not working.
• What is Save’s mandate beyond just being part of a platform delivering cash?
Case Study 4: Nigeria - E-vouchers for children’s food security in Borno State (Nigeria)

Presenter: Andrew Simbwa - Project Director EFSP/FFP, Save the Children

Market based approach using electronic vouchers for pre-selected food items. Monthly recharge of electronic wallets, which started with $46 per household, later shifting to $9 per person per household, equivalent to 70% cost of food basket. Evaluation conducted between 2016 – 2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Overview</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Reduced portion of food insecure households in caseload from 95% to 74%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Limited funding means unable to sustain this large a coverage ($1,000) on continued basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Need for an impact assessment to capture qualitative and quantitative impact of the programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A livelihoods package should be designed for households exiting the programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use of e-vouchers allows delivery of assistance without delays</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion Points

- Informed “graduation” based on Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM), but recognise the need to monitor what happens next and advocate for supporting the transition with sustainable livelihoods.
- Design feature: food security was assessed in programme using Coping Strategy Index
**Case Study 5: Sierra Leone - Kailahun Food for Emergence Ebola Virus Diseases Support (FEEDS) Program – Sierra Leone**

Presenter: **Eddington Chinyoka – Project Director, EFSP, Sierra Leone, Save the Children**

Programme objective to improve access to food among vulnerable households affected by Ebola Virus Disease. Interventions included Unconditional Cash Transfers (UCT) to 10,318 households; Conditional cash transfers to 400 female traders, receiving approximately $400 in two tranches; Conditional cash transfers to 18 ‘Women in Agriculture Groups’, each group receiving $2500.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Results Overview</th>
<th>Lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Dietary Diversity Score:</strong> the aggregate HDDS was a significant 6.3 by end-line, which is greater than baseline and target HDDS values of 4.5 and 5.0 respectively.</td>
<td><strong>Staff were deployed within targeted communities throughout project lifetime which proved very helpful for effective monitoring of market prices, cash utilization and nutrition-sensitive messaging</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household Hunger Scale:</strong> Severe hunger reduced from 1.0% to 0.5%, Moderate hunger reduced from 68% to 34.3%; and Little to no hunger increased from 32% to 65.2%</td>
<td><strong>Having in place the right partnerships with state and non-state actors (anti-corruption, social welfare, banks, money transfer companies) added special value such as reduced targeting errors, corruption and waiting time taken by beneficiaries to receive their cash</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Normal Household Expenditures (% of total household expenditures):</strong> From baseline to end line expenditure on food slightly increased from 44% to 45.0%, whilst average expenditures increased significantly from for: Education (from 10% to 18.3%), Healthcare (from 8% to 14.7%), Agriculture (from 7% to 12%), and Savings (from 0% to 4.7%). Expenditure on household items, rent/shelter, gifts, reduced significantly from 15% to 1%</td>
<td><strong>Beneficiary testimonials are powerful tools to communicate the impact and importance of the programme.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Emergency Food Security Programme projects should be reviewed regularly to enhance more adaptive programming as the operational context shifts from an emergency to a recovery or development situation.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion Points**

- Beneficiaries able to raise issues via hotline system, to contact staff directly at distribution points, and through focal people in community
- What impact does it have on social cohesion if you give cash to some but not others? – The community took part of identifying who are the most in need.
## Case Study 6: Nepal / Bangladesh - Is there value for money (VfM) in cash transfer preparedness activities?

**Presenter:** Emily Wylde

### CONTEXT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepal</th>
<th>Bangladesh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake in May 2015 Category 1 disaster</td>
<td>Floods in June 2015 and 2016 in chars (north) Category 4 disaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No CT preparedness measures</td>
<td>No CT preparedness in 2015, but prepared for 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three cash recipient groups</td>
<td>• Provided opportunity to compare 2015 recipients with 2016 recipients (different groups) • Cash disbursed 1 month faster for 2016 group • In practice, flood in 2016 was worse than 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Early grants for shelter in June 2. Unrestricted cash grants (MPGs) between August and September Grants for shelter in December/January</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Session Overview

#### The ‘4E’s of VfM: Economy, Efficiency, Effectiveness & Equity

**Hypothesis:** Timing and quality of transfers are important to the welfare of recipients...
- Quickly helping people to re-build dwellings and re-purchase lost assets allows households to get back to work more quickly
- This increases short-term earnings, lowers debt and could avoid descent into a poverty trap

**Research Findings:**
Returns to investment in preparedness are overwhelmingly positive. Investing would continue to have good VfM even if costs are higher/benefits lower than assumed

#### Dwellings
- Nepal: beneficiaries that received transfers sooner spend far less time in temporary accommodation (9 weeks vs 20) and took less time to rebuild their own dwellings (12 weeks vs 16-20).
- Bangladesh: earlier beneficiaries returned home and rebuilt homes more quickly, even though floodwaters took longer to recede than for those receiving later transfers

#### Earnings
- Nepal: beneficiaries that received transfers earlier returned to cultivation 1 month earlier and had earnings 22-51% higher in the year after the quake compared to later beneficiaries

#### Debt
- Either the level of indebtedness was greater amongst those with later transfers (Nepal), or the reason for borrowing was for consumption rather than investment (Bangladesh).

#### Negative Coping Strategies
- Beneficiaries receiving transfers sooner less likely to have resorted to reducing food and non-food expenditure (Nepal and Bangladesh)
- Beneficiaries receiving transfers later in Nepal had a worrying level of child labour and migration, adult migration, and risky work for children and adults.

### Some next steps...
- Save the Children needs to make decisions on investing in cash transfer preparedness. We need to influence donors too, e.g. in Mozambique with a preparedness program.
- Examine outcomes at different levels of the causal chain (expenditures > dietary diversity)
- Need to determine the exit strategies? From humanitarian to sustainable livelihoods
Session 5: What does the evidence tell us about how best to design and implement effective cash transfers for children across contexts across our Breakthroughs

Presenter/s
Jessica Saulle - Head of the Humanitarian FSL Team at Save the Children UK

Session Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Recipient</th>
<th>Restrictions on use of cash</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditionality</th>
<th>Targeting Mechanism</th>
<th>Complementary &amp; Supply Side Services</th>
<th>Payment Mechanisms</th>
<th>Grievance Mechanisms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Cash Transfer design features which may affect child outcomes and impact

What we ascertain right now:
- Duration and amount: the more, the better!
- Cash ‘plus’ leads to better outcomes
- Not sufficient child level evidence, especially on cash delivery mechanisms and complaint procedures.

What is needed:
- To develop a multifactor Theory of Change to inform design and M&E, look at unintended effects, graduation and exit strategy; financial inclusion, social protection. Cash alone is not enough.

Discussion Points
- Graduation can also be about links to systems and policies; needs to be related to environment, insurance markets and financial products that can take the place of short term interventions of donors.
- Should we set a minimum duration for cash transfers in humanitarian contexts? We need to know what people need, household economics etc. We need comprehensive needs analyses and situational context analyses to help get duration, modality, frequency right.
- What determines the frequency, amount, duration, targeting, conditionality and modality of cash transfers? Is it evidence-based, donor restrictions, other restrictions etc.? How is evidence used to inform programme and donor wishes? It can be hard to know what works best between conditionality, modality, duration and frequency etc. as we are not controlling other factors when testing one of these, e.g. we test the impacts of duration but not frequency or we test modality but not duration.
- For interventions with a Social Behaviour Communications Change component, how do we avoid a scenario in which the cash stops, the behaviour also stops? Carrot vs stick: We need clear objectives and to be very clear with donors on expectations, especially with lower amounts of money given as cash transfers. Cash Plus interventions are key here.
Session 1: Overview of the emerging evidence around shock responsive social protection in crisis prone contexts, and social assistance in protracted crises

**Presenter/s**

Andrew Karden - Senior consultant within the Social Policy Programme, Oxford Policy Management

Jessica Saulle - Head of the Humanitarian FSL Team, Save the Children UK

**Session Overview**

The research aimed to identify ‘factors that could enable social protection (SP) systems to be responsive to shocks and to deliver effective shock response’ (i.e. the research investigated the design features of SP programs; the implementation aspects and attempted to establish how humanitarian, disaster risk management and social protection systems can best work together for more effective responses to shocks)

- Responses in protracted humanitarian settings often start to look like long-term social protection particularly when administered by national governments
- Research involved 2 case studies in West Africa, 2 in Asia, 2 in Southern Africa.
- Although the study explored the potential of SP systems to be responsive to large scale shocks it was noted that SP systems are largely designed to respond to shocks at the household level.
- Emerging themes on how SP can be better at shock responses included: extent of the coverage, timeliness of the response, predictability, cost and extent of duplication
  - Trade-offs between these factors in order to ensure humanitarian needs are met through adequate and relevant responses.
- Research findings propose 5 options for SP systems to be responsive to large scale shocks.
  (i) **Design tweaks** (improve flexibility in regular service or extend coverage and timeliness e.g. Philippines Pantawid cash transfer program)
  (ii) **Piggy-backing** (pick up and mix-approach e.g. borrow a SP program’s beneficiary list e.g. Pakistan National Socio-economic registry)
  (iii) **Vertical expansion** (temporary increase in value/duration of support to some or all current SP program beneficiaries)
  (iv) **Horizontal expansion** (temporary inclusion of new beneficiaries; increasing coverage in a geographic area etc.) (Note: Pakistan, Philippines, Lesotho all considered temporary inclusion of new beneficiaries to flagship programmes in recent shocks but decided not to due to design and implementation challenges & potential risks to the programmes)
  (v) **Alignment** (Align humanitarian response with current or possible future social protection intervention (e.g. aligning objectives and targeting method e.g. Mali Cash Transfers)

Recommendations for policy makers include the need for systematic analysis of social protection programs, ex-ante planning to enhance Disaster Risk Reduction and deliberate efforts to build strategic partnerships in advance.
Session 2: What type of evidence is needed to support national level change and policy development

Chair: Richard Morgan – Director Child Poverty Global Theme, Save the Children
In discussion with...
Apera Lorwa, National Programme Manager – GDGP, Save the Children
Matt Tasker – Food Security and Livelihoods Advisor, Save the Children

Session Overview
The session focused on experiences of engaging policy makers in Myanmar and Nigeria, asking the questions; How are we using evidence from Nigeria and Myanmar Save the Children programming to influence National Social Protection Policy? How do you see policy change occurring around Social Protection? How can we better use evidence/what types of evidence are needed to make a difference in policy?

Nigeria experience (Child Development Grant Programme)

CDGP has struggled to get government support in the past but had success by involving the Government through strategic ongoing learning and sharing activities so that they can see programme in action.

- Develop package of resources (policy briefs, fact sheets etc) from robust research to advocate government and inform change
- Design road map for implementation – government knows what they can use it for and how it can be implemented
- Beneficiaries’ testimonies have proven to be very impactful on government interest.
- Enable learning exchange: tours and learning for government officials to interact with the programme
- Embed a specialist in the government to build capacity.

Myanmar experience

The maternal cash programme running for 2 years has involved lots of policy dialogue and engagement with the government. Pushing Cash Plus programme to be adopted by the government required early and strategic engagement.

- Save the Children drew on evidence from an RCT to make the case for investment in SP and for cash-transfers. Evidence and emerging findings from the RCTs was supported by global evidence. This narrative data also helped to demonstrate the impact of the program on women
- However, relying simply on impact is not going to be very useful in the political cycle. We also looked at feasibility, ongoing M&E mechanisms (case study narratives, post-distribution) and long-term impact towards the ends of the programme.
- The transfer amounts needed to increase slightly to cover the increased Cost of the Diet.
- The biggest evidence gap was on measuring value for money effectiveness of the modality.
- Fiscal sustainability is fluid and is not a fixed constraint, it’s political. Therefore, it is important to talk about the issues in economic terms with government and to try to make the case for the Return on Investment.

Key Takeaway: The importance of regular sharing and learning with Government stakeholders;

SC Myanmar shared the emerging findings regularly and in short time frames so that the information could be fed-back in real time to the Ministries. With regard to informing decision-making by government and the Ministry of Finance, sharing cost analysis of programs to inform efficiency and effectiveness is very important. Governments need to know what programs are going to cost; whether there is budget for a specific initiative and if an initiative is fiscally sustainable - in order to make a policy decision. It is also important to understand where the bottlenecks and who the key decision makers are. So, it is important to use a political economy approach to engaging with government.
Session 3: Panel discussion

Chairperson: Richard Morgan – Director Child Poverty Global Theme, Save the Children
Panellists:

Kevin Watkins - Chief Executive Officer, Save the Children UK
Brian Hunter – Associate Vice President, Hunger and Livelihoods, Save the Children US
Caitlin Brady - Regional PDQ Director West and Central Africa, Save the Children
Ebrima Saidy - Deputy Country Director PDQ, Save the Children Somalia.

Summary of questions and responses of the panel:

1. From what you have heard during the event, and from your own experience, which evidence gaps and types of evidence do you think Save the Children should be aiming to prioritise?

   - The gap on evidence in humanitarian contexts needs to be filled; we need studies with experimental designs looking at the long term.
   - Cash has shown to be successful on raising the expenditure of households on food but less on dietary diversity and nutrition. Why is that? We need to know.
   - What happens after cash and does modality matter? Are we introducing more resilience with cash? Does modality matter for resilience in cash transfer programs?
   - We focus on and know a lot about the impact cash transfers can have, but we need to also shift our attention to situations where impact has not happened and ask why.

2. What are the key constraints that prevent us from accessing existing evidence, generating new evidence on gaps, and learning from it, and how can we overcome them?

   - Allocate more money into PDQ functions and encourage inquisitive minds to ask questions; develop hypotheses to test. We are not investing where we need to, if we want to be a learning organization.
   - So far have not been analytically clear enough on what we expect and what we are trying to achieve with cash. Clarity of objective will more easily define appropriate research.
   - Resources need to shift to our Country Offices. CO’s need to be in a position to drive the agenda. Influencing policy agenda cannot be done from the centre. Move resources where they can make more of a difference. Mobilize resources for research in the field is also what donors are doing.
   - Expand scope of evidence beyond cash + for one theme (Child Poverty) and think across all thematic areas.
3. **What role do you think you could or should play in helping to address evidence gaps?**

- We need to better link our evidence to our design/policy and practice, being deliberate at design stage of building research questions right from the start.
- We need to bring in the right skill sets for specific research.
- We should be utilising Cost of the Diet to really advocate for a cash transfer amount that makes sense.
- We should look to replicate the WFP (Bangladesh) study on Cash Plus BCC in other countries.
- We need to be better at identifying and using our staff expertise and research potential in country offices.
- We should be conscious of the limits of cash in a positive way and look for greater integration.
- We must spend greater time working with all Global Themes to think about the role of Cash Plus.
- We must be recognising funding opportunities, e.g. World Bank crisis window in IDA. We need to be better placed to take advantage of such opportunities.
- We need to be identifying and producing the exact information governments require.
- We must find better ways to work cross-thematically to focus on broader range of outcomes for children.

“We must place a focus on how cash is an enabling condition to Save the Children’s Breakthroughs and use it to drive an integrated agenda”