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1. Background

- Objective of Public works - to increase cash income and improve food security of beneficiary groups
- National wide coverage for 5 years funding of US$ 15 million
- 12 days work on community assets of their choice
- Wage income of MK200/day (US$1.3/day for 12 days~US$16 per year)-7% above minimum wage
- Wage set to purchase subsidized farm inputs
- Only done during the lean period- sub projects Implemented- Oct-Dec
- Part of the funds used in savings and investment activities
- Resource allocation uses population and poverty factors at national level
- Same factors used at district level for geographical targeting
- At community level, community wealth ranking approach used
- At least 40 percent of participants are women
2. Results Chain

**INPUTS**
- Financial Resources
- Human Resources

**ACTIVITIES**
- Issue Indicative Planning Figures (factors)
- Determine the No. of beneficiaries
- Identify sub projects
- Procure tools and materials
- Conduct community sensitization
- Mobilise savings groups
- Identify COMSIP groups
- Implement sub projects

**OUTPUTS**
- No. of Sub projects completed
- No. of people receiving income support
- Amount of cash transferred
- No. Groups trained in savings mobilization
- Amount of farm inputs procured

**OUTCOMES**
- Increased household income
- Improved household food security
- Increased food intake
- Improved nutrition
- Increased asset accumulation
- Increased savings and Investments
- Reduced poverty

**LONGER-TERM OUTCOMES**
- Higher Order Goals
3. Primary Research Questions

1. Within the current design: does allowing households to access the program for two consecutive years increase income and insurance against risk?

2. What is the value addition of the savings and investment promotion on income growth and diversification?

3. [UNDER DISCUSSION]: Does an alternative design of the Programme improve gains in terms of income and food security (lower wage, not linked to the fertilizer, higher coverage, implemented by an NGO with MASAF support)
4. Outcome Indicators

- household income
- household food security
- food intake
- Nutrition
- Employment
- Asset accumulated
- Savings and Investments
5. Identification Strategy/Method

- Random selection of cluster of villages (unit of intervention) into 4 groups:
  1. Current PW design
  2. Current PW design + 2\textsuperscript{nd} year offer to reenroll
  3. Current PW design + savings and investment promotion (COMSIP)
  4. Control group
6. Sample and Data

- Current Integrated Household Survey (HIS) panel in the field (March 2010). 3,200 panel households in 200 clusters
  - Oct- Dec 2010 (baseline)
  - Oct- Dec 2011 (possibly re-interview)
  - 2012

- Question: is it feasible to piggyback (take advantage of) the current data collection for the evaluation?
- Randomly select the 4 groups among the sampled clusters. (say 30 each), stratified
- Within each cluster oversample household from the target population using listing from community wealth rankings
6. Sample and Data

- Stratified sample:
  - Regional (to take care of regional differences)
  - District level
  - Community level (selection of potential households)
7. Time Frame / Work Plan

- 2010 Baseline survey
  - select the sample of areas for each intervention arm
- 2011 - first follow up
  - interim evaluation report: impact of the current design relative to no program after 1 year of operation
- 2012 second follow up
  - final evaluation report: assess the relative effectiveness of the current design vs the two alternative options
- 2013 third follow up
  - program to be scaled up??
8. Sources of Financing

- World Bank/ IDA
- Other Cooperating Partners