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**Abstract**

This paper assesses the impact of Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Nets Programme (PSNP), the largest social protection programme in sub-Saharan Africa outside of South Africa. Using propensity score matching techniques, we find that the programme has little impact on participants on average, due in part to transfer levels that fell far below programme targets. Participants with access to both the PSNP and packages of agricultural support are more likely to be food secure, to borrow for productive purposes, use improved agricultural technologies, and operate non-farm own business activities. However, beneficiaries did not experience faster asset growth.

**Gender Connection**

Gender Informed Analysis

**Gender Outcomes**

Gender disaggregated nutrition, access to credit, employment

**IE Design**

Propensity Score Matching

The objective of the PSNP program is to provide transfers to individuals who are food insecure in chronically food insecure areas in a way that prevents asset depletion. The program targets transfers in two ways, through public works and direct support. Public works pays beneficiaries about $.75 per day for labor on labor intensive projects designed to build community assets. Direct support provides cash or food transfers to households whose primary income earners are unable to work. Beneficiaries remain in the program for three years.

**Intervention Period**

The program started in 2005

**Sample population**

A total of 68 out of 190 woredas were selected that represented food-insecure areas. In total, there was 3700 households surveyed.

**Comparison conditions**

Households in the PSNP program are compared to similar households that were not included in the program. Similar households were identified through propensity score matching.

**Unit of analysis**

Propensity Score Matching

**Evaluation Period**

The survey was conducted in June-August 2006
## Results

The results of the program are very sensitive to how program participation is defined. If participation is defined as households that receive any payment from PSNP, then there is no evidence of impact on food security, and some positive impact on credit. If treatment is defined as receiving a set level of payments from the PSNP program, then the program has a significant negative impact on the probability that the household has low caloric intake. In both definitions, there is no significant impact on female wage employment.

## Primary study limitations

There was no survey fielded before the intervention. Due to the timing of the survey, many people who actually participate in the program may not be included. This study only examines impacts for 18 months after the program started.
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