**AFRICA**
RESULTS

**RURAL SYNERGIES**
*Building bridges between social and
productive inclusion policies*

## Strengthening coherence between social protection and productive interventions in four African countries

## KEY MESSAGES

Coherence between social protection programmes and rural productive development can help poor and at-risk households escape the poverty trap and break its intergenerational transmission. Although these are studies carried out before the crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, the results are promising in terms of their contribution to increasing the resilience of households in the face of shocks, an argument particularly relevant to promote this kind of strategies given the need to promote processes of reactivation in the rural sector.

This is demonstrated by four studies carried out in Ethiopia, Lesotho, Mali, and Zambia. The impact evaluations, in general, show positive effects of the interaction between the analysed programmes on productive variables –livestock production, crop production, average herd size, crop diversification, consumption and access to markets.

Some cases also showed positive effects on food security –Lesotho, Mali and Zambia, as well as income and poverty –Lesotho and Zambia.

Political commitment is necessary, but not sufficient to guarantee coordination between programmes. Formal coordination is needed for interventions throughout the public policy cycle and at all levels of implementation. Formal coordination mechanisms are more common at the central level than at the local level, where coordination occurred informally.

The analysis showed the need to pool resources to implement joint programmes. Additionally, budgetary aspects could be a key instrument to articulate interventions, especially when the stakeholders involved have different views, and coordination is seen as a cost. Human support at all levels of implementation is also needed. Human resources require training on the importance of multisectoral interventions.

## RESULTS OF THE IMPACT EVALUATIONS

### PRODUCTIVE OUTCOMES

**PSNP + IN-SCT**
+ livestock
+ production of livestock by-products
+ average herd size
+ crop production

**CGP + SPRINGS**
+ access to markets

**Nioro Cash +**
+ livestock production

**CASU + HGSF**
+ livestock
+ marketing

### INCOME, POVERTY & LOCAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

**CGP + SPRINGS**
- poverty gap
+ income
+ consumption

**CASU + HGSF**
+ total revenues
- poverty (simulation)
+ income distribution (simulation)

### FOOD SECURITY & EDUCATION

**CGP + SPRINGS**
+ dietary diversity

**Nioro Cash +**
+ food security

**CASU + HGSF**
+ food security
- schooling

### FINANCIAL

**CGP + SPRINGS**
+ household savings and borrowings
+ money saved and borrowed
- negative coping strategies
+ willingness to take risks

### PSYCHOLOGICAL & SOCIAL

**Nioro Cash +**
+ aspirations for children's education

# RESULTS OF THE INSTITUTIONAL ANALYSIS

| Ethiopia | Lesotho | Mali |
|----------|---------|------|
| Coordination through targeting beneficiaries | Coordination through geographical targeting based on social protection beneficiaries | Formal coordination with ministries and their technical departments at national and regional level was not considered |
| Lack of formal coordination mechanisms between involved ministries | Formal coordination at different levels. It enabled the coordination between key actors at the local level | Informal coordination with some programmes at the local level |
| Formal coordination at the local level enables permanent contact between key actors | | The programme targeted the non-beneficiaries of other existing initiatives, thus acted as complement in serving the population in need |

## RECOMMENDATIONS

- The impact evaluation results reveal that synergies between social and productive programmes in Africa have generated positive effects on productive outcomes, household income, food security, and financial inclusion. These results encourage us to continue the search for these types of synergies between rural livelihood programmes in combination with social protection programmes.

- In the context of Africa, the agricultural sector has greater importance than other sectors, and is reticent with respect to working with social sectors which are the most recently created and in which budgets, along with human and technical resources are all less consolidated. For these reasons, the proposal is **to have one programme with two types of components under the direction of the ministries of agriculture, to take advantage of the institutional and technical capacities of this sector.**

- **The institutional weakness may be an opportunity to incorporate cooperation and coordination arrangements from early stages; these changes can be difficult to promote in greater institutional strength contexts, but also of greater rigidity.** International Cooperation Agencies and NGOs already play an important role in the design, funding, and even programme implementation, promoting coordination processes and strengthening the technical and budgeting capacity of the region. They should continue opting a strategy of financial and technical support through cooperation agencies, international NGOs, and the public sector to contribute to the strengthening of the ministries and public services, including the design of formal coordination mechanisms that generate the right incentives to promote coordination.

## THE COUNTRIES AND PROGRAMMES

### Ethiopia
- Productive Safety Net Programme (PSNP)
- Improved Nutrition Social Cash Transfer (IN-SCT)

### Lesotho
- Child Grants Programme (CGP )
- Sustainable Poverty Reduction through Income, Nutrition and Access to Government Services (SPRINGS)

### Mali
- Nioro Cash + Project

### Zambia
- Home Grown School Feeding (HGSF) Programme
- Conservation Agriculture Scale-Up (CASU) Project

info

sinergiasrurales.info

**For more information about the Rural Synergies Project, write to:**

- **Jorge Maldonado**
  jmaldona@uniandes.edu.co

- **Viviana León-Jurado**
  dv.leon10@uniandes.edu.co

**For more information about the African evaluations, write to:**

- **Alejandro Grinspun**
  Alejandro.Grinspun@fao.org

- **Christine Legault**
  Christine.Legault@fao.org

With the technical support of:

Universidad de los Andes | Facultad de Economía
Colombia

IFAD
Investing in rural people

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

To access the full documents from the project use this QR code: