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Background

- Population is 11 Million
- Poverty at 68%
- HIV/AIDS at 16%
- Economic growth at 5% in last 4 years
- No significant dent on poverty
History of SP and the SP Strategy

Before introduction of social protection strategy
- Coverage: very poor, patchy, and insufficient.
  - Untimely interventions.
  - Poor coordination.

Developed PRSP in 2002
- PRSP focused on poverty reduction based on economic development.
- In 2005 SP strategy was drafted
- The FNDP was produced with a chapter on social protection which was based on the SP strategy.
The SP strategy was developed by the SP SAG - chaired by MCDSS with diverse membership.

Developed from the assessment of social protection interventions, needs, and the gaps between the existing programmes and the achievement of adequate and comprehensive social protection.

The SP provides a common framework and shared vision for a set of programmes – expansion, coordination, monitoring, reporting and financing.

The SPS is the basis of the current cash transfer pilots and seeks best practice for a possible national cash transfer programme.
**KEY GOVERNMENT SOCIAL PROTECTION PROGRAMMES**

- **Incapacitated households**
  - Public Welfare Assistance Scheme (PWAS)- in-kind transfers
  - Social Cash Transfer Scheme- cash transfers to destitute and incapacitated households
  - Food Programme Management – provision of food to vulnerable households

- **Low capacity Households**
  - Food Security Pack- provision of inputs to vulnerable but viable farmers
  - Micro credit to women by Micro Bankers Trust
  - Microfinance credit to vulnerable people with disabilities by NTD
  - Peri-Urban Self Help (PUSH)- public works programmes

- **Children adult care without givers**
  - Street Children Programmes
  - Free basic education for all children
DATA AND KEY FINDINGS FROM PROGRAMMES

INCAPACITATED HOUSEHOLDS
- Programmes proven effective especially cash transfer scheme.
- However programmes are under funded.

LOW CAPACITY HOUSEHOLDS
- In 2006 the funding target for these programmes was exceeded. However, by mid 2007 mixed achievements where being seen with the beneficiaries of the food security pack going down by 46% due to reduced funding, while the micro credit exceeded target by 36%.

STREET CHILDREN PROGRAMMES: Great achievements - greater coordination of the various interventions is still required. In 2007 the Street Children Programme met it’s target by 63 %

ALL PROGRAMMES
- Most categories of the vulnerable are covered but there is need to strengthen funding and implementation capacity if social protection is to be comprehensive.
Description of Pilots

- Social cash transfer scheme launched in 2004.
- Piloted in 5 districts Kalomo Monze, Kazungula, Chipata and Katete each with a lesson learning agenda.
- The scheme targets 10% of the most destitute and incapacitated in target communities except for Katete.
- Implemented by Ministry Staff
- Targeting is community based using proxy means tests.
- Criteria is Extreme poverty and incapacitation.
- The scheme pays out ZK 40,000 (US$ 10) plus ZK 10,000 (US$ 2,5) for HH with children per month in Kalomo Kazungula and Monze.
- In Chipata the scheme pays 40,000 ZMK plus ZMK 10,000 for HH with more than 1 member, ZMK 10,000 per primary school child & ZMK 20,000 per secondary school child.
- Bimonthly rhythm, Pay point
Minister of Community Development with a Beneficiary
In Katete it is universal and targets all people over sixty years.

Launched in July 2007

Targets persons above 60 years

Now 4706 beneficiaries

Now in 10 Wards (half of District)

In Katete the scheme pays 60,000 ZMK (US$15) per month per person.

Scheme payments are made on a bi-monthly basis
Pension Beneficiary in Katete
## Current pilots and lessons to be learnt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of Households</th>
<th>Lessons to be generated</th>
<th>Indications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kalomo     | 3515                 | - Implementation level capacity  
                                - Up scaling needs  
                                - Combination of the regular PWAS with cash transfers in Kalomo               | - Community structures need econ. Incentives    |
| Monze      | 2548                 | - Soft conditionality on education and health                                          | - Not yet                                       |
| Chipata    | 1167                 | - Urban transfers –  
                                - Transfer value (child bonus)                                                   | - Community Targeting difficult, manipulation  
                                - Increases retention                                                            |
| Katete     | 4706 Individuals     | - Universal based targeting  
                                - Pensions for the old                                                             | - Quick to roll out  
                                - Low Admin costs                                                                  |
| Kazungula  | 554                  | - Implementation in a vast, sparsely populated area  
                                - difficult to access district                                                     | - Admin cost high                                                                   |
Impact of Cash Transfers

- **First Evaluation** show that:
  - **Education**: enrollment rate went up by 3%.
  - **Nutrition**: % of HH not satiated after one meal went down from 56.6% to 35.2%; food intake is more varied
  - **Health**: incidence of illnesses decreased from 43% to 35%.
  - **Livelihood**: number of HH making investments quadrupled to 50% and average amount invested doubled; 71% of all HH stated to have invested part of the cash transfer; asset ownership increased from 8.5% to 42%

- **Future perspective**: more households are hopeful (increase from 37% to 49%) and have more plans (increase from 50% to 73%)

- **Community**: incidence and frequency of begging reduced

- However more rigid and strictly controlled impact evaluation is underway and will produce more conclusive evidence on impacts of the scheme
Recipient’s Reaction

- Without the social cash transfer scheme I would be dead and buried. The scheme has become my husband. I can only beg government to continue for the likes of us.”
  
  the words of Mrs. Felistus Hamalambo an aged widow looking after 5 orphan grandchildren.

- “I am now able to eat three meals a day and have managed to buy 6 chickens and a goat”
  
  the words of Mrs. Gertrude Simasiku a sickly widow looking after 5 children.
Budgetary Challenges to Scale Up

- Competing priorities
- In this year’s budget priority was given to infrastructure development.
- Emphasis being put on economic growth as opposed to social protection.
- The pilot social cash transfer scheme model if scaled up to national level could cost government approximately 0.36% of nominal GDP and only 1.3% of the annual GRZ budget.
- Experiences from countries like Lesotho who fund a national social cash transfer scheme show that it is possible to fund adequately social protection programmes with(out) limited donor support.
Responses at high level to Extending Social Protection coverage

- Political will for investment in social protection building development of the SP strategy, government is playing in implementing SP programmes through MCDSS.
- Other government ministries need to fully appreciate fairly new concept of social protection.
- In 2007 and 2008 350,000 US$ as government contribution.
- Calls from general public for increased coverage are limited due limited awareness.
- Civil society is playing a vital role in advocating for increased social protection coverage.
- Stepped up advocacy activities.
CHALLENGES

- Affordability and Insufficient funding to the social protection sector.
- Insufficient awareness and understanding of social protection amongst stakeholders
- Limited capacity for implementation of programmes
- Increasing poverty levels
OPPORTUNITIES

- Increasing evidence being generated on the effectiveness of the Cash Transfers is having positive impacts and has lead to government funding for the scheme.
- Political will for social protection is increasing.
- Engage political leadership more.
- Draft constitution has made provisions for an old age pension and social economic rights.
- Capacity building programmes and studies are being carried out.
**Way Forward**

- Workshop for Members of Parliament
- Finish Review by July - before national budget
- Government make a final decision - whether to scale up or not. Go beyond Pilots
- Come up with a Social Protection Policy - long term
- Legislate Social Protection Programmes on long-term
CONCLUSION

- While Social protection is an essential component and pre-requisite for poverty reduction and economic development. There is need for long term support for it to be successful and adequate.