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Impact Evaluation of the Cash Transfer Programmes for At-Risk Households Affected by Inflationary Pressure and Severe Floods

This policy brief summarizes the impact evaluation results of the Royal Government of Cambodia’s cash transfer programmes for at-risk households affected by inflationary pressure and severe floods.
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I. BACKGROUND

In 2022, the Royal Government of Cambodia (RGC) launched two cash transfer programmes to support the livelihoods of At-Risk Households affected by inflationary pressure and severe floods. The programmes were introduced under the principle of adaptive and shock responsive social protection. At-risk households are identified as near poor households that are likely to fall into poverty from disruptions and economic shocks in times of crisis.

The programmes were implemented between December 2022 and July 2023 and benefitted 495,307 households – equivalent to 1,833,344 people. The inflation cash transfer programme offered nationwide coverage, while the severe flood cash transfer programme covered affected areas in 16 capital/provinces. In total, the government spent more than Riel (KHR) 222 billion, equivalent to US$55.7 million on the two programmes.

Box 1: Regulatory documents

1) Royal Government of Cambodia’s Decision No. 67 SSR dated 5 October 2022 on Social Protection Intervention Responding to Inflationary Pressure

2) National Social Protection Council’s Decision No. 134/MEF dated 1 December 2022 on Mechanism and Procedure for the Implementation of the Cash Transfer Programme for At-Risk Households during Inflationary Pressure

3) National Social Protection Council’s Decision No. 133/MEF dated 1 December 2022 on Mechanism and Procedure for the Implementation of the Cash Transfer Programme for At-Risk Households Affected by Severe Flood
Box 2: Definition of at-risk households

At-risk households refer to near poor households that meet at least one of the following five vulnerabilities: include a person with disabilities; include a child under two years old; include an elderly person 60 years old and above; are single women-headed; or consist only of members under 18 years old. The households are identified through the Ministry of Planning's IDPoor mechanism.

Objective and Methodology

The objective of the conducted impact evaluation was to examine the key socioeconomic outcomes and impacts of the cash transfer programmes for at-risk households in order to inform future interventions. The impact evaluation included both quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative surveys were administered in two intervals, in February 2023 and August 2023. Surveys were conducted with a total sample of 811 that was roughly equal in size (415 recipients, 396 non-recipients), and a two-step framework was employed. First, Propensity Score Matching (PSM) with single nearest neighbor matching without replacement was used in each round. Second, the matched samples in each round were used to estimate the impact between the two rounds of interviews using Difference-in-Difference Analysis (DID). Case studies through in-depth interviews were also conducted to complement the quantitative surveys.

II. IMPACT EVALUATION RESULTS

Overall, recipient households viewed support in the form of cash transfers as highly useful (97 percent) compared to other forms of support. As anticipated, for the duration of the programmes, the purchase of food was the most common use for the cash transfers among households and was reported by 94 percent of those surveyed. This was followed by expenditure on medicine (50 percent), education (20 percent),...
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ឧបករណ៍: ការប្រើប្រ្រានទូត់បំណោល លោក-ភ្លើង សុខាភ័ិបាល និងកូន បុណ្តនាទី មេសារ ទូត់បំណោល កូន បុណ្តនាទី និងមេសារ ទូត់បំណោល ប្រារព្យកូន បុណ្តនាទី ធ្ងន់ធ្ងរពីគៃួសារទឹកជំនួយ

Figure 1: Cash transfer expenditures
Impact Evaluation of the Cash Transfer Programmes for At-Risk Households Affected by Inflationary Pressure and Severe Floods

Key socioeconomic results

Food security and nutrition

Figure 2: Estimated impact on household food security by survey round
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បរិស្ថានចំពោះការវាយតម្លៃផលជះនៃការអនុវត្ត, ដែលឈរូអ៊ីនធឺណិតមករបស់ និងគោសារឈរូទ្ធភាព
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សកម្មភាពទី៣ លទ្ធភាពក្នុងការចំណាយស្រវាសុខាភិបាល, ស្រវា ទឹក-ភ្លើង, ជួលផ្ទះ ផ្អ្រកលើទិន្នន័យជុំទី២

Health and utility expenditure

By the end of the cash transfer programmes, clear differences in the ability of households to cover their basic needs emerged. Recipient households were significantly more likely to be able to cover their medicine and medical treatment costs compared to non-recipients, as shown in Figure 3. While 61 percent of non-recipient households stated that they experienced moments where they were unable to pay for health expenditures, only 34 percent of recipient households reported any issues. Similarly, 43 percent of non-recipient households stated there were times when they could not cover the cost of basic utilities or housing (e.g., rent or mortgage costs), compared to 30 percent of recipient households.

Figure 3: Proportion of households unable to cover costs based on second round interviews

Recipient B - “After I got the allowance from the government, my family is living better than before because when I receive the money, I keep some part to pay the bank loan, and the little money that I have left I keep it to buy food and medicine to treat my illness. It's not difficult like when we didn't get the allowance from the government.”
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Household savings and loan repayment

The proportion of households with savings was shown to have decreased since the start of the cash transfer programmes. Previously, 27 percent of recipient households reported some savings, including in gold, cash, and bank accounts, which was significantly lower than the 35.6 percent of non-recipient households that reported some savings. By the end of the cash transfer programmes, only 17.8 percent of non-recipient households and 16.7 percent of recipient households reported having savings. As shown in Figure 4, although the proportion of households with savings diminished for both groups, analysis reveals that the cash transfer programmes reduced the decline of recipient households’ overall savings by 7.5 percent.

Figure 4: Household savings

In parallel, by the end of the cash transfer programmes, late loan repayments had decreased for both groups with recipients being late (25 percent) less often than non-recipients (32 percent). The findings reveal that the cash transfer programmes have reduced late loan repayments from recipient households by 2.4 percent. Moreover, due to the cash transfers, recipient households were slightly more likely to pay off debts (4.5 percent) than non-recipients (3.8 percent).
ការវាយតម្លៃផលជះនៃការអនុវត្តកម្មវិធីឧបត្ថម្ភសាច់បៃៃក់ជូនគៃួសារងាយរងហានិភ័យក្នុងអំឡុងពៃលមានសមារណអតិផរណា
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អុកទ្ធទ្ធួលផ្តល

គំ ខំបានខចីប្រាាក់ពីីគេយកទៅជះួលដី និងទ្ធិញជះីដើម្មបែីដ្ឋាំឈូក។ ការដ្ឋាំឈូកពីុំទ្ធទ្ធួលបានទ្ធិនុផ្តលលែសោ។ ខំម្មិនអាច់ប្រម្មូលផ្តលបាន ហើយក៏ខាតប្រាាក់អស់ ដែលនេះជាម្មូលហតុដែលខំគាំនលទ្ធយាពីសងប្រាាក់គេយ។ បន្ទាប់ពីខំបានទ្ធទ្ធួលប្រាាក់ឧបតថម្មភពីីរាជះរដ្ឋភាពីរាជួរដ្ឋឋិបាល ប្រាាក់ឧបតថម្មភនេះបានជះួយសម្រលបនុកគ្រួសាររបស់ខំជានើន។ ពេលទ្ធទ្ធួលបានប្រាាក់ឧបតថម្មភម្មួយលើើកៗ ខំបានដកប្រាាក់ច់ំនួន១០០០០រៀៀល សងគេយហើយសល់ច់ំនួន៧០០០០រៀៀល ខំបានច់ំណាយលើើការសិកសារបស់កូនៗ និងទ្ធិញម្មូបអាហារ។ នេះជា ម្មូលហតុធ្វើើយជះីវភាពីគ្រួសាររបស់ខំប្រសេើរជាងម្មុន។

ខំអាច់សងប្រាាក់គេទាំន់ពេលនិងម្មិនយឺតយ៉វដូច់ម្មុន។

ទ្ធសាំនៈរបំសា់ស្រ្តបំជួាពលរដ្ឋឋចំគោពោរាជួរដ្ឋឋាភិិបាាលជារួម្មកុងអំឡុងពៃលអនុវតតកម្មមវិធីីឧបតថម្មភសាច់់ប្រាាក់, គ្រួសារគោលដៅនិងគ្រួសារម្មិនទ្ធទ្ធួលបានប្រាាក់ឧបតថម្មភ មានទ្ធសសនៈវិជះជមានច់ំពោះរាជះរដ្ឋភាពីនិងអាជាាធីរថាំក់ក្រោម្មជាតិជាពីិសសពីីសំណាក់គ្រួសារគោលដៅដែលមានអត្រាប្រមាណ៍ជះិត ១០០% ដូច់បានបងាញកុងរូបភាពទី៥។ លទ្ធធផ្តលនៃការវាយតម្លៃះក៏បានបងាញថា គ្រួសារគោលដៅមាន ទ្ធសសនៈវិជះជមានច់ំពោះរាជះរដ្ឋភាពីនិងអាជាាធីរថាំក់ក្រោម្មជាតិខុស់ជាង ធ្វើៀបនងគ្រួសារម្មិនទ្ធទ្ធួលបានប្រាាក់ឧបតថម្មភ ដែលកុងនោះកម្មមវិធីីឧបតថម្មភសាច់់ប្រាាក់បានពីង្រឹងទ្ធសសនៈវិជះជមានរបស់គ្រួសារគោលដៅមាន ទ្ធសសនៈវិជះជមានរាជះរដ្ឋភាពីច់ំនួន 3.៥%។

Figure 5: Household perceptions of national (top) and local (bottom) government between survey rounds

Recipient perceptions of government authorities

Overall, the perceptions of recipient and non-recipient households towards national and local government remained positive for the duration of the assessment. This was especially true among recipient households, with positive perceptions reaching nearly 100 percent, as shown in Figure 5. Evaluation results revealed that recipient households held significantly higher positive perceptions of national and local government compared to non-recipient households. Furthermore, analysis suggests that the cash transfer programmes strengthened recipients' perceptions of national government by 3.5 percent.
Challenges

Limited awareness of the cash transfer programs among at-risk households

Issues with the cash receipt experience

III. KEY RECOMMENDATIONS
ការវាយតម្លៃផលជះនៃការអនុវត្ត កម្មវិធីឧបត្ថម្ភសាច់បៃៃក់ជូនគៃួសារងាយរងហានិភ័យ ក្នុងអំឡុងពៃលមានសមារបៃត្តិការណ៍

4. បង្ខេកើនការផ្តល់ឱ្យអ្នកទ្ធខ្មែរនិងម្មន្ត្រីតិអនុវត្តកម្មវិធីឧបត្ថម្ភភាំងនេះ ដើម្បីរើសអំពីឱ្យការម្មិនទ្ធខ្មែរបានប្រដាប់ការយល់ដូចការអនុវត្តឧបត្ថម្ភភាគឺ់ប្រាំក់ ដែលបានជំនួយសង្គមជាសាច់បៃៃក់ជូនគៃួសារងាយរងហានិភ័យ ដៃលរងផលប៉ះពាល់ធ្ងន់ធ្ងរពីគៃះទឹកជំនន់

5. បង្គារបញ្ហានៃការអនុវត្តភាគឺ់ប្រាំក់ ការដ្ឋាក់ចេញនូវកម្មវិធីទាំងនេះ ដើម្បីអនុវត្តការបនតគាំរោងដល់ការពីង្របិតវិសាលភាពម្មូលនិធីិសម្មធូកៃសុខាភ័ិបាល គឺជាការបង្គារបញ្ហានៃក្រីតុម្មគោលដៅនេះ បនថាខាងលើ។
Impact Evaluation of the Cash Transfer Programmes for At-Risk Households Affected by Inflationary Pressure and Severe Floods

which was to ease the impacts of rising inflation and the effects of severe floods on people’s livelihoods. Nevertheless, conducting reviews on the adequacy of the cash transfer benefits periodically during programme implementation is recommended to effectively prevent people from falling into poverty, particularly in the context of rising prices.

3. Enhance outreach to potential recipients and local implementers: Limited awareness of the cash transfer programmes among both recipient and non-recipient households should be addressed. While the emergencies of rising inflation and severe floods needed to trigger urgent programmatic responses, greater outreach and communication campaigns should be provided to better inform potential beneficiaries, grassroots communities, and local implementers on the programme implementation procedure, eligibility criteria, and benefits.

4. Plan for ex-ante shock-responsive social protection programmes: Considering the frequent and recurrent nature of inflation and floods in addition to their impacts, systematic and timely responses are needed. It is therefore recommended to conduct ex-ante planning of cash transfer programmes. This includes clearly defining the threshold of inflationary pressure and types of vulnerabilities that could trigger an appropriate shock-responsive social protection intervention. This is in line with the newly adopted Guideline on the Shock-Responsive Social Protection Framework.

5. Ensure continued support to at-risk households: While the cash transfer programmes helped to support the livelihoods of at-risk households and their management of increasing financial pressure, this progress is threatened as the programmes have come to completion. Therefore, the launching of the technical and vocational education training programme and the extension of Health Equity Fund benefits are the continued social assistance supports, which are critical important to this target group.