Appendix: Niger Safety Nets Project Follow Up Panel Survey

General background information on follow-up survey: <mark>*Details on the survey, such as who carried out the survey, why the government chose to do the survey, etc…*</mark>

Niger is one of the poorest countries in the world and faces severe challenges in early childhood nutrition and development. It is estimated that 44% percent of the population in Niger lives on less than US$1.25 per day, and 75.23% on less than US$2 per day (WDI, 2010). More than 50 percent of Niger's population is food insecure, with 22 percent of the population suffering from chronic food insecurity (per capita consumption of less than 1,800 kcal/person/day) in any given year (World Bank, 2011). Human development indicators are particularly alarming for children. The infant mortality rate is 66.4 per 1,000 live births (WDI, 2010). The prevalence of chronic malnutrition as measured by stunting (low height-for-age) is estimated at 50 percent (DHS, 2006), which makes Niger the second worst affected country in Sub-Saharan Africa. Seasonal and acute malnutrition is also very high.

While Niger has had institutions and programs aimed at reducing food insecurity, most programs have provided only ad hoc emergency assistance. The effect of these programs in reducing chronic food insecurity has been limited, particularly since they have been channeled towards short term emergency assistance following acute crises. To provide more sustainable approach to addressing chronic malnutrition, the World Bank Niger Safety Nets project (P123399, $70 millions) aims to establish and support an effective safety net system in order to increase access of poor and food insecure people to cash transfer and cash for work programs. The project contributes to building a comprehensive, permanent, and efficient safety net system that can address chronic food insecurity in Niger. In addition to system-building activities, the safety nets project includes a cash transfer for food security component (US$48.6 millions), as well as a cash-for-work component (US10.5 millions). The cash transfer component is the core building block of the Niger social protection system. It combines a cash transfer program (US$48.3 millions), as well as a parenting training intervention that serves as an accompanying measure to the cash transfer (US$10.3 millions).

Geographical targeting is used to select the poorest regions and communes to participate in the cash transfer program. The cash transfer program was implemented in several phases in 5 regions (Dosso, Maradi, Tahoua, Tillabery, and Zinder) that present the highest concentration of poverty in Niger and where 95 percent of the country's poor population lives. The first phase of the project targeted the regions of Dosso and Maradi, including 40% of the country's poor population. Within these regions, departments and communes eligible to the cash transfer program were selected through local stakeholder meetings with commune chiefs and regional leaders, who select communes to target based on available information from poverty maps and the levels of chronic vulnerability through a participatory process. As such, the eligible communes are chosen by local stakeholders as being the most disadvantaged areas.

An impact evaluation of the Niger Safety Nets Project has been put in place in 6 communes participating in the first phase of the cash transfer program implemented by the government of Niger with support from the World Bank. The communes covered in the impact evaluation sample survey include Tibiri and Guecheme in the region of Dosso, as well as Sae Saboua, Guidan Sori, Gangara and Tchadoua in the region of Maradi. The baseline survey was implemented in 2012 by the national statistical agency with technical

support from the World Bank. In 2015, a follow up panel survey was conducted by the Swiss Tropical and Public Health institute in collaboration with local NGO Riseal and with support from the World Bank.

Questionnaires: *Description of the survey instruments: all questionnaires (forms). Possibly a table for each with sections described.*

The follow up survey included two separate instruments: 1) a household survey and 2) a survey for children aged 6 to 59 months old.

The household survey instrument draws from the baseline survey, which itself builds on the comprehensive 2011 Niger LSMS-ISA survey instrument. This enables consistency and comparability of core poverty and human development indicators. Some additional modules were introduced in the follow-up survey instrument, including for instance a module on social cohesion in the household survey and a module on socio-emotional development in the child survey.

Table 1 provides the full break-down of the household survey modules.

Table 1: Summary of Household Survey Modules

Sections	Content
Section Identification	Household and household members identification and tracking
Section 0.A	Household Roster and Socio-Demographic Characteristics
Section 0.B	Education
Section 1	Health and Reproductive health for women
Section 2	Employment
Section 3	Household Enterprises
Section 4	Dwelling Characteristics
Section 5.A	Household Durable Goods
Section 5.B	Livestock
Section 5.C	Land
Section 6	Shocks
Section 7	Transfers
Section 8.A	Non-Food Expenditures in last 7 days
Section 8.B	Non-Food Expenditures in last 30 days
Section 8.C	Non-Food Expenditures in last 6 months
Section 8.D	Non-Food Expenditures in last 12 months
Section 8.E	Expenditures for Ceremonies in last 12 months
Section 9.A	Food Expenditures in last 7 days
Section 9.B	Food Security
Section 11.A	Saving Groups
Section 11.B	Intra Household decision making
Section 11.C	Social Cohesion

The survey for children aged 6-59 months builds on the MICS questionnaire and is consistent with the baseline test. Table 2 provides the full break-down of the household survey modules. The child questionnaire also included a cognitive test to measure cognitive development among children below 42 months.

Table 2: Summary of Child Survey Modules

Content of Child Survey	
Sections	**Content**
Section 0	Identification
Section 1	Age
Section 2	Nutrition and Health
Section 3.A	Parenting Practices
Section 3.B	Disciplining
Section 3.C	Child Care
Section 3.D	Socio-emotional development
Section 4	Anthropometrics
Section 5	Cognitive development test

The follow up survey used the World Bank Survey Solutions CAPI data collection platform.

Sample: *Details of sample design.*

The follow up survey sampling strategy builds on the baseline sampling strategy. The communes covered by the baseline survey include Tibiri and Guecheme in the region of Dosso, as well as Sae Saboua, Guidan Sori, Gangara and Tchadoua in the region of Maradi. In these communes, over 500 villages were eligible for the first phase of the Cash Transfer Program, many more that the project could serve. Given the difficulty to find transparent targeting criteria to prioritize villages within communes, the project team decided to implement public lotteries to select beneficiary villages among all equally eligible villages. Within commune, a randomization procedure is used to select beneficiary villages through public lotteries in presence of village chiefs, commune authorities and program staff. Prior to performing the randomization, small villages were grouped into clusters containing at least 150 households. The randomization was performed by clusters, and stratified to ensure an equal probability of selection for nomadic and sedentary villages. In addition to selecting villages to benefit from the cash transfer project, a number of control villages were also drawn to be sampled at baseline. Since the baseline sample of clusters for the evaluation is obtained through randomization among all clusters of villages selected communes, it is representative of these communes. The final evaluation sample includes 151 clusters (244 villages).

Prior to the baseline survey, a listing exercise was undertaken in all villages in the evaluation sample. Based on this household listing, screening criteria were applied to exclude ineligible households, defined by program documents as those with self-reported income higher than a pre-set threshold. Approximately 20% of households were deemed ineligible based on these criteria. The listing of households eligible to the cash transfer program constitutes the sampling frame for the baseline survey. It is representative of households eligible for the cash transfer program at the commune level. Therefore, the evaluation sample is representative of eligible households in communes eligible to the cash transfer program. The evaluation sample was drawn by taking a random sample of 30 eligible households from the sampling frame in each cluster. The baseline survey successfully interviewed 4330 households.

After the baseline survey was conducted, clusters assigned to receive the cash transfer program were further randomized into a group that would receive the cash transfer only (CT), and a group that would receive the cash transfer plus behavioral change accompanying measures (CT+BCC). In addition, the baseline survey data was merged with administrative data from the cash transfer program in order to identify which households were selected as beneficiaries. Table 3 below summarizes the composition of the baseline sample, including by treatment and control group, as well as by household beneficiary status in the treatment group.

Table 3: Composition of Baseline Sample

	C	CT	CT+BCC	Total
Beneficiaries HH	0	558	570	1128
Non-Beneficiaries HH	1469	862	871	3202
Total HH	1469	1420	1441	4330
Total Clusters	52	50	49	151

The sampling strategy for the follow-up survey aimed at ensuring sufficient statistical power to detect impacts between the various treatment and control groups, and including among the sub-sample of beneficiary households between the two treatment groups. Therefore, the follow-up sample was stratified based on the proxy means test score used to determine eligibility to the program. Specifically, all the households with a proxy means test score below 1.04 times the beneficiary selection threshold were selected, while half the households with a proxy means test equal or greater 1.04 times the beneficiary selection threshold were selected. Table 4 details the composition of the follow-up panel sample.

Table 4: Composition of Follow-up Panel Sample

	C	CT	CT+BCC	Total
Beneficiaries	0	558	570	1128
Non-Beneficiaries	1313	760	752	2825
Total	1313	1318	1322	3953
Clusters	52	50	49	151

For the purpose of the project impact evaluation, an additional booster sample of 1058 beneficiary households was randomly selected from the administrative database of beneficiaries and added to the follow-up sample. That booster sample is only added for the two treatment groups. The booster sample is not part of the follow-up panel survey.

Field work details: *including dates on which the field work occurred, total number of households visited, refusal rates, total number of households and individuals included in the final sample, problems that occurred during the administration of the survey (strikes, inclement weather, inability to enter parts of the country).*

The follow up survey data collection was undertaken by the Swiss Tropical and Public Health institute (STPH) in collaboration with local NGO Riseal, with technical support from the World Bank and the Safety Nets Project staff. The follow up survey for the impact evaluation was collected over a six-months period between mid-January and mid-June 2016. Household survey data collection was undertaken first, and child survey data collection followed a few months later. The survey period included breaks, as well as periods dedicated to reinforce knowledge of field protocol, to pass on new rules and to share experience. Preparatory activities took place between October 2015 and January 2016, including programming of the tablets, survey pre-testing both on paper and using tablets, preparation of the manuals and protocols and the training of the enumerators.

Quality controls were built-in the tablet Surveysolutions CAPI application, with pre-determined ranges, drop-down lists, and automatic validation of the fields as well as error messages to explain inconsistencies. Each data collection team had a supervisor responsible of validating questionnaires on a laptop before uploading it to the server via 3G. In addition, a dedicated team of quality controllers verified the data after it was sent to the server. Automated quality checks were also performed once the data was submitted to the server. During survey implementation, some issues arose because of low connectivity in Niger's remote area. Several machines had to be restored and a total of seven household interviews were lost.

3811 of the 3953 households in the panel survey were tracked (96.4%). Table 5 details the composition of the follow-up panel sample.

Table 5: Composition of follow-up panel sample

		C	T	T+BCC	Total
Beneficiaries	child	0	855	826	1681
	Hh	0	541	557	1098
Non-Beneficiaries	child	1724	971	896	3591
	hh	1266	730	717	2713
Total	child	1724	1826	1722	5272
	hh	1266	1271	1274	3811

Household and child survey teams followed each other in the field. Household survey teams were responsible for refer children eligible for the child survey to the child survey teams. To ensure a smooth transition between the two teams, the child listing was extracted from the data uploaded on the server

by the coordination team (after verification), and were loaded to the child survey team computers and tablets.

Child survey teams were responsible for collecting data for all children identified by the household survey team. The household survey listing provided the sampling frame of the child survey. In case of doubt as to whether a child was over or under 5, household teams were instructed to also refer the child to the survey team. In practice, this happens for some children under 6 months old, as well as for many children reports as being 5 years old. The child survey team was thoroughly trained to establish ages.

Field teams for the survey included 6 household survey teams and 4 child survey teams. The household survey team included one supervisor and four enumerators. The child survey team included a supervisor and four enumerators.

The coordination team included two survey coordinators and four quality controllers from STPH/Riseal. The supervision team from the World Bank and Safety Nets project included a child development specialist, a field coordinator, and a data analyst. Thorough quality control procedures were put in place, with systematic verifications of the collected data by enumerators and supervisors. Additional verifications, including household visits, were undertaken by the coordination and quality control teams continuously over the full survey period.

Use of the data: ==Notes on how to use the data, including anomalies in the data. This includes details on how to link observations across data files. Notes on the data quality, including how missing values were recorded, data cleaning. This can include a complete list (table) of data files in the data set.==

The data is documented in two files:

- A household-level file: includes household-level data from the household survey
  "1 Niger_2015_SIEF_HH.dta"
- An individual-level file: includes individual-level data from the individual survey and child survey
  2 Niger_2015_SIEF_ind.dta

All data is in a wide format. The data was partially cleaned, notably about result code, labeling, recoding of some variables and ensuring IDs are unique. The data includes the observations in the follow-up panel survey. The follow-up booster sample that was not part of the baseline sample is not included. Provisions of the licensing agreement do not allow submitting cognitive test instrument or raw data.

The identifiers are the following:

- Household-level identifier: household_ID
- Individual level identifier: person_ID (within HH identifier))

The household-level data can be used to merge the household-level data with the individual-level data.

The data is fully anonymized.

The code of the cluster (sampling unit) is 'UNIT'. This is unique at commune level. The variable for commune is 'com_code_ref'.

Weights:

As mentioned above, the follow-up sample was stratified based on the proxy means test score used to determine eligibility to the program. Specifically, all the households with a proxy means test score below 1.05 times the beneficiary selection threshold were selected, while half the households with a proxy means test score above 1.05 times the beneficiary selection threshold were selected.

The household-level weight variable is *sample_weight_strat*. It takes the value of 1 (for households with PMT score below 1.04 times the beneficiary selection threshold at baseline) or 2 (or households with PMT score equal or greater than 1.04 times the beneficiary selection threshold at baseline).

W_CENSUS_itt : sample weights proportional to the total number of households in the cluster

W_CENSUS_tot_benef : sample weights proportional to the beneficiary households in the cluster

W_CENSUS_tot_benef : sample weights proportional to the non-beneficiary households in the cluster

Variables related to treatment status:

sample_pred_benef: dummy that indicates if a household has a PMT score below 1.04 times the beneficiary selection threshold.

Intervention: variable that indicates the treatment group of each cluster: control, cash transfer only, cash transfer and behavioral intervention.

sample_targ_1: variable that indicates if households are beneficiaries of any treatment arm or not

Constructed or additional data sets

N/A

Access:

For additional information on the survey, documentation or data, please contact Patrick Premand at ppremand@worldbank.org . Additional data cleaning and impact evaluation analysis is ongoing at the time of submission. A revised version of the data is expected to be resubmitted once the impact analysis has been completed.

Documentation:

- Household Survey Questionnaire (in French)
- Child Survey Questionnaire (in French)
- Household Survey Enumerator's Manual (in French)
- Child Survey Enumerator's Manual (in French)

<u>Codes.</u> <mark>Codes not found already printed in the questionnaires, such as industrial codes, plant codes, animal codes, product units of measure, etc…</mark>

N/A

<u>Other</u>: <mark>Other information without which users would have difficulty analyzing the data.</mark>

N/A