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The impact of a cash transfer on the local economy

- Transfer raises purchasing power of beneficiary households
- As cash spent, impacts spread to others inside and outside treated villages, setting in motion income multipliers
- Purchases outside village shift income effects to non-treated villages, potentially unleashing income multipliers there
- As program scaled up, transfers have direct and indirect (general equilibrium) effects throughout region
How do local economy effects work?
Transfer
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Three possible extreme outcomes

• Local supply expands to meet all this demand
  – Big local multiplier

• Everything comes from outside the local economy
  – No local multiplier at all: 1:1

• Local supply unable to expand to meet demand, and no imports
  – Inflation

Follow the money!
Survey data and the LEWIE model
Simulation of local economy impacts in the PtoP project

- Construct village Local Economy Wide Impact Evaluation (LEWIE) models for cash transfer program areas
  - Capture social and economic structure of village/local economy, including types of households
  - General equilibrium model: captures price effects
  - Simulate impact of cash transfer on local economy in terms of income multipliers
- Analytical work led by Ed Taylor and Karen Thome at UC Davis
Countries/evaluations included in this review

- Malawi
  - Mchinji pilot, 2008-2009
  - SCT Expansion, 2013-2015
- Kenya
  - CT OVC, 2007-2011
- Zambia
  - Child Grant, 2010-2014
- Ethiopia
  - Tigray SPP, 2012-2014
- Ghana
  - LEAP, 2010-2012
- Lesotho
  - CGP, 2011-2013
- Zimbabwe
  - HSCT, 2013-2014

Mixed method approach

- Household and individual level impacts via econometric methods (experimental and non experimental)
- Perceptions on household economy and decision making, social networks, local community dynamics and operations via qualitative methods
- Local economy effects via LEWIE (GE) modeling
LEWIE structure

- Centered on principal economic activities, household income sources and goods and services on which income is spent
  - Production activities (crop, livestock, services, other, retail) and corresponding commodities
  - Factors of production (hired labour, family labour, livestock, inventory, land, capital)
  - Degree of disaggregation depends on the context
    - By crop, gender of labour, etc
- In Kenya and Ethiopia, built two regional models, where local economies were considered structurally different
Constructing the LEWIE

- Household expenditure functions for each category
  - Estimate using household survey data
- Production functions and intermediate demand from agriculture and livestock
  - Estimate using household survey data
- Production functions and intermediate demand from other productive sectors
  - Estimate using business enterprise survey data
LEWIE data input matrix

• Initial values for variables of interest
  — Output of crop and other activities; demand for commodities and factors in each activity; consumption expenditures; public and private transfers, etc.

• Economically estimated parameters and standard errors
  — Exponents and shift parameters in Cobb-Douglass production functions for each activity; marginal budget shares for consumption functions, etc.

• Complete matrix includes spatial organization of ZOI
  — Households consume and produce local commodities
  — Households export production or import goods from outside markets
  — Linkages between ZOI and rest of world
  — Essentially the Social Accounting Matrix (SAM)
Simulating the LEWIE

• LEWIE computer program in GAMS uses parameter estimates and baseline data to calibrate GE model of program-area economy

• Model consists of separate models of household groups (eligible and non eligible) calibrated and nested within a model of the treated economy

• Estimated SE for each parameter combined with Monte Carlo methods to perform significance tests and construct confidence intervals around income multipliers
Market closure and other assumptions

• GE models require assumptions about where prices are determined
  – Some goods are tradable (prices set outside the local economy) while others are nontradable (prices set within)
    • Context of transaction costs
• These LEWIEs assume
  – Local markets for most production activities
  – Local markets for labor
  – High elasticity of labor supply
    • Reflects excess labor supply in rural Sub Saharan Africa
  – Assume land, capital and credit constraints
• Sensitivity analysis conducted on these assumptions
  – Some more important then others
Some intuition

- Transfers increase demand for goods supplied inside and outside of local economy.
- Impact of increased demand on production and local income multiplier depends on supply response to prices:
  - More elastic supply response, the more positive spillovers.
  - More inelastic, the more transfers will raise prices instead of stimulating production.
- If production supply response is inelastic (constraints limit ability to raise output), then impact will be inflationary rather than real.
Ghana: LEAP households spend about 80% of income inside the local economy
These production activities buy inputs from each other, pay wages, and make profits.

![Crop Production Expenditures diagram]

- Large local content
- Local Purchases
- Leakage
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- Less local content
- Leakage

Data from Ghana

These expenditures start a new round of income increases.
Simulated income multiplier of the Ghana LEAP programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income multiplier</th>
<th>Base model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal (CI)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.38 – 2.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real (CI)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.40 – 1.59)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every 1 Cedi transferred can generate 2.50 Cedi of income.

Production constraints can limit local supply response, which may lead to higher prices and a lower multiplier.

When constraints are binding, every 1 Cedi transferred can generate 1.50 Cedi of income.
Nearly all the spillover goes to non-beneficiary households
¾ of increase in value of production goes to non beneficiary households

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production multiplier for:</th>
<th>Beneficiary</th>
<th>Non beneficiary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crop</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Production</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.34</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For every 1 Cedi transferred to beneficiary households, the value of production earned by non beneficiary households increases by 1.03 Cedi.
### Alternative market structure scenarios (Lesotho)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Alternative 1</th>
<th>Alternative 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elasticity of labor supply</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity constraint on</td>
<td>Off</td>
<td>off</td>
<td>on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchased inputs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Income multipliers</td>
<td>Real</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(CI)</td>
<td>(1.25-1.45)</td>
<td>(1.08-1.20)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Keeping constraints on land and capital;
Assumptions on market structure come from qualitative fieldwork and expert opinion.
Cash transfers lead to income multipliers across the region

Every 1 Birr transferred can generate 2.52 Birr of income

Income multiplier is greater than 1 in every country

If constraints are binding, may be as low as 1.84
Size of income multiplier varies by country and context—Why?

- Which sectors get stimulated
  - Where do households and activities spend their income?*

- Openness of economy
  - How much demand is for goods produced inside the economy?
  - What goods are tradable, where are prices determined?
    - Retail: biggest sector, and most open

- Supply response
  - Intensity of local production in different inputs (labor, etc.)*
  - Elasticities of these inputs’ supplies

- Other constraints
  - Cash constraints on inputs
  - SCT loosens these for beneficiaries, but not for non-beneficiaries
LEWIE data requirements: household survey

• Detail on family businesses
  – Agricultural and non agricultural enterprises
  – Production, input use—enough to estimate a production function
• Detail on labour supply
• To/from whom and where on all interactions in which cash or goods are exchanged
  – Business sales and consumer and input purchases
  – Asset values
  – Transfers
    • Public and private, incoming and outgoing
  – Labor
  – Credit and savings
Practical problems with the household survey data

• Not all impact evaluations collected data on non eligibles
• Required use of secondary data (LSMS) to estimate parameters for non eligibles
• Cash transaction data not always available in secondary data
  – Had to borrow from another country in one instance
• Complicates gauging scale of program
LEWIE data requirements:
Business enterprise survey

• Non agricultural business only
  – Agricultural activities adequately captured in household survey
  – Enough information to estimate a production function
Important decisions in planning business enterprise survey

• Determine boundaries of zone of influence (ZOI)
  – Village or cluster of villages?
  – Dealing with businesses on the periphery, rotating markets, itinerant traders
  – Trade off:
    • Wider you search, greater the multiplier, but weaker the linkage

• Capturing unique or large businesses
Complementary sources of information

• Groundtruthing assumptions
  – Expert opinion
    • Agricultural experts, local informants
  – Qualitative fieldwork
  – Price information from surveys (household and community)
FAQ

• Does the size of the transfer affect the income multiplier?
  – Yes, model is nonlinear.....
  – Yes, change spending patterns......
  – No, size of transfer unlikely to be large enough

• Does the share of households receiving the transfer affect the income multiplier
  – No.......unless the expanding share brings in different kinds of households
Some conclusions

• From a political economy perspective, great demand and anticipation for LEWIE results
  • Context of weak political support, fears of dependency, view of cash transfers as charity with no economic content
• Clearly demonstrate the potential impact of cash on the local economy
  • Putting a number on it
• LEWIE most powerful as a comparative tool
Our websites

From Protection to Production Project
http://www.fao.org/economic/PtoP/en/

The Transfer Project
http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/transfer