[Linking Cash and Voucher Assistance and Social Protection: Demystifying the entry points for humanitarians](#)

10 December 2019

Questions and comments from the audience

### #1 (Matteo Caravani) @Nupur Kukrety your slide seems to say that when we have "mature SP system" there is no humanitarian response.

*There is a role for humanitarian actors even if a system is mature.  There is a mix of system; better to think about it in terms of elements.  There is definitely a role for both SP and humanitarian actors in all contexts.  Our roles will differ (based on expertise we bring to the table).  If we look at a 'mature' system there are some key questions to consider. 1 is there a political appetite within govt to even respond to a crisis? (sometimes there isn't). 2 Even where govts are responding, there is a role for humanitarians in terms of gap filling…no matter how good a system is, there will still be areas that will require support. 3 Influencing is a big role (evidence collection, conducting research, to influence how SP is designed and managed so that it responds to the needs of people when it's needed regardless of what the need is (poverty/vulnerability etc). Everyone has a role, the extent of engagement is the question.*

*Influencing is a key role humanitarians can play.  Iraq example: first step was to align the HCT to the national safety net.  Looked at targeting first (cross fertilisation between the two was a added value for both the humanitarian and social protection actors.  The over arching objective should be a strong national system when working like this.  Question becomes how do you use the humanitarian funding and investment to progressively strengthen the national system?*

*With strong govt, good to remember that a lot of leg work can be required to change the legal framework especially in refugee contexts. Changing legislation can take years so there is a lot of work to do in preparedness even in places that have strong 'mature' systems in place.*

### #2 (Louise Moreira Daniels – UNICEF Sri Lanka) Is there guidance on doing a risk-informed analysis to inform National Social Protection Strategies?

*UNICEF will shortly release its Programme Guidance on Shock Responsive Social Protection. This guidance looks at what can be done to risk inform all components (including  social protection policy/strategies) of a social protection system to make them stronger such that they are able to maintain routine programmes during times of crisis and where needed, can scale up to respond to new needs. The SPaN guidance [https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sp-nexus/wiki/guidance-package-social-protection-across-humanitarian-development-nexus](https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sp-nexus/wiki/guidance-package-social-protection-across-humanitarian-development-nexus) and the OPM research on shock responsive*

*social protection [https://www.opml.co.uk/projects/shock-responsive-social-protection-systems include useful information on this topic.*

**#3 (Dod Kyama) Is there any case study of SP being linked to a national ID system?**

*See ID4D and their publications https://id4d.worldbank.org/ Much has been said and written on linking routine social protection systems to national IDs (see for example this ISPA tool) and that those arguments all hold true in emergency settings, with additional risks around privacy and data protection (due to much higher potential for misuse)*

**#4 (Louise Moreira Daniels – UNICEF Sri Lanka) For Emily: I much appreciate your initial statement about wondering if a well-established/functioning social protection system is a pre-requisite for use to respond during crisis; what about where the system exists but is inefficient in terms of actually reaching the "most vulnerable"?**

***See answer to question 1 and also:*** *More generally, it will always be important to assess different options (including the potential to leverage national social protection programmes or their underlying systems) against the outcomes we are collectively aiming to achieve:*

- ➢ ***Better meeting needs****: delivering an equal or greater impact than alternatives, through a response that is better targeted, provides a more adequate level of support, or provides support of a more appropriate nature;*
- ➢ ***Ensuring greater coverage of population****: increasing the absolute number of people reached, or the relative share of those in need of assistance;*
- ➢ ***Ensuring timeliness****: delivering a more timely response to crises, avoiding interventions being delivered too late to be of use for the shock they were intended to address;*
- ➢ ***Ensuring accountability to affected populations****: abiding by humanitarian principles and ensuring dignity*
- ➢ ***Ensuring predictability****: of funding for implementing agencies and of assistance to households;*
- ➢ ***Eliminating duplicated delivery systems and processes, and minimising gaps****: such as multiple agencies conducting similar targeting exercises in the same communities;*
- ➢ ***Leading to greater sustainability****: leading to strengthened organisational capacity, such as through responses being embedded in government-led systems.*

*The 'entry point' might not be the exact same eligibility criteria qualifying conditions and strategy for registration and enrolment as routine programmes – these can be modified! More generally, it should be stressed there are inherent **trade-offs** between these objectives and these need to be addressed ex-ante where possible (with strategies for*

*mitigating risks): e.g. timeliness vs a 'better targeted response' or the potential for overburdening the administrative capacity of existing social protection systems, undermining longer term sustainability, etc. Any strategic decision will affect all seven objectives simultaneously and no policy decision can affect all of them in a positive direction!*

**#5 (Gabriel Fernandez – Independent SP Specialist and former National SP Coordinator Liberia) How can humanitarian action contribute to supporting national efforts to achieve SDGs and could this be an opportunity to strengthen linkages and transition from crisis to development?**

*Useful to think about it in terms of leveraging the systems.  Look at how elements of the humanitarian system can leverage the national ones. Somalia example: there is a policy but no programmes for safety nets.  The one that will start is through humanitarian actors and that will slowly build the blocks for the national one.*

*From SP side…lots of actors already working on SP system strengthening.  Question is where is the delta…where is the difference between the routine work of national systems to linking it for shock response (future proofing instead of looking backwards).  What is it that could look different along the chain of programmes/systems.  TRANSFORM (training on SP floors and building capacity), has a module that will look at this 'delta', and future UNICEF social protection guidance also covers this.*

**#6 (Kerstin Imbusch) What is the difference between adaptive SP and shock responsive SP?**

*Given this topic has been 'hot' for a few years now, there has been a lot that has been written, said and defined by different actors working in different countries. As always in these cases, this has led to some confusion and overlaps regarding the core terminology and definitions. We suggest there is no full 'resolution' to the issue, but it is useful to understand the history of different terms (in extreme summary)[1]:*

- *2009. The **'adaptive social protection** framework'[2] was developed at the Institute of Development Studies with the support of the World Bank and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) and was the first scholarly effort to explore the linkages between social protection, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation – worlds that had worked in silos to that date.*
- *2012. The World Bank built on this contribution, issuing a paper on 'making social protection **climate responsive'** and starting to discuss scalable social protection systems[3]*

---

[1]  Solórzano and Cárdenes (2019)
[2] Davies et al. 2009
[3] Kuriakose et al 2012/2013

- *2012. A strong focus on 'resilience' was placed within the so-called 3P&T – 3D Analytical Framework by IDS, discussing the role of Absorptive coping capacity, Adaptive capacity and Transformative capacity and introducing a focus on time and scale issues[4]*
- *2015-2018 The DFID funded, OPM led global study on Shock Responsive Social Protection set out to answer the questions: what are the constraints to social protection systems being more responsive to (covariate) shocks, and, conversely, what factors would enable them to become more responsive to shocks?[5] Further research alongside WFP focused on similar issues, strengthening the evidence on the social protection delivery systems that can be leveraged for shock preparedness and response[6]. Overall, this body of research did not focus on resilience-building – not because this wasn't deemed important, but because it wasn't a core focus of that specific research agenda.*
- *2015. At around the same time, the [BRACED](#) resilience 3A framework was introduced by ODI, focusing on the capacities to adapt to, anticipate and absorb climate extremes and disasters[7] – and how social protection can play a role in that[8]*
- *2018. The World Bank further conceptualised the term 'adaptive social protection', building on their work in the Sahel and operationalising the concept as "two interrelated*
  *approaches focused on building household resilience and increasing the responsiveness of programming"[9]*
- *2019. The EU SPaN guidance on Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus focused on better understanding the conditions under which humanitarian action and social protection can coexist, converge and be mutually supporting[10].*
- *2019. The UNICEF Guidance on Shock Responsive Social Protection framed 'shock responsive' very broadly, acknowledging strong overlaps with other frameworks (adaptive etc).*

*Ultimately, it is not worth using these terms (alongside others you may have encountered, e.g. risk informed social protection) as the tools for an ideological battle[11]. What really matters is what they have in common: the acknowledgement that social protection can play an important role in the context of increasing hazards, shock and stresses. This can be achieved in many different ways, before, during and after any given shock – and in the long term in anticipation of future events.*

*Useful from practioner side to think about it in the following manner: realise the benefits you can have in getting transfers out earlier (before people resort to negative coping*

---

[4] Bene' et al 2012

[5] O'Brien et al (2018)

[6] Beazley et al

[7] Bahadur et al, 2015

[8] Ulrich and Slater 2016

[9] World Bank. 2018

[10] SPaN (2019)

[11] For example, see this recent blog by ITAD: https://www.itad.com/five-key-principles-for-adaptive-social-protection-programming/

*strategies). Three 'steps': (i) Resilience before the crisis, (ii) transfers that can be more timely (before the shock), and (iii) during the shock (traditional HCT).*

**#7 (Amelia Charles) Could Emily or one of the organizers kindly share the USAID document referencing the value of a shift in humanitarian investments?**

*Courtney Cabot-Venton for USAID on the [economics of resilience to drought](#)*

**#8 (Louise Moreira Daniels – UNICEF Sri Lanka) For any presenter: What is the role of something like WFP's SCOPE in humanitarian response, within the context of SRSP, including in MICs context?**

*There has been a lot that has been said about SCOPE in recent times, for good and for bad (see the [recent scandal](#) on Pallantir's involvement). Ultimately, the topic cuts across the humanitarian and social protection sectors: a) SCOPE is not the only humanitarian information system performing these functions of registration through to delivery (think of UNHCR's ProGres as another example); b) countries around the world have been refining their approaches to managing social protection information management (primarily via development partner funding) – see [here](#) and [here](#) for an overview of trends. The publication "Building on government systems for shock preparedness and response: the role of social assistance data and information systems´- can be found [here](#) and discusses implications... Ultimately, from a L-MIC country perspective, it makes more sense to build and improve national systems (ownership, sustainability) rather than use an external tool such as SCOPE – unless there are very good reasons (e.g. linked to security concerns, etc). The topic of 'information systems' for SRSP has also been explicitly analysed (alongside other key building blocks) in recent WFP and OPM publications for [the ASEAN region](#), in [Latin America](#) and in the [Caribbean](#).*

**#9 (Michel Steven – UNICEF Mozambique) Valentina mentioned complaints and appeals mechanisms as part of the administrative aspects of SP. Accountability to Affected Populations is a core component of humanitarian assistance and targeting is often one of the most difficult and sensitive issues. Are there good practices from the SP side in terms of AAP and complaints and feedback mechanisms that can be built into humanitarian cash/voucher programs?**

*The key concept is that a) most social protection systems do not STILL do this well enough (under-funded, weak systems – see for example [here](#) and [here](#)) and b) the type of accountability issues in emergency settings are very different and therefore routine systems are unlikely to ever be able to fully fulfil this function. In short, this is a key 'gap' that humanitarian counterparts may always need to fill, even where systems are country-led, etc.*

**#10 (Joseph Gyandi) I am the disaster response coordinator to a local responding organisation in Nigeria called CRUDAN, I enjoyed the webinar, but connect in late, in few sentences what SP is all about?**

*SP is social protection. By this we mean a "set of policies and programs aimed at preventing or protecting all people against poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion throughout their lifecycle, with a particular emphasis towards vulnerable groups". Please see the first part of the presentation for more information on the topic where we set the scene for social protection and the ways in which humanitarians might link to it for humanitarian cash transfers. Watch the first 10 minutes of the webinar if you are keen to know more (recording here)!*

**#11 (Aliou Diouf) Thank you very much. I notice that in Annika's presentation they separate adaptative social protection and shock responsive. This is different to my understanding. I understand that adaptative social protection has 2 pillars: productive one and reactive one. Could you please explain me the difference?**

*See answer to question 10 above.*

**#12 (Aliou Diouf) How do we manage to integrate exit strategies?**

*What we have found useful for example Cameroon and Niger, we give social assistance but have LLH grants on top of that, using national systems that have training and other aspects also and linking to those. Good opportunity to link that way. Build on local actors and systems in place (world bank evaluations show this has worked well….to use existing schemes).*

**#13 (Chan Kuar) I am Chan Kuar from Africa Street children development .org and I have no much to say and just want to thank you a lot for a warming presentation.**

*Thank you for attending!*

**#14 (Julie Lawson-McDowall - CaLP) What new forms of funding mechanisms could help us bridge these gaps?**

*Point is not just about funding but what we do with the funding; having a longer term vision and building sustainable blocks that can build a long term system. Not possible with short term and unpredictable funding. Multi-year funding is an enabler and key (longer term) and working with both humanitarian and development funding (leveraging these). How do you invest that money and have a common vision between the HCT community and potentially the safety net community.*

*When talking about the humanitarian and development nexus, this is key. The funding channels have not been aligned with this yet. There are efforts being made by donors for this (IDA an example of this). Where the funding goes (to which countries), is a different process. There is a slight onus on us as humanitarian and development stakeholders to coordinate and design better also so that we can see how each piece of the puzzle fits in and can meet the needs of the people better. If we can align our mandates and expertise better, we could be doing much more using the current funding that exists.*

**#15 (Peter Simon) Do you think cash transfers are a sustainable way to go!? How? Especially unfunded systems.**

*The vision is for national governments to finance and run their own social protection systems, and increasing domestic financing is a priority. But the sector is still relatively immature in a lot of countries and there is still a need for donor financing to strengthen systems and fund cash transfers. To ensure sustainability it is critical to work with governments and identify long term financing options.*

*The question here however is not only about the funding sustainability of national systems but also the one of humanitarian cash transfers especially where crises are protracted and poverty and vulnerability overlap. The sustainability of humanitarian assistance (including cash) has been raised at the World Humanitarian Summit and is only growing with the continuous raise in humanitarian needs and protracted crises. The question becomes what system can best respond to people's actual needs (including poverty and non-crises related needs) with available funding (including donor funding) and how to diversify sources of funding (get governments to fund crises, risk financing, etc…).*

*There is enough evidence on the humanitarian (add CaLP link) as well as development programming [here](#) to suggest that cash transfers have a positive impact in the lives of the poor and vulnerable households. Importantly, cash transfers give people the power to decide and invest in what they consider as their most critical needs. There is [evidence to suggest that cash transfers help with strengthening the local economy](#) and are therefore a proposition that supports sustainable growth.*

*However, most humanitarian cash transfers till date have been supported by donors, however, governments are increasingly looking at financing mechanisms, including contingency budgets, risk financing mechanisms etc, to provide humanitarian assistance (including cash transfers) with little or no donor support.*

**#16 (Jackeline Frize) In your experience what is the best forum in country to have discussions with governments on how to link SP with Humanitarian Aid?**

*All governments have a mechanism to support coordination of humanitarian action and this varies based on the type of crisis and the governance system. Typically, coordination of humanitarian action is managed by the DRM authorities, but in some contexts Ministry of Interior or civil defense can play a central role.*

*The Ministry of social welfare is typically responsible for social transfer programmes and many countries already have a social protection coordination mechanism that is chaired by the government. This mechanism would be the most appropriate for having a dialogue on linking humanitarian cash to social protection in most crisis contexts.*

**#17 (Aleksandra Godziejewska) What would be the elements of the existing SP systems that would make us wait before entering into considering linking the two (CVA with SP system)? (One I can think of is discrimination of some groups and lack of interest to include them in the system) anything else?**

*CVA can be linked with social Protection in many ways, including by aligning with the design of an existing social transfer programme. There may be some contexts or phase of the crisis where the risk of humanitarian principles being compromised outweighs the need to leverage the system for the delivery of assistance to crisis affected populations. A decision has to be made in such contexts to use the system fully or partially or to implement a CVA through a parallel system.*

*An assessment of the social protection system in advance of a crisis or a rapid assessment after the crisis can help with identifying any red flags on leveraging the social protection system.*

**#18 (Gabriel Fernandez – Independent SP Specialist and former National SP Coordinator Liberia) Thank you and season's greetings!**

*Thank you for attending!*

**#19 (Louise Moreira Daniels– UNICEF Sri Lanka) Many thanks for the interesting presentations and discussion!**

*Thank you for attending!*