
Jo Sharpe: Hello and welcome to the Social Protection Podcast. I'm your host, Jo Sharpe. This year on this show, we've explored different universal approaches to social protection. Like the idea of providing a universal basic income to everyone, regardless of need. Or achieving the SDG target to provide a minimum set of protections or floors for all by 2030, the elephant in the room in these conversations is always cost and country's willingness and ability to invest the percentages of GDP required.

Conceivably many middle-income countries could make the political decisions to increase that investment raising funds through taxation, social contributions, and other means. But as we'll hear in today's episode around 30, mostly low-income countries, simply can't even raise the funds required to lay down these critical floors, and about 20 can't even afford half of that cost.

So in this episode, we ask: could a global fund for social protection be the answer?

Calls for a global fund have recently been renewed by the UN Special Rapporteur On Extreme Poverty. And last year, the UN proposed developing a global accelerator on jobs and social protection for just transitions. That would include a new international financing mechanism that could help fill some of these gaps.

In today's episode, I'm speaking with Charles Lwanga-Ntale who is an Independent Consultant on poverty, vulnerability, and social protection based in Kenya.

Helmut Schwarzer, who is the Head of Public Finance, Actuarial and Statistics Unit of the Social Protection Department at the ILO.

And Marcus Manuel, whose recent research work has focused on addressing extreme poverty, assessing country's tax potential and their ability to self-finance social spending. Charles, Helmut and Marcus. Welcome to the Social Protection Podcast.

Marcus Manuel: Thank you.

Helmut Schwarzer: Thank you.

Charles Lwanga-Ntale: Thank you.

Jo Sharpe: Helmut, can we start with you? What's driving this current interest and focus on international financing for social protection?

Helmut Schwarzer: I think that firstly, it is a lesson of the recent crisis of the pandemic that has shown the extreme importance of social protection for dealing not only with the consequences of the crisis on people and on societies, but also with the transition towards new development models. And we have seen a discussion about more sustainable
development patterns, green jobs, fair transition, and the social protection plays an extremely important role in that sense as well as in cushioning the effects of all kind of crisis.

And on the other hand, we are more and more aware that there is such a huge gap in terms of jobs and of social protection coverage in the world. More than 4 billion people have no direct access to social protection schemes, according to the ILO estimate. And there is an urgent need to implement policy measures coordinated globally, internationally, and nationally that help comply with a sustainable development goal with a target 1.3. And of course, international solidarity is key in that process.

You mentioned two important concepts. One of them is a global fund for social protection, which has been proposed by the UN Special Rapporteur, Mr. Olivier De Schutter. This is one possible structure. The other structure, which is not competitive with a global fund, but which can be really very compatible with a global social protection fund is the idea of an accelerator of jobs in social protection for a just transition. This is an initiative that was born last year, September 2021. The Secretary General of the United Nations proposed such an accelerator with the aim of speeding up the recovery from the crisis and of transiting towards a more sustainable development pattern in the world.

Jo Sharpe: In a recent episode of this podcast, we also talked about that 2030 goal to achieve universal social protection. And obviously, financing is absolutely key to countries investing in social protection programmes for their citizens. So Marcus, to achieve the goal, how much should countries actually be spending?

Marcus Manuel: It's a great question. And actually, it's one of the really big unknowns. So if you look at say education, or if you look at health, they're actually quite well-established spending targets. So 20% of a government's budget should be going on education. 15% should be going on health. But when you ask the same question for social protection, there's a blank at the moment. And that's where some of the research we've been trying and do is to try and tease that out. So we've done two approaches really to that question, and we hope that will move the debate forward.

The first one is look at the SDG costing. So we looked at SDG costings for health and for education and compared those with social protection. And the very rough numbers that come out of this are about the same. Education, if you look in a low-income country, the cost for achieving the health target is about the same as for education is about the same for social protection. So you must get a sense, okay. There ought to be some sort of parity around this is what we should be expecting.

The other way of looking at it is to look at what donor countries do themselves. The global fund would be about donors transforming resources to poorer countries. So it's always a good starting point for what they expect others to do. And if there is very clear that in all OECD countries, you have at least a parity between health, education and social protection, actually the US is the country where it did not happens. In all other countries apart from the US, the level of social protection goes up a lot more and actually can be more than the spending on health and education. And in OECD European countries is actually even more than health and education combined. But to our mind, the fact that the SDG costing
suggests it should be about the same. The fact that no OECD country spends less than some degree of parity points out. So we've come out with a number of 14%. There's a bit more number crunching around it, but the idea it's sort of pretty comparable to health and education. I think that's probably the message I want to get across here.

Jo Sharpe: So following on from that, to what extent is that actually affordable for most countries in your analysis?

Marcus Manuel: So my analysis isn't very different from ILO's and others. If you take those sort of very typical numbers, most upper middle-income countries are able to afford these floors. They may not be currently allocating relatively enough, but if they increase their taxes and you find most upper middle-income countries or all can afford a basic level of social protection. If you go down to the other end of the scale, there's really almost no low-income country that can afford to do this. Their rates of poverty are just so high and their incomes are just so low. They just can't afford to do it. And maybe they can only afford 10% or 20% of the costs that's involved. And then in the low and middle-income countries, quite a lot can although that depends on the really increasing that their tax revenues to the maximum that's feasible and that's sustainable, but there are some low-income countries that also just can't fully afford it. We reckon there's something like 31 countries that can't fully afford it. I think more challenging there are 20 that can't even afford half the cost. They're just way off being able to do that. And those are the countries that we are particularly interested in. Thank you.

Jo Sharpe: Can I come to you, Charles? And based on your research in Uganda and Zambia, both low-income countries, as well as Kenya an upper-middle-income country. Can you talk a little bit about how governments in low-income countries are thinking about needing to invest in social protection? Is expanding social protection a priority for those governments?

Charles Lwanga-Ntale: I think there are things to look at. And the first one is that poverty eradication has been a running theme for many low-income countries, especially countries in Africa. There hasn't been as much success as one would've expected over the years. So there's always been a question. What is it that needs to be done differently?

Now overall governments in Africa, especially have embraced social protection. Now several things are being done in the countries that we have spoken to for this study, but many other countries as well. One is that social protection policies being rolled out to a large extent in all these countries complement the anti-poverty strategies that the countries already have. There are also indications that even countries' constitutions, budget allocations are being reviewed. So that there is a lot more resource allocation going through social protection as a tool for poverty eradication something that has become even more important lately. Thanks in a way to the COVID pandemic that recognised, or that brought about the magnitude of the problem of poverty and risk, which only social protection can help deal with.

Jo Sharpe: Are governments actually interested in more international financing to help achieve some of those universal goals?
**Charles Lwanga-Ntale:** I think the straight answer is yes, there is interest in international financing, but there is also interest in making existing resources much more efficient and much more useful. One of the challenges that did come across in the study was that there were lots of inefficiencies in spending and by pulling those resources together and making them much more relevant and much more consistent and much more organised. One would find some of the pathways for finding the right resources that are needed to fund social protection. But even with that, a lot more resources would be required to be able to deal with the magnitude of the problem that is being faced by the respective countries. Only some kind of a Marshall Plan or some kind of a major investment is going to help deal with the challenge. But also because there are ways in which investment in sectors like social protection can be seen as a pathway to unlocking the poor performance in other sectors such as education, health, agriculture, et cetera.

**Jo Sharpe:** Thank you. Turning now to Helmut, the ILO has been tasked with developing this concept of a global accelerator for the UN. What might that look like?

**Helmut Schwarzer:** I would like to put in perspective this idea of international financial support, we have done an estimate of how much would it cost to close the coverage gaps for the social protection floor in different regions of the world.

There is a gap of 1.2 trillion US dollars in the world each year. So if you wanted to reach the goal of universal social protection floor, you would need to increase the spending of developing countries in general, by a little bit more than 3%. And the poorest countries, the low-income countries, it represents approximately 16% of the GDP of these countries. So such an effort would be probably impossible by the less developed countries. The middle-income countries are now may be better positioned to carry on a formalisation process of their economy, of enterprises, of jobs. So that the basis for collecting contributions and taxes increases. But even in the less developed countries, it’ll be also necessary to support the development of the institutions that are needed for sustainable financing on the basis of domestic resources in the long run.

**Jo Sharpe:** Charles, I’d be really interested to hear from you how you think a global fund would need to work for low-income countries. What would those countries expect to see from an international financing mechanism of the type that we’ve been discussing?

**Charles Lwanga-Ntale:** The first one is that for lower-income countries, a successful global fund would need to be both efficient and effective. It has to be able to deliver to people who are currently facing risk, vulnerability, poverty, et cetera. It should also be reflective of mutual respect, accountability, and predictability. And these are the things which, especially officials in lower-income countries, actually African countries keep bringing to the fore.

Now, given these expectations, of course, lower-income countries still have some worries, which need to be addressed. One of those is that any new commitments to social protection might simply add to the stress that low-income countries are facing to be able to find the right amounts of resources, fund budgets, et cetera. Made worse of course, by the fears now that ODA, Overseas Development Assistance, seems to be on the way down rather than up as would've been expected by different stakeholders. Now given also that many countries,
especially in Africa are increasingly beginning to see the rise of debt, there is a worry there that new investments, new focus on areas like social protection might simply make things a bit more challenging, not least because they're again on the horizon, new vulnerabilities, new risks, climate-related catastrophic phase, et cetera.

And the low-income countries officials quite obviously worried that a global fund for social protection might simply lead to new forms of conditionality and financing and the challenges of the resource mobilisation that they might not be able to deal with. So there is interest and there is hope. There is also that some worry that things might not work as well as one would like them to. A number of officials that we came across still have some hesitation that if the conversations continue taking place in the Northern capitals, the chances of having a design, which is too north centered are quite high. And the chances of paternalism in the design and management of the fund might also arise. So these are some of the issues that have been brought to the surface.

Jo Sharpe: And really important considerations to keep in mind as these conversations develop. Marcus, there are a lot of global funds partnerships out there for education, the global fund to fight aids, tuberculosis, and malaria. Around climate financing for the SDGs. What sorts of lessons should a global fund for social protection, be learning from some of those other experiences?

Marcus Manuel: Thank you, Jo. And I think there are two interesting counter-examples that illustrate not all global funds are the same and choices you make about them matter. So the most successful one has been the global fund to fight aids, tuberculosis, and malaria just called the global fund for short. That's been phenomenally successful and it's grown really quite fast over a 20-year period.

And by contrast, you have the global partnership for education, which, although education is again, a key issue has not been able to grow or scale up to anything like the same extent. I see there are three pillars you need to have in place to get a good global fund.

First of all, you need to have a basic idea of what it's gonna do, how it's gonna work, what the governances might be, and you need a bind of the technical people and you need to have the intermediaries, the people who will be involved. They need to have some sort of common vision around it. Then you need to make sure: do the people who actually might benefit from this does actually want it? I think over the last couple of years, we've seen a shift, and whereas many low-income countries weren't necessarily putting a high priority on social protection. I think that's changing, and as it happens in more countries, they're seeing the benefits. So there is an engagement and a more greater interest, but, and this is very important. There is a concern about ownership. There is concern about conditionality and therefore how this thing is governed and what the voices will be for low-income countries within it. And what their role on governance will be. So you need to have the mechanisms, you need to have the interest, but you need to have some big funders prepared to fund it. And up to date that's been missing.

So I had the curious privilege of by accident, stumbling into the room, which announced the launching of the global fund about 20 years ago. And what was interesting was it wasn't
announced by the UN, it was announced by two finance ministers. And that immediately sends a signal to the world, these finance ministers prepared to back this. This is a serious thing, now start to engage on going on that. And that's why it's been very interesting. The German governments, the inclusion in the coalition agreement, the German government that they would be interested in pursuing and advocating for a global fund, I think is quite a game changer. Cause that's the first time we've had a major donor willing to engage.

There's one other thing I like to just say about funds. I think one of the reasons the global fund has been so successful is because it had a very strong results focus. If you go on their website, you can see how many lives have we saved, how many people have been managed to treat. And I think that really helps in motivating, helping people to understand. And I think that's one of the things that I hopefully will come out of the global fund for social protection, real clarity. How many millions of lives are we going to be affecting? How many millions of lives are we going to be seeing lifted out of extreme poverty as a result of this? And I think that will help bring the motivations together.

**Jo Sharpe:** We've been talking a lot about the role a global fund could have in filling financing gaps for lower-income countries. Helmut, what is the role that a social protection fund or an accelerator? What role is it expected to play in encouraging those middle-income countries to mobilise resources, sign up perhaps to higher percentages of spending in order to cover some of these big gaps in the social protection floors that still very much exist, even in countries that at least on paper could theoretically be closing them?

**Helmut Schwarzer:** I think it is about a whole architecture. The idea of this global accelerator is to have three different pillars, which are coordinated, which work together. So there is a first pillar, which is a policy pillar where you look for policy coherence, where you look for the benefits of improving the coordination of employment, social protection, fair transition, skills, many policies that usually are seen apart from each other. If you improve the coordination, you get scale, you get the synergy.

Then, on the other hand, there is another pillar, which is about increasing the financial resources available. And here a global fund is part of the process or can be part of the process. And then there is an essential dimension, which is the alliance with the ambition of supporting the creation of more jobs and of promoting the formalisation of more jobs so that you may also increase the basis for the extension of social protection. So this is about an architecture where the elements are mutually reinforcing.

**Jo Sharpe:** Marcus, what do you think the value of having a global fund type mechanism is? Is it just the money or is there more to it than that as Helmut was saying?

**Marcus Manuel:** So I think the value of a fund beyond the money is what Charles is talking about, is about ownership and about conditionality. So it's not merely the volume of money. It's also "what are the conditions?" And "how that's delivered?" And "how that's managed?". And that is as important in a way as the money itself.

I think the other thing the fund does is it demonstrates a long-term commitment to something. These are long-term commitments to introduce tax-funded social protection
programmes, way beyond a five-year donor project cycle. So low-income countries are naturally cautious about "should we invest in this major effort, which will last generations in our country on the back of a donor promise for a five-year support?" I think it's gonna have to last longer than five years this, certainly for some, we’re gonna be talking 20 or 30 years to make this happen.

The other thing, if I think can come back to your point about the green the climate funds. I see very much that the accelerators help people like setting the whole agenda. If you like, it's the UN triple C approach, there's a whole global conversation around climate change that's happening. Within that, there's a need to fund some countries that can't afford to do it themselves. And this is a separate fund that's set up to do that. And that's why I like what Helmut was saying. I think the accelerator is quite a broad thing. And I think within it, there is a global fund. Now, how you quite manage the linkages? And the arrangements around that is the question of detail. But what I am clear is you need both happening at the same time.

Jo Sharpe: Charles, Marcus was just talking about the value of a global fund being its potential to offer some security, longevity, predictability. These are all things that you mentioned earlier as well. Can you talk a little bit more about what that looks like from a low-income country perspective?

Charles Lwanga-Ntale: Well you just said it. The things we've been hearing include long-term financing being key to moving forwards with the global fund idea and making sure that the fund helps with the generation of domestic resources and in making more efficient of resources that already exist. The other side of interest looks at the whole area of technical support or technical assistance. Given that social protection design and implementation are becoming a lot more sophisticated than they were decades ago. Increasingly countries are having to move forwards with acquiring capacities that would enable them to make appropriate designs and then to manage those programmes.

The [unintelligible] is the, having a participatory approach, which recognises that there are things to learn from all angles. Countries that are implementing social protection programmes themselves, especially those where poverty levels are very high, but have a really implementing different types of programmes have things to share with the donors and international agencies, et cetera. So there needs to be a way of bringing this on the same table in the participatory approach.

Jo Sharpe: Marcus, we saw during COVID-19, of course, a real increase in spending on social protection, a real uptick as well in the volume of ODA and donor financing that was being provided to support countries through the crisis. How has COVID-19 affected financing trends? And what do you think they’ll look like over the next few years?

Marcus Manuel: Thank you. COVID has had a really remarkable impact on financing. And I think what we've seen there has been a massive scale-up in rich countries and in poor countries that's been temporary and it's been fueled by debt. There are clear limits to how long you can keep that those debt flows going and lots of low-income countries are now levels of being in debt distress. So we've emptied that pocket of what we can do.
The other thing that's been interesting though. It's been the first time there's been a shift in the proportion of donor aid going for social protection. So social protection has been around 1% of donor aid. I mean by comparison education and health is something like 10% now, each round about 10%. So it means it's been a very small fraction. And one of the puzzles is that if you go to donor countries and say: "how much do you spend on social protection?" They'll say 20%, 30%. In Europe it's 40% of their budget is going on social protection, but they're only putting 1% of their aid budget to social protection in the poorer countries.

And I think they really does need to be rebalancing. And we are saying that again, looking at some of the numbers, we think a reasonable share for donor age should be 7%, not 1%. And that would make a big difference. Now what's happened under COVID is that has jumped from 1% to 2%, which is an amazing doubling as an extraordinary effort that's happened. But if we're gonna take, go from 2% to 7%, we need to go a lot further.

But I also want to say there's not much at stake here. I mean, yes, there are trillions of dollars worth of gaps, but if we just want to get child benefit for the youngest children nor to threes in low-income countries, we're talking about $10 billion. Now, $10 billion, if you went from 2% to 7% of donor rate, you could do that with no problem. I think in a way you could also actually motivate an increase in the ODA to GNI ratio. If you said, look, we do want to go up a bit, not from 0.7, maybe, but from 0.4 to 0.5. And the reason we want to do that is because we can see these children that we want to help.

And I think that's what's missing in the moment, that political dialogue, a sense of why do you want to give the aid, not just that it's the UN target. It's because it makes a difference to millions of children's lives. It makes a difference to millions of people who are disabled. It makes a difference to millions of people who are elderly. And if we can help make that connection between taxpayers, this is what your aid could do, and this is how it could do it. And there'd be confidence about how that could work. I think that could be quite transformational.

Jo Sharpe: Okay, well, on that note, let's have a lightning round to finish this off. Can I ask you all, whether you think there really is enough interest, momentum, and indeed financing to make the global fund a reality? Charles, could I start with you and your impressions of where this is all going?

Charles Lwanga-Ntale: On whether we should be optimistic or pessimistic here. I would say, first of all, it depends very much on who you are talking to, even within the same government. Overall, I think the message that we are hearing is that there is consensus that social protection will perhaps be the next turning point to usher us into a different kind of development, especially given that now we know, we've seen what risks like a COVID pandemic or other risks, which would be climate-related, et cetera, can do to people or to a programme of development that has been there for a number of years or decades.

What, however, hasn't happened very much yet is innovative thinking around how to build on what has been achieved before. For example, a lot of resources continue to be invested in sectors like education, health, agriculture, et cetera. It should be possible to conceive social protection not only least in its own right, but also as an agent or as a catalyst for
ensuring that those sectors perform better, that education performs better, that health performs better, that agriculture performs better, and so on and so forth. Now, if that were part of the agenda that global fund or a global partnership would embrace that should help in driving new interest in how social protection can be pushed in the future.

Jo Sharpe: Thank you. That’s a great optimistic note to end on. Although of course, some caveats there to be mindful of. Marcus, what do you think?

Marcus Manuel: A global fund will happen. I think the question is whether it takes a generation to get there, or whether we do it in five years. And that depends on global political forces. We know social protection tends to get introduced in Latin America when there were left-center governments came to power and I think we’re gonna need to be the same among donors. They’ll need to be a donor consensus to shift some serious money that way. And that's trying to peer into the politics of the G-7 countries.

I think one of the most powerful things is the ILO charts that look at how social protection has developed over the decades over the last hundred years. It will happen. The tides going only one way. It's just the question where do we accelerate. And I think climate change may be the accelerator. I think when people realise the damage that's being done to poor farmers, subsistence farmers, because of climate change, people will start to say: well, we should more urgently address supporting at least people living on the breadline in subsistence environments, in rural areas. And they need our support and they're worthy of our support. So I think that might be the bit that gets accelerated first. Thank you.

Jo Sharpe: And finally, Helmut, your views.

Helmut Schwarzer: Yes. I agree with my colleagues that we are in a situation where more awareness about the crucial role of social protection has been created. It is important to use this positive situation we have seen, for example, many countries interested in unemployment benefits. As a lesson from the crisis, we have been seeing many countries as well, interested in improving employment injury benefits because COVID and the health situation also was linked with labour environment. Then, of course, social assistance benefits are benefits, which target the vulnerable. 1,700 measures have been adopted according to our social protection monitor as a response to COVID. And this encourages us quite a lot.

And I would like to add one point if you allow me, I do not agree sometimes with analysis, which put all the bets on taxation. I also think that we need to look again at the social contributions because social contributions are relevant sources of financing for social protection. And I think that another advantage of the contributory schemes is a larger stability in the long run political, social stability because there is a stronger ownership behind it as well.

Jo Sharpe: I guess we’ll watch with interest to see whether the global fund is an idea whose time has come at last. Thank you, Charles, Marcus, and Helmut for joining me for the Social Protection Podcast today.
Marcus Manuel: Thank you.

Helmut Schwarzer: Thank you.

Charles Lwanga-Ntale: Thank you very much.

Marcus Manuel: Thank you very much. It's been great.

Jo Sharpe: Before we go today, we'll end with some quick wins. Each month we ask a guest to give a quick roundup of news and research that it sparked their interest and that we think you should know more about.

Joining me today is Dr. Zina Nimeh, who is an Associate Professor of Public Policy at UNU-MERIT and Maastricht. Welcome, Zina.

Dr. Zina Nimeh: Thank you, Jo, for having me. It's really nice to be here.

Jo Sharpe: So what have you brought in with you today?

Dr. Zina Nimeh: I think the topic of what we're talking about is social protection financing. And I'm really interested in the topic of innovation in social policy in general, but in particular, innovative approaches to financing social protection. And I wanted to highlight to your listeners the efforts that are being done by the global coalition for social protection floor and the advocacy that they're doing for the establishment of a global fund for social protection or similar structures that addresses the sustainability of financing of social protection programmes.

So the logic is very simple from the perspective of why can the global community try to convince governments to set up a fund that would support social protection systems and co-finance them for a period that is needed. And then this has been done before. So if we think of the global fund to fight aids, tuberculosis, and malaria. So the idea is there. And the intuition here is why not for social protection.

Jo Sharpe: Thank you. And I should mention that Marcus and Charles, who we heard from in our first segment of this episode have also prepared analysis for the global coalition, which we'll also link to in the show notes.

I'm like you really interested in this idea of how and whether a global fund can catalyse greater domestic investment, especially in those countries that could, in theory, be raising more revenue or reallocating spending for more social protection. The argument in this note, as you say, is that a global fund could co-invest with governments. And I guess with the idea that domestic investment would increase over time.

The question for me does remain whether this approach is quite a technical technocratic approach, whether it's enough to overcome what really is a political problem, the persistent
skepticism around social protection in some countries, the turn towards austerity, and less, not more social spending and so on. So I think it's a really powerful idea and it would just be really interesting to see how it played out.

**Dr. Zina Nimeh:** You raised a very important point, but look, the question has never been whether government should invest in social protection. I don't think you'll have many people resisting the notion. Social protection is a Human Right. And it's a major tool to tackle poverty and social exclusion. But the issue is that beyond the rhetoric, the major challenge for social protection is financing. The issue in my view is whether funding them is possible or takes priority over other political matters. And here the fund can provide a good, innovative solution for that, but it is important that this message is advocated properly. And this is another point, which I also would like to highlight. One of the items that we're also working on is how do we innovatively think about advocacy and policy influence for social change, for a topic like social protection.

**Jo Sharpe:** What would be your top tips for people trying to advocate and influence policy around this issue to expand social protection or perhaps to increase financing?

**Dr. Zina Nimeh:** I would like to focus on the role of people in academic institutions and think tanks to support such as the work of the fund through empirical evidence, through conducting research, such organisations, they supply a vast amount of objective research, which can inform any policy debate. And I want to underscore objective. Because such research can also show the effectiveness of consequences, but also unintended consequences of policy after it is enacted.

Now, one example I would like to provide here is a study that we have conducted at UNU-MERIT. And here I would like to give a shout-out, as they say to my colleagues, Giulio Bordon, Guido Heins and Mitja Del Bono, and we looked at two country's cases in this case, Uganda and Nepal. And we wanted to show empirically what are the potential effects of such a global social protection funding mechanism and how can that be a reality?

So we basically looked at how much would it cost to finance the closure of national gaps in social protection floors. And what was very interesting to see is that you have options with the numbers that you have with the data that you have with the projections that you can make, say, okay, how can this become a reality? Is it feasible? Is it possible? And the results showed us that it is possible. Then we can start to think about, okay, if that's the solution, how can we think about further mobilising strategies and how can we ensure that implementation as well as sustainability of social protection investments are viable and they're not far-fetched. Ultimately what I want to emphasise is the need and value of an innovative, collaborative and strategic funding architecture to support nationally owned programmes of social protection because that is the way how they can be effective and efficient for the long term.

**Jo Sharpe:** Thank you. And it's really interesting to hear about that analysis and how it kind of ties in with some of the discussions we had earlier. It's still a long way to go. I think, to build this kind of political support for social protection in a lot of places, but it is really
exciting to hear the support and some of the momentum that it seems to be coming up around international financing architecture, as you've just described.

Thank you Zina for joining us for the Social Protection Podcast today.

**Dr. Zina Nimeh:** Thank you very much for having me. It was nice to be here.

**Jo Sharpe:** Thank you for joining me for the Social Protection Podcast. We are a production of socialprotection.org from the International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth. Follow us on Twitter at [SP_Gateway](https://twitter.com/SP_Gateway) and find us on [Facebook](https://www.facebook.com), [YouTube](https://www.youtube.com), and [LinkedIn](https://www.linkedin.com). Subscribe to this podcast via your favorite podcast provider and leave a review. Back next month. See you then.