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Country Situation - Belize

- Population: 368,000 (2015 Est.)
- Territory: 22,966 Km²
- Official Language: English
- Population Structure (Est.):
  - Mestizo 53%
  - Creole 26%
  - Maya 11%
  - Garifuna 6%
  - East-Indian 4%
  - Mennonite 3%
Country Situation - Belize

Country Situation - Belize

Water and Sanitation

96.0% Of household members have access to improved water sources

87.1% Of household members have access to improved sanitation facilities
Country Situation - Belize

Child Development MICS5

Percentage of children age 36-59 months who are developmentally on track for indicated domains

- Literacy-Numeracy: 52.5%
- Physical: 96.8%
- Social-Emotional: 76.9%
- Learning: 93.3%
- ECDI: 82.5%

UNICEF for every child
Country Situation - Belize

Violent Discipline

Percentage of children age 2-14 years who experience violent discipline

- 2015: 65.1%
- 2011: 70.5%

Violent discipline includes both psychological aggression and physical punishment.

Boys are only slightly more likely to experience violent discipline compared with girls.

26% of respondents believe that a child needs to be physically punished.

Above National Level (MICS4)

- Belize: 75.9%
- Stann Creek: 74.8%
- Toledo: 81.4%
- Creole: 80.0%
- Maya: 78.5%
- Garifuna: 77.8%
Country Situation - Belize

Figure 5. Poverty in Belize, 2002 and 2009

- Hholds 2002: 76% poverty, 17% indigent, 8% poor, 85% not poor
- Hholds 2009: 69% poverty, 21% indigent, 10% poor, 80% not poor
- Population 2002: 67% poverty, 23% indigent, 11% poor, 76% not poor
- Population 2009: 59% poverty, 26% indigent, 16% poor, 68% not poor
Why the Need to Map the Social Protection System in Belize?

• Highly fragmented delivery of social services targeting different populations and at different stages
• Social Programmes reactive rather than preventive
• Social Protection spending amounts to less that 2% of GDP
• Conditional Cash Transfer Programme – BOOST targeting poorest communities (PMT based) – low coverage, high administration cost
• Issues with administrative efficiency and effectiveness
• Interest on the part of the Ministry of Human Development, Social Transformation and Poverty Alleviation
Pre-requisites for a Successful Mapping

- A strong buy-in from the national government counterparts
- A national strategic framework within which to place the mapping process
- A multi-stakeholder endorsement for the process
- A well-developed system for data collection
- An early commitment from Ministry of Finance and/or Economic Development
- Mechanisms for quality control of data and systems
- A multi-sectorial coordination mechanism
- A strong team of national and international experts
- A well developed, concise and comprehensive Terms of Reference, with clear reference to the expected results and how those will be used to strengthen the system overall
Thank You
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CODI Belize Results
Purpose of the exercise

• **Strengthen the national social protection system** to better respond to the needs of people, families and children in Belize.

• This process requires a comprehensive, step-by-step approach that aims to **fill existing information gaps and provide guidance and information to complement key policy reforms** in the sector.
  • These are expected to lead towards an integrated social protection system, one that is capable of effectively addressing multiple vulnerabilities through a mix of gender and age sensitive, equity focused policies and interventions (transfers, services, programmes etc.)
CODI Questionnaire – Module 2 and 3 – Programme Design and Implementation

49 projects and programmes for Belize were identified. The following 12 – representing the life cycle approach - were selected for applying the CODI tool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOOST</td>
<td>Cash transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td>In kind transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Subsidy</td>
<td>Cash transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB-Contributory Pension</td>
<td>Contributory Pension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB-Non-Contributory Pension</td>
<td>Non-Contributory Pension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Finance Programme</td>
<td>Microfinance for agriculture and off farm activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HECOPAB</td>
<td>Health, Education and Community Participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB programme</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health</td>
<td>Maternal &amp; Child Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSB</td>
<td>National Health Insurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roving Care Givers</td>
<td>Early childhood development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVTP</td>
<td>TVET training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme</td>
<td>Life cycle (age groups)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOOST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Pantry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-contributory pension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributory pension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belize Rural Finance Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school subsidy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVTP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Education and Community Participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau (HECOPAB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BZE Tuberculosis (TB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and Child Health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roving Caregivers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Grouping the assessed programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TRANSFER SCHEMES</th>
<th></th>
<th>SERVICE DELIVERY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>BOOST</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FOODPANTRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SECONDARY SCHOOL SUBSIDY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>SSB CONTRIBUTORY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>SSBNOCON</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>RURAL FINANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>HECOPAB &amp; CHW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>TB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>MOTHER AND CHILD HEALTH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>SSB NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>ITVET</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>ROV. CAREGIVERS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CODI System Assessment Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Inclusiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Adequacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Respect for Rights &amp; Dignity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Institucional Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Financial &amp; Fiscal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sustainability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Coherence &amp; Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Responsiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Cost-effectiveness (optional)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive Compatibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (optional)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example for generic assessment level definitions

- Criteria: **Inclusiveness**
- Area: Coverage of non-contributory SP
  - Rank 1 (VERY WEAK/LATENT): **Coverage** of overall target population (as defined nationally) across the life cycle through non-contributory programs is very low.
  - Rank 2 (WEAK): **Coverage** of the target population (as defined nationally) across the life cycle through non-contributory programs is low.
  - Rank 3 (MODERATE): **Coverage** of the target population (as defined nationally) across the life cycle through non-contributory programs reaches a majority of the target population.
  - Rank 4 (STRONG/ADVANCED): **Coverage** of the target population (as defined by the nationally) across the life cycle through non-contributory programs is high.
### Assessment rating levels are being described qualitatively in the country assessment report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment criteria</th>
<th>All programmes</th>
<th>Transfer programme(s)</th>
<th>Service programme(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Rights &amp; Dignity</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Institutional Capacity</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial &amp; Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence &amp; Integration</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Weak (2)</td>
<td>Moderate (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment criteria</td>
<td>Programme group</td>
<td>CODI average performance levels (scale 1 to 4)</td>
<td>Comparison between programme groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All (A)</td>
<td>Transfer (T)</td>
<td>Service (S)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column (C:) A</td>
<td>C: B</td>
<td>C: C</td>
<td>C: D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Rights &amp; Dignity</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Institutional Capacity</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial &amp; Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence &amp; Integration</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Overall comparative implementation performance SP Belize 2016, grouped by assessment criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ALL PROGRAMMES</th>
<th>TRANSFERS</th>
<th>SERVICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Rights &amp; Dignity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance &amp; Institutional Capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial &amp; Fiscal Sustainability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence &amp; Integration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Main**  
areas for improvement
CODI Belize Conclusions and Recommendations
Main findings

• STRENGTHS
  • High level of domestic financing
  • Modern structure for expenditure budget classification

• LIMITATIONS
  • In general
    • Weak information sharing between programs and across sectors. Stakeholder involvement and policy coordination sector bound but not across sectors.
  • Transfer schemes
    • Low coverage; minimal redistribution effects; non consolidated legal bases; staff suffers lack of resources for adequate implementation; lack of preparedness for shock situations
  • Service delivery
    • Adjustments of expenditure composition to population needs can be improved; weak legal basis for entitlements; weak updating of statistics for evidence based policy making
Lessons from the MSPF perspective for Belize

• There is a need for increased support / incentives for income security

• Consider the possibility of:
  • Fiscal pact for SP
  • Protected minimum budget guarantees for SP
  • Working in SP planning not only with targets but as well with required minimum achievements (benchmarks)

• Coherence and coordination require improvement: consider alternatively bottom up and/or top down systems
Strategic recommendations

• Design of a **SP strategy** and its operational elements

• Strategic recommendation: For ensuring future progress in expanding SP in Belize it is important to have a **clear definition of what social protection means in the country and what is its scope**, as well as the rationale for selecting priority programmes.

• A SP strategy capture the sector's main priorities and actions.

• It clearly defines roles and responsibilities of the different institutions

• It can also be the basis of legislation pieces to formalize and recognize key entitlements.

• CODI results provided insights for possible strategic entry points for strengthening and consolidating SP in Belize
Operational recommendations

• **Clarity in programme operations**: Very few of the revised programmes and services have operation manuals and clarity in their overall functioning,
  • consider developing clear operations manuals for priority programmes and stating clearly the mechanisms for key interventions to complement each other

• **Defining legal bases**: From a rights based approach position having a clear and strong legal base for SP programmes is a basic requirement for a country.
  • Even of all revised SP programmes do have some normative base, almost none of the SP activities are anchored in law. Anchoring priority SP activities should be a priority for the country
CODI Implementation Experience
Operational aspects of CODI implementation

• Relevant stakeholders and Steering Committee identified and established by the government (MHDSTPA)
  • Steering committee members: MHDSTPA, National Council on Aging, Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education, Labour Department, Gender commission, SSB.
• CODI assessment team of 4 consultants: 2 international (SP experts) and 2 national (for data collection)
• We did not adapt the CODI questionnaires (since we did not know in advance which information we would find)
• We did not pre-populate the questionnaires before addressing the government (but it would have been a good idea indeed)
Operational aspects of CODI implementation

- We completed as well CODI Module 1 -policy and legal framework (it is in the report but not in this ppt).
- Main areas of improvement identified through the numerical exercise shown in this presentation
- Recommendations and lessons learnt are the results of the discussion with the Steering Committee which we met 3 times: at the beginning of the exercise, after the draft report and for the final report (which was then complemented again).
Main outcomes for Belize

- **Institutional structure:** Social Protection Committee established in 2015. Guiding the Social Protection System assessment was one of its first tasks.
  - Outcomes of the SPS review and the CODI exercise provided quality inputs for the deliberative work of the Social Protection Committee.
  - The committee’s consolidation is the main outcome regarding the strengthening of the SP institutional structure.
  - The (unofficial but recognized) leading role of the MHDSTPA in the SP sector and its policy debate processes has been (unofficially) reconfirmed and strengthened.

- **Policy Framework:** Improved and progressed discussion on Social Protection concepts and considerations regarding the need for a Social Protection Strategy.

- **Roadmap to strengthen social protection:** The production the SPS review report, includes technical elements that have guided the processes and discussions of the Social Protection Committee. The committee uses this process and the report’s content for moving forward towards the definition of an eventual SP strategy.
Positive elements – *What worked well?*

- **The inventory table:** All stakeholders regarded CODI’s inventory table as valuable as it compiles key information on the country’s SP programmes. It offers a quick snapshot of programmes that can illustrate what exists in a given country.

- **Government ownership:** There was a gradual process for government to learn more about CODI. This was achieved thanks to a first initial inception discussion, and then with frequent follow up meetings.
Challenges – *What didn’t work well and why?*

- **Questionnaires:**
  - Implementers found questionnaires too long. Programmatic and finance data, was difficult to gather, or non-available.
  - Filling in the questionnaires was a time consuming task and many of the government counterparts didn’t have much time to support this task.

- **Capacities to apply the questionnaires:**
  - Given CODI’s emerging nature, national consultants and ECI team did not have a full training for CODI tailored data collection. This implied an on the job training implementation. Understanding the questions and filling the questionnaire was not easy.

- **Policy Framework**
  - It would be helpful for the CODI exercise if a “general policy framework for a social protection system" existed. Since there is no such strategy yet in Belize, there was a missing guiding piece of work because it would have helped to assess the institutional and policy information recollected.
The process of assessing the system

• The overall process of the CODI implementation was implemented in four stages
  • Data recollection
  • Desk based assessment
  • Validation of the assessment with the line ministries and institutions who had provided the information for the CODI questionnaire
  • Re-assessment and adjustment to ratings and their qualifications after the validation exercise

• The validation exercise became a key activity of the CODI exercise. SP programme implementers were much more critical than the consultants regarding the implementation performance of their activities (1/4 or our ratings downgraded by government officials)
CODI’s value added

• The set of priority SP programmes assessed for the Belizean report reflects the use of a life cycle approach for SP policies.

• Non-universal coverage and some targeting issues imply that Belize does not have a full minimum social protection floor.

• The German Friedrich Ebert Foundation estimates that Belize would have to invest between additional 1.3 to 4.7% of their GDP (in income and health care security) in order to achieve a Minimum Social Protection Floor.
  • The country however does not have any fiscal space for increasing social expenditure.
  • CODI findings however can help to identify spaces of action for improving SP outcomes that to not require considerable additional expenditure.
CODI’s value added

• CODI findings suggest that there is a need for:
  • Improving inclusiveness of transfer programmes
  • Consider the conceptual update for the design of some service delivery programmes
  • Improve financial and coherence/integrative aspects of service delivery
  • Improve the responsiveness of transfer programmes

• Such activities offer opportunities for improving effectiveness of existing programmes (making them more pro poor) but would not resolve the problems of coverage and targeting.
CODI’s value added

• Additional effectiveness of existing programs could be achieved through internal adjustments to make them perform better (following CODI assessment findings) but would not be sufficient to fully accomplish a MSPF.

• CODI findings suggests that the main thematic areas for adjustments are achieving a higher coherence and integration of transfer programmes into the SP system and improving the adequacy of services, improved governance and institutional capacity and a higher respect of rights and dignity aspects for SP programmes which are delivering mostly services (and not transfers) to the population.
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