Follow-up to questions asked by participants
Nupur Kukrety (CaLP) and Clare O'Brien (OPM)

Responses to questions are grouped according to the theme.

1. ADAPTING SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS FOR HUMANITARIAN CRISES

Q: In countries where there are many SP programmes that sometimes overlap what is the best option for linking them to humanitarian interventions?

This is a big and very relevant question. Inevitably, there is no single ‘best’ option. The DFID two-year research programme on Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems, currently halfway through its study, focuses on exploring this issue. Click here for a link to the project and its outputs (in the ‘Downloads’ tab). Outputs of interest may include:

- The working paper discussing the concepts as to how which social protection systems and humanitarian responses might be linked to respond to shocks; this includes a typology of five mechanisms that are also shown on the slides for this webinar.
- The literature review (in English and French) of global experience in linking social protection and humanitarian assistance.

Do look out for other outputs as we produce them over the next year.

Q: Question for Nupur - Slide on Contexts - Do you have an example of Advanced Contexts where the social assistance systems was used to respond to covariate shocks and expanded horizontally and vertically?

There are unfortunately not many examples on this but the WFP e-voucher programme in Gaza comes close. The e-voucher programme in Gaza was designed to support food insecure households and is aligned with the social protection strategy of the Ministry of Social Welfare of the Palestinian National Authority. During the war in July 2014, this programme was effectively used by WFP in partnership with Oxfam to deliver humanitarian assistance to the affected population in Gaza. As a part of emergency preparedness funded by the UK Department for International Development (DFID), printed vouchers were kept ready by WFP along with a list of approved shops to aid expansion of the programme. In addition, a software was developed to support a vertical and horizontal scale-up in case of crisis. Therefore, within a week of the escalation of violence in 2014, the first cards were distributed and utilised by beneficiaries in Gaza. Before the war approx. 285,000
people were reached through these e-vouchers, however during the war the system increased its capacity to reach over 1 million people. From the regular 60 shops, the system expanded to include 92 shops in all 5 governorates of Gaza during the war, which enabled households to redeem vouchers from anywhere within the Gaza strip. Vertical expansion happened with the utilisation of these e-vouchers by Unicef and other humanitarian agencies to provide hygiene kits and other non food items.

Q: You mentioned that in Kenya the amount defined in the shadow-alignment more was lower than desired by humanitarian actors. I am particularly concerned by impact on desired outcomes when the amount has to be aligned to (poorly defined) amount of the social protection system. Is there robust evidence on that specific programme and its impact?

Yes, a quantitative and qualitative evaluation was done of the Emergency and Food Security Cash Transfer Initiative in one urban informal settlement in Nairobi, Korogocho. The evaluation report (OPM, 2011) is available here. There is a broad issue that cash transfers should have good political traction if they are to be sustained. This doesn't necessarily mean that humanitarian actors have to distribute a particularly low amount in the midst of a crisis. Options might include eg. having a multi-layered transfer whereby it is made clear that one component is to support longer term development and recovery, while an additional top-up is available for a defined period during the crisis.

Q: Do you think the theoretical framework applies to advanced contexts where the relief effort is normally largely led by national disaster management agencies with smaller international aid role, like in Latin America and the Caribbean? Could the tips/toolkit for linking humanitarian assistance with social safety nets be used by government disaster management agencies?

Mozambique is a good example of a country with a strong national disaster management agency which is looking to explore ways of strengthening its links between disaster risk management, humanitarian assistance and social protection. A case study of Mozambique in OPM's Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems research is due out later this year.

Q: I would encourage you to look at insurance as a mechanism of 'vertical expansion' and perhaps 'piggybacking', when plugged on existing government safety nets. http://www.wfp.org/climate-change/innovations/risk-management-insurance-finance

This is an important point and indeed social insurance is a part of national social protection strategies and plans of some countries. Additionally, as suggested by you, specific insurance measures can be added to existing social protection in countries to help people cope better with shocks and stresses. You can find more information on this in the literature review (Page 22-31) of the OPM’s Shock responsive social protection research. http://www.opml.co.uk/sites/default/files/Shock_responsive_social_protection_Literature%20review_EN.pdf

Q: More of a comment: it would seem to me that a key challenge is not simply how to link up humanitarian work with social protection, but also 'when' and 'how' to do so in relation to
specific groups - I'm thinking here of not only specifically disadvantaged groups, but also to those where the assistance has greater immediate multiplier effects (impact).

True `when' and `how' to link humanitarian assistance with social protection is an important challenge. Experiences of humanitarian agencies who have worked on making these links in different humanitarian contexts serve as useful guidance for agencies interested in making such links in the field. CaLP’s guidance note on `Working with cash based safety nets in humanitarian contexts’ draws from such experiences and provides information to humanitarian actors on this issue.

http://www.opml.co.uk/sites/default/files/Shock_responsive_social_protection_Literature%20review_EN.pdf

Q: The options of horizontal and vertical expansion assume that social protection systems continue to operate in times of crisis. This is not necessarily the case. Example: Yemen's Social Welfare Fund. Here, the challenge we are trying to address is how to revive the national social protection system!

The issue of whether social protection systems can stand up to a crisis—and if not, how to strengthen their capacity—is a vital one. In the absence of a functioning social protection system the 'shadow alignment' option mentioned in the typology might be appropriate.

Under that approach, humanitarian agencies / NGOs might set in place an independent response that has some of the attributes of a social protection system (eg. commonly agreed forms for registration and monitoring, perhaps agreement on transfer values or frequency and on payment mechanisms etc.). This might then allow for a smoother transition to a long-term social protection system once the possibility of a transfer became feasible.

Q: Do you have any examples of how vertical and/or horizontal expansion has worked in an actual shock situation?

In 2015 the Government of Kenya triggered the horizontal expansion of its Hunger Safety Net Programme for the first time. A qualitative evaluation of its experiences with the first two payments, in April and May, is available here. The programme temporarily added 90,000 households to its regular caseload for those two months after some parts of northern Kenya, where it operates, were classified as being in ‘Severe’ drought status.

Evaluations of the response to Typhoon Yolanda in the Philippines, which included a vertical expansion (top-up to existing beneficiaries of the government's social protection scheme, the 4Ps) are available here and here.

Q: In the example about Somalia’s CT, there was conflict between the actors over who would take responsibility, can anyone further elaborate on the conflicts that occur in such contexts? Or rather, the clashes of power and interests?

Others may be well placed to provide more details about conflicts between actors in Somalia. In case you haven’t seen them, you may be interested in the final evaluation of the cash and voucher response in South and Central Somalia after the 2011-12 crisis, and some research on the political economy of expanding social protection systems in sub-Saharan Africa.
Q: FYI - the WFP e-voucher scheme in Gaza is a good example of shadow alignment in my view.

WFP’s e-voucher programme in Gaza is a very interesting programme from many perspectives. It is not only a good example of shadow aligned programme but it is also a useful example of vertical expansion. More importantly, the proactive engagement of WFP staff in the development of Ministry of Social Affairs social protection strategy is a good example of the role humanitarian actors can play in framing of national social protection policies and programmes in countries.

Q: In order to design a Piggybacking system you will probably need some information from the MIS and the civil identification system. How is this alignment of strategic objectives in order to guarantee a diverse governance of the program? Is there some methodology to build this governance system?

Indeed, coordination with the department/ministry responsible for information management is essential for piggy backing by using the beneficiary list of an existing social protection programme. Experience suggests that engaging with the department/ministry (and where possible, signing an MoU on this) prior to a crisis is very useful to embark on a speedy response at the time of crisis. Piggybacking the system by using the existing transfer mechanism however does not necessarily involve engaging on MIS. Instead detailed discussions have to be held with the financial service provider. One important issue to be discussed with the financial service provider in such contexts is regarding beneficiary data protection. CaLP’s publication on ‘Protecting beneficiary privacy: Principles and operational standards for the secure use of personal data in cash and e-transfer programmes’ contains some useful information in this regard.


Q: In a political context where social protection is seen as an unuseful expense the piggybacking system is a critical factor to deliver secure information to defend the need of the program. To alleviate suffering we would need to expand the program, then the data should be quite precise and able to justify the expense in social protection. Is there some indicator of sadness or suffering? This is quite hard to measure. The most used indicators are access to food through school lunches, income per capita and access to social services provided by the state. This link between social protection and humanitarian aid is quite complicated.

Indeed, the links between the two are complicated. Cash transfers aren’t the only solution. There are other contexts in which linking other social protection instruments such as free school meals or providing access to social care services will be valuable.
2. WORKING WITH GOVERNMENTS / POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

Q: Do we have any government representatives participating in any of these dialogues and willing to demonstrate how they plan to work with Humanitarian agencies on social protection

Yes, there is quite a lot of discussion among government representatives. On 17-21 May 2016 there was a Community of Practice Cash Transfer conference in Brazzaville, Republic of Congo, for the representatives of 17 governments of Francophone Africa. The topic of how to make the link between social protection initiatives and humanitarian agencies was given considerable attention and evoked much interest. The topic has also been a focus of the World Humanitarian Summit in Istanbul.

Q: Given that Clare O’Brien says that the government might be absent in certain cases, and Nupur Kukrety says the responsibility for social protection lies with the government, can one of the speakers perhaps elaborate a bit on the interaction that takes place between these two actors in an emergency situation?

Humanitarian crises happen in a range of contexts. While government systems are strong in some contexts, they may be either weak or absent in some other contexts. The nature and extent of engagement with the government on social protection will depend on the context of the crisis. Social Protection is primarily the responsibility of the government therefore engaging with the government on linking humanitarian response with social protection is extremely important. In contexts where the government is absent or weak, humanitarian agencies could consider developing shadow aligned or standalone humanitarian programmes that can be linked with social protection in future. The recent guidance note from CaLP on working with cash based safety nets provides detailed practical guidance to humanitarian actors on linking humanitarian cash based programmes with cash based safety nets in 3 different contexts (i.e advanced, intermediate and basic). This document can be found here: http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/library/862-working-with-cash-based-safety-nets-in-humanitarian-contexts-guidance-note-for-humanitarian-practitioners?keywords=working+with+cash+based+safety+nets&region=all&country=all&year=all&organisation=all&sector=all&modality=all&language=all&payment_method=all&document_type=all&searched=1&pSection=resources&pTitle=library

Q: Question: do we consider humanitarian assistance recipients to have a right to assistance? and if so, how does such a right (or lack thereof) work with the national legislation regarding social protection (e.g., not all states follow a rights based approach for social protection)
This is a good question and highlights one of the main challenges that are encountered while making the links between humanitarian assistance and social protection. Social protection is a human right and therefore everyone in the country must benefit from social protection provisions. However, the reality is often different. Lack of adequate depth and coverage of social protection renders many people vulnerable to humanitarian crisis. Yes, the people affected by crisis have a right to assistance, therefore for linking humanitarian assistance with existing social protection system the first question to check if the basic conditions for making the links exist. If these basic conditions do not exist then making this link (atleast in the first phase of the crisis) may not be the most appropriate way to provide humanitarian assistance. In case the basic conditions exist then the level, type and time of engagement with social protection system would be determined by the context of operation. Refer to the guidance note developed by CaLP (link provided in the response to the previous question).

Q: it would be good to explore how we can invest in social protection systems to make them more resilient in times of crisis. The work shouldn't start only after the shock occurs...

Absolutely. You may be interested to see the World Bank study and toolkit (2013) on 'Building Resilience to Disaster and Climate Change through Social Protection', which has several resources on this theme.

Q: Existing delivery systems are often small in scale, heavily fragmented and designed for different beneficiary groups. How can these be utilized?

In many cases humanitarian agencies are grouping themselves together to provide a joint response to a crisis, including through common delivery mechanisms. Some governments are also moving to reduce fragmentation among their own social protection systems by bringing them together under one umbrella where appropriate, such as the National Safety Nets Programme in Kenya which is improving harmonisation of four cash transfer programmes.

Often, organisations that are delivering cash transfer responses (eg. payment providers) will be keen to expand. However, sometimes they prefer to stay small so that their organisational capacity is not overwhelmed, and so that they are able to continue to serve their usual (non-emergency) customers. Also, there may be benefits in retaining a variety of delivery systems to enable beneficiaries to receive support in the way most convenient to them, and to avoid monopolies.

Q: Drought is the main slow-onset shock. It means it makes less effective the cash transfers, but how is this trigger between the authorization of the disbursements and the climate change factors? Is there a way to predict a drought to integrate with the disbursement system?

There are various ways that you can use an index to trigger the authorisation of the disbursement by looking at climate change factors. For example, Kenya’s Hunger Safety Net Programme uses a Vegetation Condition Index that has different thresholds of severity, triggering different levels of payment. The operational manual [here](#) explains how it works.

Cash transfers aren't necessarily less effective in a drought situation, as it is possible to have long-term cash transfers which may help households to reduce their vulnerability.
Q: What are the policy or practice challenges that humanitarians face when trying to make linkages with the social protection sector in developing countries?

Some of the challenges of making linkages between humanitarian actors and the social protection sector are summarised in this concept note and in the literature review on global experiences of shock-responsive social protection.

Q: My question is - how to "scale-down" transition in the recovery phase from emergency interventions to long-term SP standard interventions - humanitarians often do already face challenges to identify when to transition out post/ in long-term complex disaster contexts - so programme options/ strategy guidance around this - in particular adjustment based on revised targeting criteria that support recovery

Indeed humanitarian actors face challenges to scale down in complex disaster contexts and usually this challenge arises because alignment and coordination with existing long term development programmes has not been well thought through at the time of designing and implementing humanitarian response. Though the context of the crisis is a big determinant, an early identification of areas of convergence and consideration of making links with existing programmes is helpful.

3. COLLABORATION BETWEEN HUMANITARIAN & SOCIAL PROTECTION PRACTITIONERS, TOOLS/RESOURCES

Q: Is there a similar Guide for Social Protection practitioners, with considerations relevant for them when designing or updating their systems to be more flexible and responsive?

As part of OPM's Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems research we are in discussion at the moment with several people about the nature of a guidance note or toolkit that we might be able to develop in the light of our findings. Such a toolkit may be available towards the end of the year. One option is to provide guidance for social protection practitioners as you suggest. Do stay in touch with the research team for more information in the coming months.

Q: Listed under the Strategic Challenges in Figure 3 of the Humanitarian practitioner guidance notes: "Perceptions among long term development practitioners on the role of humanitarian actors in social protection and perception among humanitarian actors on their role in social protection". What is being done to address this discrepancy? What can be done to reduce competition/strengthen collaboration between development and humanitarian practitioners given that they are both highly supportive of cash transfers and often play overlapping role?

This is a good question and perhaps something for all of us to reflect on. This webinar (and the following series) is an attempt in this direction and aims to initiate dialogue between humanitarian actors and development practitioners. CaLP is currently working on a strategy which includes efforts to enhance awareness among humanitarian actors on social protection and their potential role in different contexts, creating platforms for greater interactions between a range of stakeholders etc.
Q: What is the value-added or the tools that humanitarians can offer to SP sector for better designed SP?

Over the past decade, great strides have been made by humanitarian actors with regard to innovation in cash transfer programming. Some areas where humanitarian actors have a clear added value are;

- Innovative ways to deliver cash at speed to people even in remote and conflict affected areas. This includes making the internal systems more agile and working with private sector service providers;
- Accountability systems that enable the participation of affected communities in providing feedback on the programme functioning;
- Design of flexible programmes that can link different types of cash transfers eg. Linking unconditional cash grants to save lives in the first phase with recovery activities such as livelihoods promotion, calculating the value of transfer to meet a range of needs etc.
- Market analysis and monitoring to check the relevance and appropriateness of the support etc.
- Early warning systems that can be effectively linked with social protection to enable timely expansion

4. REFUGEE CONTEXTS/ CONFLICT / FRAGILE STATES

Q: Among the 5 different strategies that have been presented do you think there is one of them that would be particularly appropriate to expand national SP systems targeting host communities to expand and cover refugees communities? (any difference is case of camp or non-camp settlement?)

Specialised UN agencies are responsible for ensuring that the needs of the refugee population is met in the host country. While designing their humanitarian programmes, these UN agencies can consider any of the 5 programme options mentioned during the webinar. Some suggestions on how this can be done are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme Option</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vertical expansion</td>
<td>If the system is already being used to deliver humanitarian assistance to refugees, then a vertical expansion is possible by adding a top up to the existing assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horizontal expansion</td>
<td>In close coordination with the host country government new case load comprising refugees can be added to an existing social protection system. This horizontal expansion could be enabled to access all provisions within the existing SP system or just a select few provisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piggybacking</td>
<td>Existing social assistance delivery mechanism can be used to deliver humanitarian assistance to refugee population by the humanitarian agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contexts where the refugee situation is unlikely to be resolved soon, it is possible to design a humanitarian response programme that aligns with the existing social protection system in the host country. In future, such design can be used to influence the social protection provisions to host populations. This programme option may not be appropriate for supporting refugee population.

The options presented above are simplistic and in practice, extending social protection to refugees can be very challenging. Challenges could range from operational issues such as mismatch of design to political such as host population resentment particularly in contexts where the poor are not adequately supported by the country’s social protection system.

**Q:** Vertical and horizontal expansion are often not options in the case of large refugee inflows - e.g. refugees from Syria in Jordan. As refugees, they are not eligible for social protection systems that cater to Jordanian citizens.

Refer to the response above. Cannot comment on the specific context in Jordan but the bread subsidy (population wide price control of bread) in many middle east countries is a form of social protection which facilitates the access to a basic food item for all residents (citizens, migrants and refugees) in the country.

**Q:** To your knowledge, are there examples of social protection systems with horizontal scale up to include refugees? or migrants?

Unfortunately, there are not many documented examples in developing countries of horizontal scale up of social protection systems to include refugees. The needs of refugees are covered by UNHCR (and UNRWA in case of Palestine refugees). For example in Lebanon, UNHCR has entered into an agreement with the Lebanese government that allows Syrian refugees to access Lebanese health services at subsidies rates. The Hunger Safety Net Programme in Kenya is designed to support people who constantly move within northern Kenya. Some developed countries offer migrants limited access to some social protection provisions. For example, legal migrants in the UK can access health as well as education services free of charge and migrants from the EU member states can claim child benefit in the UK.

**Q:** Linking humanitarian aid to social assistance social thought an analyses of refugees productive inclusion could be a way to do it?

Options for linking humanitarian aid for refugees with social assistance depend a lot on the context. Indeed some contexts may allow for refugees’ productive inclusion that can help with linking humanitarian assistance with social assistance.
Q: Which programme options are viable in fragile contexts where government social protection systems are rudimentary

Fragile contexts where government social protection systems are rudimentary, humanitarian agencies may want to check whether the problem is chronic in nature that necessitates a longer term or sustained presence of humanitarian actors. In such cases, a shadow aligned programme could be designed as a part of humanitarian programming that lays the foundation of a future social protection programme. This context is referred as ‘basic’ context in CaLP’s guidance note on linking cash based safety nets with humanitarian cash transfer programmes. It may be noted that all fragile contexts may not be appropriate for linking humanitarian programming with social protection and for that reason a standalone humanitarian programme may be most appropriate. Refer to detailed guidance for ‘Basic’ context in CaLP’s guidance note on working with cash based safety nets in humanitarian contexts.

Q: In the context of Boko Haram Conflict area of north east Nigeria were we have so many INGO engaged in cash transfer programming. Do you think Government in this area should pick up the programme as part of her social protection strategy for the next years now that peace is gradually returning so as to allow the INGO concentrate on more pressing resilient and development issues. Remember the Federal Government is designing a programme to pay the very poor some stipend which is captured in the current fiscal year 2016 national budget.

I'm afraid I don't know Nigeria at all but have checked with colleagues who work there. I understand that there isn't yet a national cash transfer scheme that could take over the caseload. As a more general observation, I would say that governments are often keen to introduce social protection programmes, including cash transfers, in post-conflict contexts as this can improve their visibility if they are returning to an area that they have not reached for a while. On the other hand, if a conflict is still in progress, there can be challenges with neutrality and with the selection of the most needy beneficiaries if a government is party to a conflict or has difficulty accessing some areas. The Government of Mali is starting to extend its routine cash transfer programme to the northern regions this year as the peace agreement takes hold, following the conflict of 2012 onwards. You may be interested to follow developments there as an example.

5. OPM STUDY – QUESTIONS& SUGGESTIONS

Q: I am surprised to see that no Ebola affected country is part of the OPM study; that crisis has seriously affected all levels of existing structures and it would have been a perfect setting to test the proposed models.

You're right that it would be very interesting to test these models in an Ebola-affected country. We spent some time considering this during the inception phase of the research. We decided not to include responses to epidemics as part of the case studies owing to the fact that the response is largely undertaken by health authorities rather than social protection authorities; and developing a separate frame of analysis for the health sector would have been beyond our available resources at
this stage. If you are able to undertake a similar analysis in an Ebola-affected country we’d be very pleased to see the results.

Q: A pity that there are no countries from the Middle East and North Africa among the case studies under the DFID-OPM research programme. There are interesting lessons to be learned here! Are there other ways in which we can feed in experiences?

The two types of crisis that we decided not to cover in the Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems research were health epidemics (for the reasons cited above) and refugee contexts, because the response by the international community uses an entirely different system. As much of the middle east has been in the midst of its emergency support to refugees for the duration of the research we decided not to undertake a case study in the region at this stage. If you have experiences from the region about using national social protection systems to support refugees it would be great to hear of it—perhaps in a future webinar?