



LINKING SOCIAL PROTECTION AND HUMANITARIAN CASH AND VOUCHER ASSISTANCE

HUMANITARIAN OUTCOMES

April 2020

CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	4
Executive Summary	5
1 Report rationale	7
2 Overview – ‘State of the Art’ on linking humanitarian cash and vouchers to social protection	7
2.1 Key concepts	7
2.2 Key drivers and evolution of the rationale for linking CVA and SP	9
2.3 Linking humanitarian CVA to SP – Country contexts	11
2.4 Policy and programming considerations	15
2.4.1 Legal and policy frameworks	15
2.4.2 Governance and coordination	15
2.4.3 Information management and data protection	16
2.4.4 Delivery mechanisms, modalities, and complementarity	17
2.4.5 Coverage, eligibility, and targeting criteria	17
2.4.6 Setting transfer type, level, frequency, and duration	18
2.4.7 Early warning, early action, and forecast-based financing	18
2.4.8 Risk layering and disaster risk financing	18
2.5 Reflections	19
2.5.1 Political economy	19
2.5.2 Clarifying the objectives of different actors	20
2.5.3 Gender	20
2.5.4 Age and disability	21
2.5.5 Transformative as well as protective	22
3 Conclusion	22
4 Annexes	23
Annex I – Objectives, scope, and focus of consultancy (from TORs)	23
Annex II – Abbreviation list	24
Annex III – Glossary	25
Annex IV – Key Informant Interview list	27
Annex V – Commitments to link humanitarian CVA and SP in high-level multilateral agreements	28
Annex VI – Unbundled visualisation/Country context typology visualisation	29
Annex VII – Protection or Social Protection?	31
Annex VIII – Key resources	33
Annex IX – Bibliography	38



HIGH-LEVEL BRIEFING PAPER – PART 1

LINKING SOCIAL PROTECTION AND HUMANITARIAN CASH AND VOUCHER ASSISTANCE

HUMANITARIAN OUTCOMES

April 2020

**Daniel Longhurst, Paul Harvey, Rachel Sabates-Wheeler,
and Rachel Slater**



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report has been commissioned by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) and was generously funded by the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO).

The study was developed by a Humanitarian Outcomes team, consisting of Daniel Longhurst, Paul Harvey, Rachel Slater and Rachel Sabates-Wheeler with support from CaLP staff, including Julie Lawson-McDowall, Martin Pittman, and Ruth McCormack and Gabrielle Smith (independent consultant). The objective of this report was to provide a high-level briefing paper on linking humanitarian cash and voucher assistance to social protection through a concise summary of discussions and a 'state of the art' review of key concepts, drivers, country contexts and policy and programming considerations. We are grateful to the many key informants and survey participants whose time, ideas and experiences have contributed to the development of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

There is a growing momentum and body of work around the idea of developing stronger links between humanitarian cash and voucher assistance (CVA) and social protection (SP). This Briefing Paper for CaLP, based on a literature review, a survey, and interviews, is intended to inform CaLP's overall approach in this area, and subsequently its capacity building and technical assistance work. We examine the different contexts in which efforts are being made to link CVA and SP, the good practices evolving out of these contexts, and the complexity of operating in crisis contexts. A second part of the work, internal to CaLP, provides capacity-building recommendations in this area.

THE CASE FOR LINKAGES

Linking CVA to SP is appealing for a number of reasons. The benefits include enhancing the comprehensiveness, coverage and adequacy of SP systems and programmes. It offers the prospect that stronger SP systems could provide more effective assistance to people in crises, help to make people more resilient to shocks, and reduce the need for humanitarian assistance. This in turn can contribute to state-building, strengthen the social contract and make states less fragile, and facilitate the adaptation of humanitarian assistance in protracted crises to help build nascent social protection systems. However, evidence for these impacts remains sparse.

Change is certainly needed given that social assistance provision in crises is deeply problematic. Too many people in need are getting no assistance, or assistance that is unreliable or irregular. This stems from a number of factors: an insufficiency of funding in many contexts; the inappropriateness of using humanitarian aid *in lieu of formal social assistance* to address chronic needs in protracted crises; too little development financing in fragile contexts; and multiple types of exclusion faced by vulnerable people. Moreover, there is often a lack of clarity about how both humanitarian and development aid actors should build national ownership whilst respecting humanitarian principles and recognising the limitations of states.

The conditions for linkages between CVA and SP have become more conducive due to increasingly shared global and national objectives, a clear overlap in target populations, shared modalities (especially cash), and the growing coverage of SP programmes. A weakness of the literature that links CVA to SP has been that whilst the theoretical case for stronger links was clear, practical examples were thin on the ground. This has changed with the emergence of a richer and more varied body of experience from which to draw lessons – from places as varied as the Caribbean, the Sahel, Turkey, Yemen, and the Philippines.

FRAMEWORKS AND THEORY

There are two dominant frameworks guiding work in this area. First, the framework of Adaptive Social Protection (ASP) considers how links between disaster risk management, climate change adaptation (CCA), and social protection can reduce the impact of shocks and stressors on peoples' livelihoods and build resilience. Second, the concept of Shock-Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) provides a framework and typology for thinking through the different ways in which CVA and SP can be linked through the categories of horizontal and vertical expansion, piggybacking, alignment, and design tweaks. For the purposes of trying to advance programming and identify gaps and risks, in this paper we move away from categories and look at how the frameworks have been operationally applied in different contexts.

The debate about linking CVA and SP is part of the wider and long-running discussion about ways to link relief and development. The terminology of this debate has covered a number of different concepts, from linking relief to development, to 'the continuum', resilience, and most recently 'the nexus', but underpinning it all have been calls for stronger cooperation between international humanitarian and development actors and disaster-affected states and civil society. A core problem with this long debate has been that it tends to assume that stronger linkages are both right and achievable amongst different parties, assuming the right concept and technical solutions can be devised. But if this is the case, then the literature largely fails to explain why it has been so difficult to make happen in practice, and tends to elide the fundamental differences in principle, approach, and ways of working that have made linkages difficult.

For our present discussion, at the heart of these differences are divergent ways of thinking about the role of the state. Social protection has a strong focus on supporting states to provide social assistance and other forms of support to their citizens as part of a wider social contract; yet, humanitarian action has tended to require some critical distance from states to preserve humanitarian principles and act as a provider of last resort in a crisis when the state is overwhelmed, complicit, or lacks control over its territory. From this arise equally important and divergent issues around coordination, funding streams, technical tools, partnership arrangements, and so forth.

FINDINGS: THE NEED FOR CAUTION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR CAPACITY BUILDING

The overall argument we make in this paper is that whilst linking CVA and SP holds much promise and has introduced interesting programmatic innovation, there is a need for greater caution in assuming it is always a good idea regardless of context. Actors need to make more nuanced decisions about whether, how, and in what circumstances it is desirable to more strongly link SP and CVA, and what this means for the right balance of development and humanitarian instruments in different places.

This way of looking at the challenge also applies to what is needed in terms of training and capacity building. So far, this has largely been approached from a technical standpoint – what is needed is to train social protection actors to do a better job of factoring in risk and planning for crisis, and to train humanitarian actors to be alert to opportunities to link with longer-term social assistance. Some of the technical challenges and proposed solutions are examined in this Briefing Paper. These include legal and policy instruments and governance and coordination mechanisms, the live and heated debate around targeting methodologies, the data protection challenges arising from the harmonisation of information management systems, the opportunities emerging for risk financing and management, and linking preparedness, early warning and early action, including through forecast-based approaches. We also consider a stronger gender dimension in programming, including through connection to other sectors and services in complementary programming that links cash services and other forms of assistance.

However, some of the challenges in deciding whether and how to link CVA and SP are not amenable to technical fixes. People cannot only be trained to come up with the right technical solutions but need to be equipped with the right ethical frameworks, policy acumen, and analytical skills to navigate dilemmas and make informed choices about how to engage. Issues that are under-represented in existing literature and training from the humanitarian side include:

- How should aid actors navigate tensions between principles? Can and should social assistance in conflicts be neutral, impartial and independent? Can humanitarian actors maintain commitments to humanitarian principles whilst working with government run social assistance?
- Is it possible to link social protection and humanitarian cash in places not controlled by governments? Would that imply international aid actors working with rebel and non-state armed groups and is that feasible given current anti-terrorism legislation? What responsibilities do governments have for the well-being of citizens in areas that they do not control?
- The politics of expansion in refugee contexts. Can and should humanitarian agencies persuade and support government to include refugees in national systems? And conversely how do governments make choices about whether or not to be more inclusive without over-committing themselves?

Therefore, we suggest that as well as developing operational skills, capacity building needs to focus on equipping people with the right soft skills to navigate dilemmas and make informed, often strategic judgements to develop context-specific approaches to social protection in crises. This includes a fuller range of training and technical assistance that comprise secondments, coaching, and broader peer-to-peer learning approaches that will be needed to encourage a principled meeting of minds between development and humanitarian actors, and potentially new partnerships to deliver these.

I REPORT RATIONALE

At the end of 2019, the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) commissioned Humanitarian Outcomes (HO)¹ to produce a High-Level Briefing Paper on linking humanitarian cash and voucher assistance (hereafter CVA) to social protection (hereafter SP), and to provide internal recommendations to CaLP on how to develop its capacity-building work in this area.

The High-Level Briefing Paper was created through research comprising three methodologies: a desk-based literature review (see Annex VIII for the bibliography), key informant interviews (KIIs, see Annex IV for a list of contacts), and an online survey. It aims to provide a concise summary of discussions around linking CVA to SP, as well as the current 'state of art' on the topic. The paper begins with a short overview of the key concepts and a review of their emergence and evolution.² The paper goes on to situate the CVA/SP linkage in relation to a number of country contexts, and then presents a series of priority policy and programme areas. Finally, key reflections are provided that highlight possible gaps and risks in the thinking and approaches to date. Throughout, we include findings and reflections from the KIIs.

The topic of linking CVA to SP cuts across different disciplines: humanitarian assistance (HA), disaster risk management (DRM), social protection (SP), and to a certain extent also climate change adaptation (CCA). It concerns different groups within these areas – international development practitioners, government staff, researchers, NGOs, civil society workers, and people and communities affected by humanitarian crises. They all have different levels of awareness of the topic and differing capacity-building needs. As this paper cannot cover all aspects in detail, or speak to all audiences equally, in each section we signpost the reader to further resources and attempt to focus on key themes.

2 OVERVIEW – 'STATE OF THE ART' ON LINKING HUMANITARIAN CASH AND VOUCHERS TO SOCIAL PROTECTION

2.1 KEY CONCEPTS

To date, the literature and practice linking CVA to SP has been informed primarily by two areas of research: Adaptive Social Protection and Shock-Responsive Social Protection.

'**Adaptive Social Protection**' (ASP) considers how links between the DRM, CCA, and SP sectors can reduce the impact of stressors, shocks, and crises on vulnerable households and communities (Davies et al., 2009; Vincent and Cull, 2012). '**Shock-Responsive Social Protection**' (SRSP) (O'Brien et al., 2018b) takes a narrower look at the links between the SP and DRM sectors (including humanitarian assistance, hereafter HA). This approach 'focuses on shocks that affect a large proportion of the population simultaneously (covariate shocks). It encompasses the adaptation of routine social protection programmes and systems to cope with changes in context and demand following large- scale shocks. This can be ex-ante by building shock-responsive systems, plans and partnerships in advance of a shock to better prepare for emergency response; or ex-post, to support households once the shock has occurred. In this way, social protection can complement and support other emergency response interventions' (O'Brien et al., 2018a, p. 7). SRSP is broken down into five categories: vertical and horizontal expansion, piggybacking, alignment, and design tweaks. An explanation of each can be found in the glossary in Annex III. Other institutions have developed interrelated definitions.³

¹ A multi-institutional team comprising Paul Harvey (Humanitarian Outcomes), Rachel Sabates-Wheeler (IDS), Rachel Slater (University of Wolverhampton – CIDT) and Daniel Longhurst (independent consultant).

² More detailed conceptual work can be found at: OPM (www.opml.co.uk/projects/shock-responsive-social-protection-systems), SPaN (<https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sp-nexus/wiki/guidance-package-span-resources>), the World Bank (www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sahel-adaptive-social-protection-program-trust-fund#5), IDS (www.ids.ac.uk/files/dmfile/ASPGuidanceNotes_FINAL.pdf), and TRANSFORM (forthcoming) – www.socialprotection.org/institutions/transform

³ Such as 'climate responsive social protection' (Kuriakose et al., 2013) and 'social protection across the humanitarian – development nexus' (Cherrier et al., 2019). ASP has been recently further elaborated by the World Bank's work since 2014 under the Sahel Adaptive Social Protection programme, which focuses on two interlinked pillars of building household resilience and improving the capacity of social protection programmes and systems to respond to shocks (World Bank, 2020).

In practice, linking CVA to SP varies across different contexts, and can go beyond the OPM focus on responding to large-scale shocks – think for instance of different forms of capacity- and systems-strengthening, resilience-building, rights-based approaches, and other activities that humanitarians undertake that are (or should be) linking to SP systems as part of delivering CVA. Teasing out these differences is a lively debate amongst practitioners working in this area. For the sake of our analysis, we take the different links between CVA and SP as broadly part of the definition of SRSP. This definition considers contexts from a non-existent through to highly advanced SP system, and all the different ways humanitarian actors design their activities to improve delivery, coordination, and future SP systems development and alignment. We would add nevertheless that the ‘alignment’ option in the typology remains broad and vaguely defined (alignment of what, with what, for what purpose?) and covers many activities of interest to humanitarian practitioners, some of which we flag below, but which need to be further elaborated.⁴ Lastly, although SRSP can be applied across the spectrum of SP instruments (with country examples for social assistance, insurance, and active labour market policies), this paper’s primary focus is on the links between CVA and social assistance⁵ and the associated SP systems development.

This paper considers how linking CVA to SP has been applied in different contexts and to different operational issues. To this end, we also note that the work of Seyfert et al. (2019) helpfully evolves the categorical thinking of OPM by breaking down humanitarian and social protection systems into operational components (such as targeting, coordination, delivery systems, etc.) and establishes different levels of possible connection, integration, or ownership with government led systems (see Annex VI for a visualisation). We also note that each operational category could include more investment from HA practitioners, on both the technical specifics of using HA and DRM tools and expertise, and also applying the humanitarian principles to establish when/whether each is feasible. We return to this in the reflections and recommendations sections. Lastly, this discussion has evolved amongst SP practitioners, moving away from categories and towards ensuring that SRSP enhances (and does not detract from) the *coverage*, *comprehensiveness*, and *adequacy* of SP programmes, three criteria outlined in the concept of universal social protection (TRANSFORM, forthcoming).

The merging of the worlds of SP, DRM, and HA (also to a certain extent CCA) has thrown a spotlight on the use of different understandings of key terms such as ‘risk’, ‘vulnerability’, and ‘shocks’. This is important when trying to frame *who* practitioners are trying to support, *how*, and in relation to *what*. As there is no consensus on collective terminology to use, we have drawn here from a number of sources (UNDRR, 2017; UNICEF, 2018; Cherrier et al., 2019) in an attempt to create a common language for discussion purposes. The full terms are presented in Annex III.

For the purposes of this paper, risk is understood as the *likelihood* of something occurring through the interaction between hazards, exposure to hazards, and underlying vulnerabilities and coping capacities (UNDRR, 2017). As ‘hazards’ in DRM terminology tend to mostly focus on climate- and weather-related events, we will use the more encompassing word ‘shock’ to denote the wide array of events (e.g. natural, economic, epidemiological, conflict-based etc.) that households, governments, and humanitarian and social protection systems aim to address in fragile contexts (TRANSFORM, forthcoming). In this context we can take a shock to mean the *realisation* of risk that *can* lead to losses or negative outcomes. A disaster refers to a situation when the impacts of a shock are widespread and often *overwhelm local and national capacities* (UNDRR, 2017).

The literature suggests that a better integration of elements of HA, DRM, SP, and CCA can create a more holistic way of addressing multi-dimensional drivers of risk (i.e. not only focusing on vulnerability to poverty, food insecurity, or hazard exposure, etc.). Integrating approaches will help poor and vulnerable households, and the social protection systems that serve them, increase adaptive, absorptive, and transformative capacity – in short, to build resilience (Browne, 2014).

⁴ These include but are not limited to – providing a clearer framework for operationalising the humanitarian principles in relation to the ‘unbundled’ operational issues; partner coordination in contexts of low government capacity; ensuring coverage in contexts of low government capacity; linking IDP and refugee response to SP; targeting and setting transfer values; delivery modalities and partners; digital ID, integrated data management, and data protection; preparedness, early warning early action, and forecast-based financing; integrated vulnerability analysis; disaster risk financing; and gender and how it applies to policy and programmatic considerations.

⁵ Also known as social safety nets or social cash transfers, social assistance consists of cash or in-kind transfers targeting poor and vulnerable households to help smooth consumption and protect against shocks. They are non-contributory, direct, regular, and predictable transfers, financed by public resources when run by government, and are, implicitly or explicitly, part of a country’s social protection policy (Roelen et al., 2018; Cherrier, forthcoming).

2.2 KEY DRIVERS AND EVOLUTION OF THE RATIONALE FOR LINKING CVA AND SP

Linking CVA to SP has been an increasing focus of research, analysis, and policy development in the last six years, driven by several factors. This paper summarises the existing literature where available, whilst also flagging some of the possible gaps in terms of both the conceptualisation and operationalisation.

To begin with, recent years have seen a significant increase in the proportion of HA provided through cash and vouchers, reflected in global commitments such as the Agenda for Humanity (2016), the World Humanitarian Summit (2016) and the SDGs (see Annex V for a summary of these goals and commitments), backed by ambitious targets from key implementers.⁶ In 2018, volumes of cash rose to a record level of \$4.7 billion, up from \$2.8 billion in 2016 (Development Initiatives, 2019; 2018). A report from the Global Public Policy Institute estimates that if the evidence were systematically followed, that figure would be closer to 40% (Steets et al., 2016). Under the right conditions, cash is increasingly seen as more flexible, cost-efficient, and suitable for beneficiary requirements than in-kind assistance,⁷ and particularly appropriate for discussions linking CVA to SP, given its fungibility.

Despite cash being at the forefront of a drive for improved efficiency and effectiveness in humanitarian response, the gap between humanitarian need and available resources is widening year-on-year, even while the sector raises more and more money. In the 10 years between 2007 and 2016, humanitarian appeals increased 272% from \$5.5 billion to \$20.5 billion, yet the percentage of unmet needs steadily rose from 32% to 40% (Development Initiatives, 2018). Only 2.5% of this aid was channelled through host governments (Development Initiatives, 2017). By 2015, nearly 88% of official humanitarian assistance went to long- and medium-term recipients, and of the 20 largest recipients of international humanitarian assistance, 18 were in protracted crisis of three or more years (Development Initiatives, 2017). Forced displacement is at record levels, with over 70 million displaced in 2018, the highest ever recorded by UNHCR, whilst nearly four out of every five refugees are in displacement situations of five or more years (UNHCR, 2019a).

The number, nature, and intensity of humanitarian crises are changing and rising, driven by stressors such as climate change, population growth, and environmental degradation, and the traditional humanitarian system is struggling to keep pace. Very little international humanitarian financing flows directly to the national governments with primary responsibility for the people affected by shocks and crisis.

The shocks driving fragility in most countries are nevertheless 'shocking' only in terms of impact, not in terms of predictability. Most are recurrent, interrelated, and multi-annual in nature. This (re)poses the question as to why a mechanism designed to respond to acute or unanticipated need, the humanitarian response, is often being used to address fundamentally chronic problems. The international community has recognised that 'new ways of working' (OCHA, 2017) are needed, where multi-dimensional risk is addressed in a more sustainable, integrated manner, anchored in investments in national capacity, systems, and ownership wherever possible (see Annex V for some specific language on global commitments).

Meanwhile, the coverage of social protection programmes continues to expand rapidly – for example, 130 countries have at least one unconditional cash transfer programme (World Bank, 2015), and the social protection sector predominantly uses cash as its preferred transfer modality, especially for social assistance (Roelen et al., 2018), showing good potential for linkage to CVA. As Cherrier (forthcoming) notes, CVA and SP have in fact developed somewhat symbiotically. Successful experiences of using cash transfers in national protection schemes in places such as Mexico and Brazil fed into the push towards cash in the humanitarian sector, and likewise certain large social protection schemes (for instance Ethiopia's Productive Social Safety Net Programme and Kenya's Hunger Safety Net Programme) developed partly out of the humanitarian community's push to move away from providing humanitarian assistance every year towards a formalised, institutionalised, and longer-term approach to social assistance provision. CVA has often filled gaps by responding to chronic vulnerability where social protection systems are absent or overwhelmed, but it is often an unsatisfactory mechanism for meeting chronic needs.

⁶ WFP and UNHCR, the two largest humanitarian agencies, both delivered 50% of their support in the form of cash in 2017 (Rammaciato, 2017), and together accounted for about two-thirds of the total \$2.8 billion spent on CBT in 2016 (Abell et al., 2018). Several NGOs have made ambitious commitments as part of the Grand Bargain to increase their CBT provision, as well as key donors such as DFID and ECHO.

⁷ The benefits, risks, and constraints of cash, mostly applicable to other modalities as well, have been noted elsewhere (see Hoffman et al., 2010; Harvey et al., 2010; The Sphere Project, 2011; WFP 2014; Abell et al., 2018).

The more effective a nationally led SP system is at addressing shocks of different kinds, the lower the need for additional humanitarian assistance. With this comes the hope of reducing the diversity of different, and sometimes duplicative approaches implemented at country level. There is now recognition of this in SDG 1, which talks about the connection between stressors, shocks, and human development, and the role that social protection must play in building the resilience of the poor and vulnerable (World Bank, 2018). However, globally only 18% of the poorest quintile in low-income countries is covered by social assistance programmes (World Bank, 2018).

Using pre-existing SP systems to reach people affected by shocks is also seen to hold the potential to be more timely and cost-effective than parallel or *sui generis* humanitarian architecture. Literature on cost effectiveness and value for money⁸ is growing in this area and shows broadly clear and compelling benefits for investing in early action and resilience measures versus a traditional emergency response (Venton et al., 2012). However, there are still big evidence gaps in terms of using SP systems and programmes to address covariate shocks (O'Brien et al., 2018b). Compromise and trade-offs are a given, and will vary across contexts. For instance, linking CVA to national SP systems could achieve scale and sustainability but compromise effectiveness (e.g. reduced transfer values). It could increase the speed of delivery in the long term but take considerable time to design and establish, and could be more rigid and less open to further adaptation. Using one common payment platform could increase cost savings but reduce equity of access for beneficiaries. There are likely to be no clear win-wins, just the need for careful consideration of the balance of requirements, as well as an acknowledgement of the influence of design decisions on cost-benefit outcomes⁹.

These combined factors – the conducive global policy environment, the frequent overlaps in intended caseloads between SP and HA, the increasing use of cash as a common modality of choice, similar systems and processes for implementation, and the push to extend social protection coverage (including in fragile contexts) – indicates significant potential for further linkages. As a result, the literature on linking CVA to SP and SRSP has grown exponentially in the last five years (with a varied body of experience which draws lessons from countries as diverse as the Caribbean, Kyrgyzstan, the Philippines, the Sahel, Somalia, Turkey, and Yemen), generating a growing body of evidence that is being integrated into institutional strategies and programmes (see O'Brien et al., 2018b; Cherrier et al., 2019). Almost every major international partner has embraced its language (this is not necessarily the case for governments). In this regard, several points deserve highlighting:

- Much of the case study evidence¹⁰ remains somewhat anecdotal or lacking robust evaluation, which takes time and money to generate.
- With a few notable exceptions (i.e. Ethiopia, Kenya, Philippines, Turkey), efforts have been tested at a rather small scale, especially in relation to levels of need.
- The majority of evidence is related to natural disasters, whilst findings from conflict and displacement settings are only now emerging (for example in Turkey, the Sahel, Uganda, and Yemen).
- The literature (in particular the case studies) talks little about the limits of SP to achieve the ambitious aims of SRSP (in terms of technical analysis, delivery capacity, coverage, funding, information, access, etc.), and describes in limited detail when other sectors are better placed to respond to shocks in a complementary or parallel approach.
- There is limited evidence on the system-strengthening outcome side, despite organisations consistently citing this as one of the rationales for doing SRSP.
- The cost-benefits and trade-offs of making SP systems more shock responsive are under-explored.
- The gaps and contingencies that will always require additional emergency response capacity, regardless of how advanced a SRSP system becomes.
- Whilst the literature appears quite extensive and clear on the rationale of 'why' CVA and SP should be linked, resources on the 'how' of implementation are less readily available or lack operational detail.

⁸ DFID defines value for money around four criteria – economy, efficiency, effectiveness, and equity.

⁹ This is the focus of a recent operational research project commissioned by DFID, results of which are due to be published in 2020

¹⁰ A range of SRSP case studies have recently been published, with most to be found on www.socialprotection.org, in the 'social protection in crisis contexts' closed member group. In this paper, we have tried to draw from as many as possible, including those provided by OPM (found here: www.opml.co.uk/projects/shock-responsive-social-protection-systems), SPaN (found here: <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sp-nexus/wiki/guidance-package-span-resources>), TRANSFORM (forthcoming: <http://www.socialprotection.org/institutions/transform>), and from the World Bank (found here: www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sahel-adaptive-social-protection-program-trust-fund#5).

2.3 LINKING HUMANITARIAN CVA TO SP – COUNTRY CONTEXTS

Country contexts differ greatly based on the types of shocks faced (often multiple simultaneously), the range of HA programmes and maturity of the SP system, levels of capacity, and political will. Here we have adapted the five ‘scenarios’ typology outlined by Winder-Rossi et al. (2017), which uses the capacity of the SP system to respond to large-scale shocks as its point of departure (see Annex VI for a visualisation and description of this typology). These examples are designed to highlight learning around linking CVA to SP, acknowledging that a country example could fit into more than one scenario and that there is overlap between them. Additionally, ‘contexts of forced displacement’ has been left as a standalone sixth ‘scenario’, as it was felt it deserved more focus.

Shattered or weakened system

In fragile countries facing an array of shocks, the capacity of SP systems can be weak or compromised, and as with nascent systems (see next category below), humanitarian actors are by necessity providing a range of support in its place. However, where elements of a SP system can be utilised, there can be advantages in doing so. *In Yemen*, Oxfam partnered with the Government’s Social Welfare Fund to use their beneficiary list and the Post Office in Al Hodeidah governorate to deliver cash transfers to half a million vulnerable households during a food crisis. Oxfam then used this experience to advocate with donors and other multilateral institutions on the effectiveness of such approaches (Whitehead, 2013). UNICEF also introduced a humanitarian cash transfer programme that revived and leveraged elements of a national assistance scheme disrupted by armed conflict in 2015 (such as design, delivery systems, and human resources) whilst keeping it in key ways operationally distinct to preserve humanitarian principles.

In these contexts there are often large government capacity constraints, a need to try and reach people in areas not controlled by governments, the need to retain commitments to humanitarian principles, and a lack of direct budgetary support for regular programmes. Therefore, alongside using elements of existing social protection systems, the emphasis is on efforts to improve the links and clarify roles between social protection and humanitarian actors, to integrate SP principles into HA programming where feasible, and to advocate for a more comprehensive approach to SP systems development in the future.

Nascent social assistance system

In many poor countries, or those in protracted conflict, SP systems are non-existent, nascent, or not functioning, and the humanitarian system has been performing the role of an informal social safety net for years (Cherrier, 2014). Here the focus is often on how CVA and the systems that support them can be designed to integrate SP principles and lay the ground for a future SP system. *In Somalia*, a roadmap has been developed to transition the numerous humanitarian cash transfer projects into a medium-term social assistance programme aligned behind the new government’s social protection policy, supported by a Donor Working Group and a new Technical Assistance Facility (Cherrier et al., 2019). *In Mali*, INGOs managing cash transfer programmes in the insecure north have established common design and administrative processes (logical framework, assessment tools, transfer value, registration method, and monitoring and evaluation) aligned with the government’s nascent social cash transfer programme in the south, enabling a move towards national coverage (Cherrier et al., 2019). *In Mauritania* where the SP system is nascent, various shock-responsive components have been designed in collaboration between SP and HA actors,¹¹ including a harmonised questionnaire for joint targeting, joint usage of the national social registry, providing seasonal ‘top-ups’ to recipients of the regular social assistance programme (aligned with the values of the humanitarian response), a common payment platform for SP and HA actors, and to underpin this, improving preparedness and early warning early action mechanisms (such as links to satellite monitoring data and disaster risk financing tools currently being explored). The government is now being supported to integrate these efforts into a longer-term SRSP roadmap and operational framework (World Bank, 2017; World Food Programme, 2019).

State SP system unable to respond to repeated crises

In contexts where a basic or limited SP system exists, but fragility and levels of chronic vulnerability remain high, linking CVA to SP has been used to make the case for shifting away from cyclical humanitarian responses towards

¹¹ Led by the World Bank and WFP working with SP and HA actors in and outside government respectively.

longer-term programmes that address predictable and chronic need systematically, especially where the main drivers of vulnerability are related to climate- and weather-related shocks. In *Malawi*, SP and HA actors have tested different ways to link the national social cash transfer programme to the lean season food security response through alignment, vertical top-ups, and using a single payment provider for both SP and HA payments, as well as reviewing how the social registry can be used for shock response targeting (Holmes et al., 2017; Longhurst and Sabates-Wheeler, 2019). In *Uganda*, support from the World Bank has been used by the government to develop an automated, shock-responsive mechanism that provides additional pay outs to drought-affected households through satellite monitoring of vegetation cover linked to disaster risk financing¹², as well as provide social protection-style programmes to refugees.¹³

Shifting to more shock-responsive approaches requires time, partnership building and technical investment from a wide range of stakeholders. In places where there is both widespread chronic and extreme poverty, there is a need both to scale-up long-term social assistance whilst maintaining humanitarian assistance. Beyond the technical and operational challenges, this type of vision also requires leadership from both governments and donors (Cherrier, 2014). Less progress has been made in finding the right combination of instruments to address the mixture of chronic and acute needs in places facing combinations of protracted conflict and natural shocks such as the Democratic Republic of Congo and Afghanistan.

Limited shock-responsive national SP system

Countries with a SP system with broad coverage have effectively used them to respond to disasters. In *the Philippines*,¹⁴ the government's flagship conditional cash transfer programme (Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Programme, known as the 4P) covers approximately 4.4 million out of the country's estimated 20.2 million households, including a high proportion of poor households in disaster-prone areas. All actors are mandated to utilise the national social registry for their programming which includes the data of 75–80% of households nationwide. These conditions meant that after Typhoon Haiyan in 2013, both WFP and UNICEF could use the 4P programme to fund top-up payments to shock-affected households to help meet additional needs, whilst also delivering to non-beneficiaries around them through INGOs in a coordinated response (O'Brien et al., 2018b). The government supported these efforts by passing a resolution waiving the conditionality of the 4Ps programme for three months in affected areas that declared a 'state of calamity'.¹⁵ Using these existing systems proved far more effective in time and cost savings, and thanks to Memoranda of Understanding signed between the government and UN agencies, the 4P programme was subsequently utilised in the same way for the response to Typhoon Ruby in 2014 (Gentilini et al., 2018).

In *Kenya*, the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP)¹⁶ is able to provide both regular social assistance using a centralised database and bank accounts, and additional shock-based payments (either vertically to existing beneficiaries, **or horizontally to additional, pre-registered households**), triggered automatically using a satellite monitoring system for vegetation cover (a good proxy in Kenya for future malnutrition rates). This system takes approximately 10 days from the point a trigger is reached to payments being released to beneficiaries, as opposed to three to nine months in the case of conventional humanitarian assistance following the declaration of an emergency (Cherrier et al., 2019). There are challenges with this approach, notably that there has been a conscious trade-off between simplicity, cost, and accuracy. The scalability mechanism provides one level of standardised payment to everyone in a geographic area once the trigger-point is reached. This has led to significant inclusion and exclusion errors, and concerns that the top-up is not sufficient to meet humanitarian needs. However, in countries where seasonal rainfall variations affect food and nutrition security (such as much of sub-Saharan Africa), social assistance programmes that can flex to better address seasonal needs have clear potential.

¹² The Third Northern Uganda Social Action Fund (NUSAF 3) <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P149965>

¹³ Development Response to Displacement Impacts Project in the Horn of Africa Project for Uganda <https://projects.worldbank.org/en/projects-operations/project-detail/P152822>

¹⁴ Reference www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a0408-shock-responsive-social-protection-systems/opm-case-study-2017-srsp-philippines.pdf?noredirect=1

¹⁵ Furthermore, the government dedicates approximately 5% of the national budget to DRM every year, of which 70% is for preparedness and mitigation, and 30% is for response.

¹⁶ See: <https://odihpn.org/blog/shock-responsive-social-protection-in-practice-kenyas-experience-in-scaling-up-cash-transfers/>; <https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/sp-nexus/documents/span-2019-case-study-kenya-hunger-safety-net-programme-hsnp>

Highly shock-responsive SP system (part or all)

Countries with a well-developed or mature SP system are providing integrated packages of support for citizens and shock-affected populations. *In Turkey*, all access to social assistance is managed through a centralised system and database (the Integrated Social Assistance Information System – ISAIS) that contains the combined information of 44 million people. The system uses a form of proxy means test (PMT) to define eligibility for social protection programmes automatically. Meanwhile two internationally funded programmes support refugees: an unconditional cash transfer programme that supports basic needs (the ESSN), and a conditional cash transfer programme for education (the CCTE), which together reach 1.9 million beneficiaries out of Turkey's 4.1 million refugees. Both programmes utilise centralised government systems such as the social registry (the ISAIS) for targeting and case management, though both run in parallel to the national social assistance programmes through the Turkish Red Crescent as on the ground implementing partner. In addition, the state has recognised refugees have non-cash related needs, and has facilitated legal access to health, child protection and legal services, and labour market access programmes as part of their right to remain in Turkey (Cherrier et al., 2019).

Contexts of forced displacement¹⁷

The motivations for linking CVA to SP hold true in contexts of forced displacement. A systemic approach to linking HA and SP can contribute to reducing humanitarian needs, ensuring equitable assistance is provided to the displaced and their hosts, and can support sustainability, peace, and integration (Cherrier et al., 2019).¹⁸ Yet the subject of the *right to social protection* for the forcibly displaced, both for internally displaced people (IDPs), and particularly refugees, requires further research.

Creating a SP system with enough technical flexibility and reach to provide support and services for IDPs (who technically retain their right to SP as citizens of the state) across different geographic locations is itself challenging, especially if communities are on the move, both in terms of delivery capacity and programme technicalities (benefit provision is normally tied to fixed addresses and conditions). The picture is further complicated in the case of refugees. Advocates for refugee rights argue that once recognised as a refugee, an individual should enjoy all the rights, including to social protection, granted under the 1951 Convention. Yet there are clear challenges in providing social assistance to refugees in contexts where the host country lacks social protection coverage for its own population, harbours fears of political fall-out or incentivising settlement and discouraging return. Legal access to SP for refugees is therefore very much debated by many nation states, and in practice these rights are limited, or the state delays providing them.

Although most countries have signed the Universal Declaration of Human Rights that includes SP as a human right, and many are pursuing social protection floors to increase universal SP coverage,¹⁹ access to SP is often not a legal right for citizens in many countries. This poses key questions about how and whether a government can provide SP to non-nationals (without a legislative basis, or overcommitting themselves financially and politically), and what role international partners should play in convincing them to include refugees in national systems.

Some evidence shows that countries are providing SP-style programmes to IDPs and refugees. Partly driven by the policy momentum arising from the Global Compact on Refugees and the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF), this is being supported by international partners who are working to show how national SP systems can be expanded to accommodate forcibly displaced people, moving progressively from aligned humanitarian delivery, to parallel programmes designed to include features of a national system, to full integration (Mitchell, 2018).

¹⁷ The term 'forcibly displaced' refers to IDPs, refugees, asylum seekers, and returnees, although due to space constraints these cannot all be considered equally here and we focus more on IDPs and refugees.

¹⁸ According to the 1951 Convention, Article 23, 'The Contracting States shall accord to refugees lawfully staying in their territory the same treatment with respect to public relief and assistance as is accorded to their nationals.'

¹⁹ 'Social protection floor' is the term used to describe nationally defined sets of basic social security guarantees that should ensure, as a minimum, that, over the lifecycle, all in need have access to essential healthcare and to basic income security which together secure effective access to goods and services defined as necessary at the national level.

In *Kyrgyzstan*, the Government temporarily waived regulations through a decree that extended the national social assistance programme (the SASW) to displaced citizens in the aftermath of violent ethnic clashes, aided by a systems feasibility study²⁰ undertaken prior to the crisis by UNICEF (Cherrier et al., 2019). In *Jordan*, the use of cash for the humanitarian refugee response has grown rapidly, with a government policy that requires equitable provision of support to both refugees and host populations that lessens tensions with host communities (Cherrier et al., 2019). Discussions are ongoing between the government and international partners to transition refugee support over to national social assistance programmes (such as the National Aid Fund – NAF), yet the government is concerned about the risk of losing international donor support should it do so. Consideration is being given to a joint strategy that uses external support to both facilitate the roll-out of the national social protection system and link it to the refugee response over the medium term (e.g. five or more years). *Turkey's* government has been lauded for its comprehensive support package for refugees using parts of the national social protection system, and has been provided €6 billion from the European Commission (alongside substantial support of its own) to enable this. However, conditions attached to this support include heavy restrictions on freedom of movement. In effect, the EU has supported the Turkish government through its social protection system to ensure refugees do not travel on to Europe, and the government in turn uses this as political leverage. The situation is paradoxical – at once a praiseworthy form of integrated programming across the nexus, yet also one in which the relative autonomy of humanitarian actors and beneficiaries is compromised. These types of trade-offs are found everywhere in negotiations for humanitarian access, but the introduction of SP into the equation is new.

COVID-19 (CORONAVIRUS) RESPONSE – LINKING HUMANITARIAN AND SP RESPONSES²¹

COVID-19 is an infectious respiratory disease that was declared by the WHO on 11 March 2020 as a pandemic, and has at the point of writing (26/03/20) affected 198 countries and territories, infected 492,056 people, and caused 22,175 deaths. As countries scramble to address the immediate health emergency, they are also employing a range of shock-responsive social protection measures to help cushion the economic impact of the disease as quarantine and social distancing measures are imposed, and ensure the most vulnerable receive essential support and care.

As of 20 March 2020, forty-five countries have introduced, adapted, or expanded social protection programmes. The most widely used are cash transfer programmes (30), followed by wage subsidies (11), and various forms of subsidised sick leave, social security contributions, and unemployment insurance. Thirteen new cash transfer programmes have been introduced (e.g. in Bolivia, India, Iran, and Peru), and countries are adapting existing social assistance programmes in various ways, such as advancing future payments (e.g. Colombia and Indonesia), providing additional payments (e.g. Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Turkey), increasing benefit levels (e.g. China), increasing the coverage of existing cash schemes (e.g. Brazil), suspending conditionality (e.g. UK and Italy), or bringing future planned beneficiaries early onto a programme (e.g. Jordan).

Humanitarian organisations are working to save lives and prevent the spread of the virus through the public health response, whilst also highlighting the longer-term impacts the disease will have on livelihoods, social and economic relations, and national systems. Social protection is seen as imperative not just for economic well-being but also for saving lives and helping people to manage and recover from COVID-19. Humanitarians are therefore considering ways to link response efforts to social protection programmes and systems, to assist with basic needs, protect development gains, and focus on vulnerable groups such as the elderly, people living with disabilities, orphans, and women, who are likely to be disproportionately affected. Organisations such as CalP are also offering resources and guidance to help humanitarians think through the implications of the pandemic, including how to link CVA to SP.²²

²⁰ Covering issues such as partner capacity, systems coverage and conditions, beneficiary registration and eligibility requirements, relevant legislation, and payment process bottlenecks.

²¹ This example draws heavily from the World Bank's COVID-19 Real-Time Review of Country Measures (www.ugogentilini.net/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/global-review-of-social-protection-responses-to-COVID-19-2.pdf), and Oxfam's Social Protection Response to the COVID-19 pandemic (forthcoming).

²² See: www.calpnetwork.org/themes/cva-and-covid-19-resources-guidance-events-and-questions/

2.4 POLICY AND PROGRAMMING CONSIDERATIONS

The literature around linking CVA with SP highlights a number of programmatic considerations. This section draws from a succession of analytical frameworks (O'Brien et al., 2018a; Cherrier et al., 2019; Seyfert et al., 2019). Perhaps the main learning from this work is that it is not helpful to see HA and SP as monolithic sectors, nor to view linking CVA to SP only through set categories. Rather it is more practical to 'unbundle' policy and operational issues in more detail, and for each country or initiative see where different possible options for connection lie, depending on the level of maturity and integration potential with national systems (Seyfert et al., 2019; Kukrety, 2016). Annex VI provides an image and explanation of the 'unbundled' framework, which lists the types of operational categories that can be considered for linkage within a country context. We loosely follow these categories here, with some deviation in titles.

2.4.1 Legal and policy frameworks

Linking CVA and SP is often not well reflected in national policies and strategies, although some examples are beginning to appear (see for instance Malawi's National Social Support Policy II²³). Given that in some countries the right to SP is not enshrined in law, the route towards sustainable government funding for efforts such as SRSP could be a long one, and the situation for refugees and displaced people is more complex still (see above). Nevertheless, enshrining SRSP principles in multi-sectoral policies and strategies, and defining the division of roles between HA and SP actors is critical and not yet receiving sufficient attention.

2.4.2 Governance and coordination

Effective collaboration and coordination is both the keystone principle for SRSP and its greatest challenge, as it requires multi-sectoral responses and goals, most of which demand trade-offs. Coordination mechanisms are needed within government DRM and SP ministries/department, across different government ministries, between government and international/local actors, and between development and humanitarian approaches. SP, DRM, and HA are often managed by different government ministries or departments, with their own coordination mechanisms, donors, funding channels and conditionality, and different entry points into international agreements, all of whom are competing for scant resources (Béné et al., 2012; Kuriakose et al., 2013; Browne, 2014). Ministries normally cannot work together without a formal signed protocol or directive. SP itself is often not under a single ministry and the department responsible for managing a social registry is frequently different to the one responsible for programmes. DRM ministries or departments offer a viable entry point for coordinating CVA to SP linkages, but are to date being overlooked or remain under-capacitated.

Cross-cutting stakeholder participation and decision-making needs to be regular, inclusive, and institutionalised. In some cases, cross-ministerial groups have been created by decree (for instance the Dispositif National in Niger) or around one particular programme (such as the PSNP in Ethiopia or the HSNP in Kenya). KIIs for this paper highlighted that country-level technical forums such as Cash Working Groups (CWGs) could further act to bring stakeholders together, with some making more effort to link to SP working groups and initiatives more explicitly (see for instance in Iraq, Bahamas, and Nigeria). As SRSP is a new concept, continuous effort is also needed to ensure it is understood right down to the local level, and accepted by district authorities and implementers as well as communities (UNICEF and WFP, 2018). One of the challenges for SRSP is systematising and formalising what has been trialled into coherent approaches. Without such efforts, a concept designed to unify actors' risks introduces further fragmentation as each actor creates their own shock-responsive mechanisms, making on-the-ground coordination during a shock even more challenging.

As noted above, beyond the operational and technical challenges, linking CVA to SP and institutionalising SRSP requires leadership and vision from governments and international partners (Cherrier, 2014). This means, for example, that beyond coordination, government works to progressively integrate SRSP principles into sectoral policies, decrees, and legislation, identifies fiscal space for SP and SRSP, and is supported to develop capacity and accountability to deliver SRSP.

²³ Several other countries are considering different SRSP options within their national social protection policies, including Kenya, Mongolia, and Myanmar, amongst others.

2.4.3 Information management and data protection

One of the backbones of coordinating CVA with SP is harmonising data systems. As SP and HA programmes often have different beneficiary databases and management information systems (MISs) with different categories of information, an increasing number of governments are now developing social and single registries.²⁴ Social registries (SRs) capture large amounts of demographic and socio-economic data on vulnerable households (whether or not they are already on a programme) using a commonly agreed data collection tool. In so doing, they aim to coordinate programmes, define eligible households, support beneficiary case management, and reduce the costs of parallel processes (Chirchir and Farooq, 2016). They are seen as key to enabling multi-year and seasonal/crisis-based programmes to function side by side and in a responsive manner. However, this is a predominantly SP partner-led exercise and needs more humanitarian buy-in to address key issues around design, data protection, inter-operability, and ethics.

Despite the potential of integrated data management and social registries (SRs) to improve programme management, coordination, monitoring, and cost-efficiency, certain issues require further investigation from the humanitarian community. At an operational level, SR data may not be sufficiently comprehensive (e.g. in terms of the types of vulnerability data collected) or up-to-date to enable its rapid use in times of shock, due to coverage limitations and/or the cost of updating information. Links between SRs and other databases may be needed when shocks hit geographic areas or demographic groups not included in the SR, however getting MISs to 'speak' to each other can be a challenge, especially if a national ID with unique identifier does not exist to link them together, increasing the risk of data duplication, fraud, and inclusion/exclusion errors.²⁵ There are significant concerns about the extent to which people can give meaningful informed consent to the use of their data in humanitarian settings. A common concern voiced amongst humanitarian practitioners is that poverty-based targeting (which is frequently how SR data is used) is often not an appropriate way to target emergency responses.

More broadly, there is a clear risk that the global push for digital ID could introduce new forms of control, corruption, mismanagement, and discrimination (Hosein and Nyst, 2014). The emerging global framework for identity management centres on SDG 16.9, which envisages the provision of formal legal identity to an estimated 1.1 to 2.4 billion people worldwide who lack it. Numerous other SDGs have a 'financial inclusion' target. Digital ID is also central to global anti-money laundering and counter-financing of terrorism conventions, as well as immigration and border control, principle motivations for nation states. Many humanitarian organisations are today introducing some form of digital identity system, and some are considering the adoption of interoperable standards, led at scale by UN agencies such as UNHCR and WFP. Projects like the World Bank's *ID For Development*, through an EU trust fund, support cooperation with states to establish interoperable social registries and national digital ID systems, to also enhance the 'digital social protection' capacity of development and humanitarian actors.²⁶ The vast majority of these systems have a biometric component, which has been incorporated into the Grand Bargain (2016), and the Global Compact on Refugees as well.

While these systems bring significant benefits to states and individuals in the form of legal, social, and economic inclusion, as well as improvements in systems efficiency, their implementation also has civil liberties and human rights implications, especially in wars where governments are often one of the parties to the conflict (Hosein and Nyst, 2014; Berens et al., 2019). The risks are exacerbated by a lack of global standards addressing the broad range of data protection and fundamental rights issues, or other checks and balances that should be implemented before these systems are financed or deployed. Data protection can therefore be seen as a key consideration for humanitarian accountability where 'the risks, harms and benefits associated with data in humanitarian contexts are not well documented or sufficiently understood' (Kuner and Marelli, 2017; Wilton Park 2019: 3)²⁷.

²⁴ For brevity we only focus here on social registries (SRs), but single registries are also being developed in many country contexts. A single registry acts as a warehouse of information linking together pre-existing MISs (including SRs) across ministries and partners, as well as linking to other external databases such as health, employment, tax, and civil registration (Chirchir and Farooq, 2016).

²⁵ Differences between databases include different programming codes, modules/fields, geographic zoning, and data collection tools.

²⁶ See: <https://id4d.worldbank.org>

²⁷ This section also draws from a forthcoming awo.agency and Open Society Foundation paper on standards for digital ID systems

2.4.4 Delivery mechanisms, modalities, and complementarity

SP's preference for cash transfers, and HA's increasing use of them, offers potential convergence in terms of delivery methods and partners. However, despite the increasing use of CVA, the majority of humanitarian assistance is still delivered in-kind, requiring different delivery arrangements. Depending on the shock (especially fast onset), there is sometimes the need to switch between modalities, or to have a mixed modality basket, an option SP programmes do not offer. In addition, the global coverage, capacity, and benefits of SP programmes remain limited, especially in low-income countries and fragile contexts, and suffer from weak institutionalisation (ILO, 2017; Roelen et al., 2018). This can limit their use for linkage in the immediate term (which is not to say they should not be supported to expand), and require that parallel or additional systems be put in place. As most humanitarian programmes also suffer from limited coverage, the broader issue remains one of insufficient resources to match levels of need, particularly in fragile contexts and protracted crises.

In both development-focused social assistance programming and humanitarian cash programming, increasing interest and attention is being given to complementary programming (sometimes called cash-plus). This examines ways in which stronger linkages between cash support and other forms of support may be able to create synergistic impacts and improve outcomes in technical sectors such as health, protection, and mitigation of sexual and gender-based violence. There is scope here for development and humanitarian actors to learn from each other in terms of what works in complementary programming (Harvey and Pavanello, 2019).

A key emerging lesson in the benefits and challenges of linking social protection and humanitarian systems is the importance of flexibility. There is a need to adapt, simplify, and relax administrative processes to meet the different needs and constraints emerging during responses to shocks. There is also a need to focus on the resilience of systems during times of crisis and ensure that systems can keep running.

2.4.5 Coverage, eligibility, and targeting criteria

One of the most discussed and complex operational topics in linking CVA to SP, eligibility and targeting, centres on how to define and measure vulnerability and needs, and how much support people should receive. At its heart, this debate is about rights and coverage – who should be entitled to support, and who does and does not receive support in contexts where resources are rarely sufficient. Ideally, shock-responsive social protection would be underpinned by adequate and regular social protection in normal times and humanitarian appeals would be fully funded. But in reality, social protection during normal times is often inadequate and patchy and humanitarian needs cannot be fully met. This forces difficult choices about how best to allocate scarce resources.

SP and HA programmes target using a range of poverty, categorical, and community-based methodologies, with social assistance programmes often favouring poverty-based targeting (such as the Proxy-Means Test (PMT)), whilst humanitarian practitioners tend towards community-based targeting. Both have benefits and drawbacks and are subject to heated debate in terms of accuracy, subjectivity, cost, and speed (see for example Kidd et al., 2017). In reality many programmes combine two or more methodologies. What is clear for humanitarians is that compromise and quick solutions are required in contexts of time, capacity, and data constraints (World Food Programme, 2006).²⁸ Due to limited resources in the face of enormous need (both for SP and humanitarian programmes), the focus is often on reducing inclusion error, when exclusion error is the greater problem.

Identifying CVA to SP linkages requires integrated vulnerability assessments that consider multiple risks and forms of vulnerability (poverty, food insecurity, exposure to shocks), and do not to conflate them. Finding practical tools to undertake integrated vulnerability analysis is often difficult at country level. Several studies have begun looking at which combination of methodologies, indicators, and funding modalities can best support the targeting of both chronic and acute or transitory need (such as combining HEA vs. PMT (Schnitzer, 2016)), or combining categorical with food security indicators. Depending on the level of maturity of a SP system and its forward vision, there could be significant advantages to moving from needs-based (discretionary) to categorical (individual entitlement) benefits, or towards universal basic income.

However, there are also significant questions to address in terms of operations, finance, and political economy. Likewise on design and longer-term objectives – does shifting the focus of SP programmes and systems to

²⁸ Beneficiary participation is also a key part of humanitarian accountability, though in fast onset crises and conflicts, community participation can be limited (Burns et al., 2011).

address disasters jeopardise their core objectives of ensuring that the SP system matures and provides increased protection across the lifecycle? Whilst this does not have to be an either/or discussion, in contexts of limited resources and political scope, the risk of over-stretch remains at the forefront of concerns for many, including the KIs interviewed for this paper.

2.4.6 Setting transfer type, level, frequency, and duration

Social assistance programmes are designed to be regular, adequate, predictable, and government financed (in the immediate or longer term). Meanwhile CVA aims to provide life and livelihood saving support for a defined period of time in the face of specific shocks (though in many protracted contexts this line is blurred). Both depend on needs assessments of the individual or household to define transfer values, but given emergency contexts and a lack of beneficiary coping capacity, the transfer value for CVA can be several orders of magnitude higher than that for social assistance.²⁹

Aligning systems brings trade-offs, and it is no surprise that setting transfer values, which make up the bulk of cost for any programme, can be disruptive in both a positive and negative sense. For instance, increasing the transfer value for a social assistance recipient during a crisis or the lean season (vertical expansion), then reducing it again, can be both welcomed (especially if provided on time and through one financial service provider), but can also lead to confusion amongst communities around why benefits ended and why certain households receive more than others. There is sometimes community aversion to the notion of 'double dipping' – one recipient receiving multiple forms of support, instead of everyone getting a little (Government of Malawi and UNICEF, 2017; Holmes et al., 2017), even though the principle of 'layered programming' is seen as key to SP.

Often a compromise is sought, either temporarily increasing SP values to match humanitarian ones (such as in Malawi and Mauritania), or setting a value below humanitarian requirements to align with social assistance programmes (e.g. in Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, and Nepal). In all of the latter cases, it was noted that values were too low to meet household needs in an emergency, however they did often lead to government buy-in to the approach, an example of a key trade-off.

2.4.7 Early warning, early action, and forecast-based financing

One feature of HA and DRM design linking Early Warning Systems (EWSs) to scalable social assistance and other SP programmes has been a growing area of interest in places such as the Sahel. Forecast-based financing (FBF) shares similar features to early warning early action approaches, but focuses on the use of climate and weather forecasts linked to predefined triggers, disaster risk funding, and response plans (sometimes known as 'early action protocols'), to improve the effectiveness of emergency preparedness, response, and recovery efforts (Overseas Development Institute, 2018).³⁰ FBF introduces useful thinking to SRSP, including how to ensure system readiness, allocate resources (and avoid 'acting in vain' by investing in preparedness measures when a shock doesn't materialise), how to design objective triggers for action based on pre-agreed indicators, and how to plan, prepare, and communicate with communities. This was the process followed for instance in Kenya under the HSNP.

2.4.8 Risk layering and disaster risk financing

Resourcing SRSP poses difficult questions as to how activities should be funded and by whom. Who, for instance, should pay for a 'vertical top-up' – a contingency fund in a regular programme, or a humanitarian donor piggybacking on a SP programme? Which financing mechanisms are most suited to address shocks before, during, and after they have occurred, and which risks need to be transferred to other partners (such as insurers)?

The answer to these questions depends on context, hence the need for an understanding of which shocks affect who and where, and the range of programmatic instruments, partners, and mechanisms available to address them.³¹ This type of 'risk layering' exercise is an integral part of the analysis for Disaster Risk Financing and

²⁹ Social assistance programme transfer values tend on average to range from 10 to 30% of an individual or household's needs for the month and can be strongly influenced by considerations of long-term financial sustainability and the desire not to create dependency. Beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance tend to require anywhere between 65 and 100% of their monthly needs to be met, using methodologies such as the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), noting that there are minimum thresholds such as those defined by the Sphere Standards that levels of assistance should not fall below.

³⁰ See also the work of the IFRC and Red Cross Red Crescent Climate Centre: www.forecast-based-financing.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/DRK_Broschuere_FUND_Web_ENG.pdf

³¹ Such as contingency funds, aligning with humanitarian resources, crisis modifiers, catastrophe bonds, and insurance for catastrophic loss.

Insurance (DRFI) processes undertaken by actors such as the World Bank with Ministries of Finance.³² DRFI analysis also supports many other design requirements for linking CVA to SP, such as creating risk profiles, generating costed models of disaster impacts, creating economic investment cases for preparedness and early warning early action, and defining emergency response plans as a precondition to releasing pre-allocated disaster risk finance.

More work could be done collaboratively with HA actors to define DRFI strategies. This is needed to create the right mix of financial instruments to respond to shocks (such as country-based pooled funds), which can also incentivise the right mix of actors to engage on SRSP (Konyndyk, 2018). On the latter, donors could further play their part by submitting expressions of interest for SRSP-style programmes that require joint applications from SP and HA actors, as DFID did in Lebanon (Cherrier et al., 2019).

What is clear is that funding strictures heavily influence programmatic action (Konyndyk, 2018). As long as humanitarians are limited in the activities they can support, and are chasing short-term funding to respond to imminent crises, they will not be able to engage in the wider agenda on linking CVA to SP fully. New ways to support multi-stakeholder coordination and programming are needed, and exploring DRFI and innovative funding mechanisms could be a fruitful avenue for linking CVA to SP. The larger implication that could be drawn for SRSP is that the move towards the use of government-led social protection systems will mean that financial requirements for shock response will increasingly be borne by governments and their development partners. It will therefore also be important for development partners to discuss fiscal space and understand options for securing predictable government and longer-term funding for SRSP, linked to a social protection strategy that includes disaster risk financing.

There is a need for realism about the potential for new approaches for disaster risk financing and a recognition of the likelihood that sustained international support, from both development and humanitarian sources, will still be needed to test approaches and take things to scale, whilst also helping people meet basic needs in many crises through conventional systems and programmes.

2.5 REFLECTIONS

Linking CVA to SP offers the possibility of multiple benefits. Harmonising approaches and developing greater flexibility within a SP system to cope with and manage a broader array of shocks holds the potential to reduce and avoid duplication of effort and cost, enhance coordination, build national capacity, and improve outcomes for beneficiaries. This is reflected across the case study literature on SRSP.

However, efforts to overcome the divisions of the humanitarian and development communities sit on top of deep theoretical, structural, and political differences. International and national actors in the development sector are fundamentally geared towards competition rather than coordination and integration (Browne, 2014; Konyndyk, 2018). These issues permeate the theme of linking CVA to SP and raise several concerns that are presented briefly for consideration below.

2.5.1 Political economy

The political economy of linking CVA to SP still receives insufficient attention in multiple dimensions: Can humanitarian and development actors maintain commitments to humanitarian principles whilst working with government-run social assistance? Does linkage of HA and SP mean a slow loss of influence, resources, and visibility for HA and DRM actors? How can trust be built across ministries and partners with fundamentally different structures and mandates who are sometimes in direct competition for resources? What are the questions of political economy a ministry or donor need answering to embrace the idea of linking HA to SP?

At the heart of these questions are well-known yet divergent ways of thinking about the role of the state. SP has a strong focus on supporting states to provide social assistance to their citizens as part of a broader social contract, rooted in legislation, integrated in sectoral policies, and financed from domestic resources. Meanwhile, humanitarian action requires a certain distance and independence from the state to uphold humanitarian principles and act as a provider of last resort when the state is overwhelmed, complicit, or lacks control. There could be openings to explore some of these questions and tensions through research and capacity-building initiatives.

³² See for instance the World Bank's Disaster Risk Financing Primer: www.financialprotectionforum.org/publication/disaster-risk-finance-a-primercore-principles-and-operational-framework

2.5.2 Clarifying the objectives of different actors

Is it appropriate to link CVA to SP in all cases, or there is a risk of over-burdening SP systems by trying to ensure they are responsive to a growing array of shocks? The SRSP literature is clear that the ability of a social protection system to manage a broad range of covariate shocks is dependent on a range of factors (capacity, maturity, shock type, coordination) (O'Brien et al., 2018b), and that even where a reasonably well-functioning and institutionalised SP programme or system exists, it may not be in a position to incorporate additional caseloads in response to additional shocks (Winder-Rossi et al., 2017).

In many countries, social assistance has limited coverage or lacks presence in hard-to-access areas. In these cases, some states may be better advised to keep social assistance and HA systems separate, and rather focus on improving and formalising overall coordination and common support systems. Working more effectively with governments to enable them to assist and support their citizens in times of crisis might mean building disaster response capacity as part of national disaster management systems instead of, or as well as, working to make social protection more shock responsive. Even in higher capacity countries where integration has been achieved to a certain degree, the picture is complicated. The example of Turkey provided above shows how linking HA to SP can have paradoxical outcomes.

'Piggybacking' on a SP system to deliver HA could improve the efficiency of HA delivery whilst doing little by way of building overall government capacity or changing donor funding priorities towards national ownership. Shifting the burden of humanitarian response onto SP systems could be achieved without reducing levels of overall need if underlying long-term programmes are not addressing them due to insufficient coverage, funding, design, or capacity. This might be in line with humanitarian objectives to increase the speed, timeliness, and efficiency of a crisis response but problematic in terms of development objectives to strengthen national systems, and risks overburdening a SP system or distracting from core objectives if not designed appropriately. Reconciling different objectives is context specific and requires commitment to close coordination across sectors, whilst avoiding opportunism. Where integration is deemed appropriate and feasible and local capacities can be strengthened, then the goal of building national capacity should be central, and a commitment be made to learn from experiences to enhance future responses. Again, focus should be on advancing the core principles of universal social protection wherever possible – how to increase the coverage, comprehensiveness, and adequacy of existing SP programmes over time.

In short, integration poses risks as well as rewards, and there is a need for greater caution in assuming that linking CVA to SP is unequivocally positive or universally applicable. States affected by crises and organisations that support them need to make more nuanced decisions about whether, where and how to link CVA to SP. Realism, ambition, and patience are needed in equal measure to ensure social protection systems are not prematurely overloaded, states are sufficiently supported, and that linking CVA to SP is not seen as a quick exit strategy for HA actors. As Cherrier (forthcoming) notes:

'Fundamentally and most importantly, this agenda calls for a complete change of mind-set and approach to humanitarian assistance and social protection. It requires reconciling different viewpoints and translating them into constructive action. From a donor perspective, the question is how can governments be persuaded to be more inclusive; from a government standpoint, it faces disproportionate political and economic risks from being left with the bill; and from the international humanitarian agencies viewpoint, there might be dilemmas on how to reconcile commitments to neutrality and independence with those to respecting the primary responsibility of governments (Seyfert et al., 2019). Clarifying the nature of humanitarian needs, agreeing on shared goals over the short to medium term, and redefining respective roles and responsibilities towards that vision require soft skills to steer dialogue and negotiate differences across actors.'

2.5.3 Gender

Disasters and conflicts exacerbate existing inequalities and affect populations differently due to gender, age, and disability. Emergency interventions themselves can risk exacerbating these fault lines if not properly planned and delivered.³³ As CaLP and others have noted however,³⁴ it is relatively poorly understood how to implement

³³ See CaLP's various resources on gender and CVA that speak to these points: www.calpnetwork.org/publication/collected-papers-on-gender-and-cash-transfer-programmes-in-humanitarian-contexts

³⁴ See: www.devex.com/news/opinion-for-cash-transfers-to-work-we-can-t-ignore-gender-93575

humanitarian responses in a gender-sensitive way, and the relationship cash transfers play in that process. With one or two notable exceptions (e.g. Cherrier et al., 2019), so far efforts to address gender disparity have also been all but absent in SRSP discussions. Yet in SP there is a strong body of evidence on the benefits of providing cash transfers to households to help address gender dynamics and disparities (Mishra, 2017). Therefore the 'bridge thinking' on gender and linking HA to SP appears to be lacking.

This could be a result of several factors, such as a lack of gender-disaggregated data evidence, a lack of political interest and will, and the fact that gender is cross-cutting and not easily 'clustered' (Cherrier et al., 2019). But there are also broader issues at play. It is widely acknowledged in SP that cash transfers alone do not lead to desired outcomes in malnutrition, health, and education (Roelen et al., 2017), they need to be accompanied by combinations of social services (e.g. primary healthcare, education, nutrition) and/or behavioural change (e.g. on child care and nutrition, financial inclusion, legal rights and entitlements), so-called 'cash plus' or 'layered' approaches (Mishra, 2017). This is especially critical for women and girls, given unequal power dynamics in households, gendered patterns of work and care, and a relative lack of access to financial, social, and political resources in comparison to men (Roelen et al., 2018). However, the scope of social services in low-capacity countries can be limited, and conflict is unsurprisingly associated with the deterioration of delivery systems and service provision (Carpenter et al., 2012). This may lead to the perception that gender in the context of already complex SRSP considerations may be too much to address in a comprehensive manner.

A step-by-step approach could prove useful to reintroduce gender as an overlooked dimension of analysis for linking CVA to SP. This could first entail applying a gender lens across an 'unbundled' operational framework (looking at different programmatic and systemic features as discussed above) to understand where it must be prioritised. Secondly, it can mean paying consideration to whether households are eligible for multiple interventions (one of the supposed advantages of working in a coordinated way in SRSP), and where looking beyond cash towards social services and accompanying measures is needed as part of a more comprehensive approach, albeit one that is introduced progressively over time. Lastly, it can mean broadening the thinking to encompass a gender-responsive social protection agenda, by looking at the political landscape to understand which gender-inclusive policies and political champions exist, and perhaps most crucially, how SP (and HA) can frame women as more than simply mothers and caregivers but agents of change, contributors to the economy, and recipients of SP in their own right (Holmes et al., 2019).

In short, a gender perspective can help arrive at a more holistic and well-rounded view of how to reach vulnerable people in and outside of crisis, as well as contribute to eventual exit strategies for HA actors and transition strategies to formalised and government-led approaches to SRSP. For this to happen, more evidence is needed of the different possible points of connection with national social protection systems, looking at social cash transfer programmes and beyond to include social services, social workers, social insurance, labour policies, and so on (Cherrier, forthcoming).

2.5.4 Age and disability

Older persons and people with disabilities and their households are disproportionately represented amongst the poorest. While access to social protection can potentially play a key role in enhancing well-being, existing programmes do not reach the vast majority of people with disabilities, and older people face barriers due to existing vulnerabilities and increased risk of protection violations (Mleinek and Davis 2012; DFID 2015a; DFID 2015b). Physical, communication, and attitudinal barriers, and a lack of sensitivity or awareness in the programme design, make it hard for older persons and people with disabilities to access support (Mont, 2010; Kidd et al., 2019). Those with disabilities are acutely vulnerable to crises because they are less likely than others to benefit from interventions or humanitarian assistance, especially due to limited accessible information, lack of disability data, and negative attitudes or knowledge amongst family members, communities, and programme implementers (Groce et al., 2011; UNHCR, 2019b; Sherwood and Pearce, 2016; Pearce, 2013; Handicap International, 2015; Rohwerder, 2018). Evidence also shows that older persons are often overlooked in humanitarian operations (HelpAge, 2012 and 2014). Humanitarian cash and voucher assistance, social assistance, and programmes that attempt to build links between them need to pay greater attention to issues of age and disability.

2.5.5 Transformative as well as protective

People needing social assistance in crises are often at risk of violence (including gender-based and sexual violence), are in particular need of protection, and have constrained rights to work or move freely (Denney and Mallett, 2017). Transformative approaches to social protection that focus not just on assistance but on areas such as the right to work, freedom of movement, and protection from violence are critically needed, precisely when they are most difficult to put into place. There is a need to focus on the extent to which transformative approaches can be successfully integrated into linked humanitarian and social assistance. 'Cash plus' or complementary programming approaches may have potential to create synergistic impacts between basic assistance and protection to reduce risks of violence and mitigate its consequences. There is also scope for more focus on how social protection might support livelihoods and inclusion (Harvey and Pavanello, 2019; Roelen et al., 2017).

3 CONCLUSION

Linking humanitarian CVA to SP, as part of the broader SRSP agenda, has gained significant momentum and interest in the last five years. This is due to a combination of factors such as the focus of global commitments on greater alignment of objectives, systems, and programmes, the demand for enhanced coordination and cost savings in operations, and the increasingly common features of humanitarian and social protection programmes. But it is principally part of a broader 30-year effort to improve the link between development and humanitarian activities to better serve vulnerable people in poor, fragile, and conflict affected countries, as the frequency and intensity of climate and other shocks increases, driving global humanitarian need to record levels.

Conceptual and policy discussions that link humanitarian CVA to SP have come a long way in a short time, and there is now a proliferation of material (position papers, case studies, guidance notes, and academic research) on how different organisations are planning or operationalising the linkages, reflecting a growing number of activities on the ground. However, there remains a number of gaps in the literature, and a pressing call from practitioners for focused, tailored support in planning and implementing the linkages at regional and country level.

This paper, commissioned by CaLP, provides an overview of how the concepts of linking CVA to SP and SRSP more broadly have developed, how the links are being operationalised across different country contexts, what some of the main programming considerations are, and some further reflections for consideration as this agenda evolves. A second part, internal to CaLP, provides a set of capacity-building recommendations based on the analysis and research undertaken here.

The overall argument made in this paper is that whilst linking CVA to SP holds much promise and has introduced interesting programmatic innovation, there is a need to better understand the different ways in which CVA can link to SP from a humanitarian perspective, and the effectiveness of the approach. Greater caution is advised in assuming that the linkage is unequivocally positive and the findings universally applicable. Actors need to make more nuanced decisions about whether, how, and in what circumstances it is desirable to more strongly link SP and CVA, and what this means for the right balance of development and humanitarian instruments in different places. That said, the approach holds significant potential and has created some encouraging early results and insights. Therefore, more work is needed to fill some of the global knowledge gaps, but more critically, to support the capacity-building needs at field level, focusing on realistic and pragmatic solutions.

As this approach becomes further embedded in different institutions' ways of working, this paper notes there will be a greater need to agree on and formalise key approaches and tools, and an increased demand for practitioners with 'hybrid profiles', those with expertise across humanitarian and social protection (as well as other relevant) sectors. As many of the challenges encountered in merging these two worlds are not conducive to technical solutions alone, practitioners must combine their practical knowledge with the right mix of soft skills to manage what are, in effect, processes of change, negotiation, and trust-building, with the objective of delivering improved programmes and better outcomes for shock-affected communities.

4 ANNEXES

ANNEX I – OBJECTIVES, SCOPE, AND FOCUS OF CONSULTANCY (FROM TORS)

The assignment covers the time period from 1 January 2020 to 30 March 2020. Its objective is:

To provide CaLP with an updated overview of the latest analysis and practice in linking social protection with humanitarian cash and voucher assistance and, drawing on this, to recommend revision and additions to training materials.

The principal output from the consultants, a high-level briefing paper, will analyse the questions below to recommend a strategy and form/content for the revision of CaLP's capacity-building (CB) materials on linking Social Protection (SP) and Humanitarian CVA:

- a. What have been the critical developments in the last four years in terms of analytical frameworks and national, regional, and global policy and practice?
- b. What high-level training materials have been generated and by which agencies and for what audience (e.g. the SSA focused Transform course, Key Aid recently offered similar training in their Master Practitioner course, UNICEF may be commissioning a toolkit, FAO have recent work on gender and SP, IDS is currently developing an online e-learning course, a module of which will be on shock-responsive social protection, etc.)?
- c. How has the audience for training evolved (e.g. government officials, UN agencies, NGOs, etc.)?
- d. Where are there gaps in existing training materials? (NB CaLP is also developing a crib sheet and three in-depth case studies for the MENA region.) How should these information gaps guide where we should support others or what further pieces of work we should develop in this area?

Based on consideration of the above issues, the consultant(s) will recommend what further training should be developed by CaLP, and/or how their existing CB material should be strengthened and for what audience and context.

ANNEX II – ABBREVIATION LIST

Full title	Abbreviation
Active Labour Market Policies	ALMP
Climate Change Adaptation	CCA
(Humanitarian) Cash and Voucher Assistance	CVA
Disaster Risk Financing	DRF
Disaster Risk Management	DRM
Early Warning System	EWS
Financial Service Provider	FSP
Grand Bargain sub-group on the linkages between humanitarian cash and social protection	GBSG
Grievance and Referral Mechanisms	GRMs
Horizontal expansion	HE
Household Economy Approach	HEA
Humanitarian Assistance	HA
Hunger Safety Net Programme (Kenya)	HSNP
Internally Displaced Person/People	IDPs
International Financial Institutions	IFIs
Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessments	ISPA
Integrated Phase Classification system	IPC
Management Information systems	MIS
Memoranda of Understanding	MoU
Monitoring and Evaluation	M+E
Multi-Donor Trust Fund	MDTF
Non-Government Organisation	NGO
Overseas Development Assistance	ODA
Productive Safety Net Programme (Ethiopia)	PSNP
Proxy Means Testing	PMT
Public Financial Management	PFM
Shock-Responsive Social Protection	SRSP
Social Protection	SP
Social Registry	SR
Vertical Expansion	VE

ANNEX III – GLOSSARY

- **Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)** – In human systems, the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects, in order to moderate harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In natural systems, the process of adjustment to actual climate and its effects; human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate (IPCC, 2012).
- **Design tweaks** – The design of social protection programmes and systems can be adjusted in a way that takes into consideration the crises that a country typically faces (O'Brien et al., 2018a).
- **Disaster** – Broadly similar to the term 'crisis', and related to shocks. Disasters are defined as a 'serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society at any scale due to hazardous events interacting with conditions of exposure, vulnerability and capacity' (UNDRR, 2017). They are often distinguished from a shock by exceeding local or national capacity to cope using their own resources, thus requiring some form of external assistance.
- **Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)/Disaster Risk Management (DRM)** – DRR is the *policy objective* of disaster risk management, and its goals and objectives are defined in disaster risk reduction strategies and plans. DRM is the *application of disaster risk reduction policies and strategies*. DRR/DRM aims to prevent new disaster risk, reduce existing disaster risk, and manage residual risk, contributing to the strengthening of resilience, reduction of disaster losses, and the achievement of sustainable development (UNDRR, 2017).
- **Hazard** – A dangerous phenomenon that may cause losses to life, property, social and economic disruption, or environmental degradation, etc. (UNDRR, 2017). It is the possibility of something occurring. Not every hazard leads to a shock or disaster (for instance, very heavy rains could be hazardous, but may not lead to flooding).
- **Horizontal expansion** – Temporary inclusion of new beneficiaries from disaster-affected communities in a social protection programme (O'Brien et al., 2018a).
- **Humanitarian assistance** – Humanitarian assistance aims to save lives, alleviate suffering, and maintain human dignity during and after man-made crises and disasters associated with natural hazards, as well as to strengthen preparedness for when such situations occur. It is rooted in the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and independence (Sphere Association, 2018; Development Initiatives, 2018).
- **Piggybacking** – Use of part of an established system or programme by a new programme response (either by government or partners) (O'Brien et al., 2018a).
- **Resilience** – The ability of a system, community, or society exposed to hazards to resist, absorb, accommodate, adapt to, transform, and recover from the effects of a hazard in a timely and efficient manner, including through the preservation and restoration of its essential basic structures and functions through risk management (UNDRR, 2017).
- **Risk** – whilst there is no universal definition of risk, the DRM and CCA communities generally define it as the interaction of three factors: a *hazard* (or more broadly a 'shock'), levels of *exposure* to the hazard (or shock), and levels of *vulnerability/coping capacity* (economic, social, environmental, political etc.).
- **Shadow Alignment** – The development of one or more elements of a parallel humanitarian response that aligns as best as possible with those used in a current or possible future social protection programme or DRM system. This is distinct from piggybacking on elements of a system, as it uses a parallel infrastructure rather than the same system (O'Brien et al., 2018a).
- **Shock** – A shock is the realisation of risk (an event combining exposure, and pre-existing vulnerabilities/lack of coping capacity). A shock can also refer to the moment at which a slow-onset process (a stressor) becomes an extreme event. Shocks can have different characteristics (weather- and climate-induced, epidemiological, conflict-related, structural (e.g. food price hikes)), and can be both slow- and fast-onset in nature. They can affect the individual or household (idiosyncratic) or a large number of people simultaneously (covariate).
- **Social Assistance** – Repeated, conditional or unconditional, predictable transfers of cash, goods, or services provided on a long-term basis to vulnerable or destitute households or specific individuals (e.g. the elderly, pregnant women), with the aim of allowing them to meet basic needs or build assets to protect themselves and increase resilience against shocks and vulnerable periods of the lifecycle. Usually refers to government

assistance provided in cash, but can also refer to in-kind assistance (CaLP, 2017). Other terms used in social protection include 'social transfers' or 'social safety nets'. They can be implemented by government, NGOs, or financial service providers (FSPs), and are usually funded through taxation or donors (Roelen et al., 2018).

- **Social Protection** – Actions carried out by the state or privately, to address risk, vulnerability, and chronic poverty. Social protection refers to comprehensive systems including safety nets, social assistance, labour market policies, social insurance options (e.g. contributory pensions, health insurance), and basic social services (e.g. in education, health and nutrition) (CaLP 2017). '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' (ISPA, 2018).
- **Vertical expansion** – The benefit value or the duration of a social protection programme is temporarily increased for some or all beneficiaries (O'Brien et al., 2018a).

ANNEX IV – KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEW LIST

Name	Institution	Contact Information
Ric Goodman	DAI	Ric_Goodman@dai.com
Alexandra Barrantes	Development Pathways	Abarrantes@developmentpathways.org.uk
Emily Henderson	DFID	E-Henderson@dfid.gov.uk
Massimo La Rosa	ECHO	Massimo.Larosa@echofield.eu
Michael Samson	EPRI	msamson@epri.org.za
Natalia Winder-Rossi	FAO	Natalia.winderrossi@fao.org
Federico Spano	FAO	Federico.Spano@fao.org
Ana OCampo	FAO	Ana.ocampo@fao.org
Calum Mclean	Independent	calum.mclean001@gmail.com
Gabrielle Smith	Independent	gab_smithers@hotmail.com
Cecile Cherrier	Independent	cecile.cherrier@gmail.com
Zehra Rizvi	Independent	f.zehrarizvi@gmail.com
Valentina Barca	Independent	valentinabarca@gmail.com
Isabelle Pelly	Independent	isabelle.pelly@googlemail.com
Helene Juillard	Key Aid Consulting	helene@keyaidconsulting.com
Sarah Bailey	ODI/WFP	sarahbaileyk@gmail.com
Karin Seyfert	OPM	Karin.Seyfert@opml.co.uk
Larissa Pelham	Oxfam	larissa.pelham@oxfam.org
Emma Delo	Red Cross Red Crescent Movement	EDelo@redcross.org.uk
Nupur Kukrety	UNICEF	nkukrety@unicef.org
Claire Mariani	UNICEF	cmariani@unicef.org
Clare O'Brien	World Food Programme	clare.obrien@wfp.org
Diana King	World Food Programme	Diana.king@wfp.org

ANNEX V – COMMITMENTS TO LINK HUMANITARIAN CVA AND SP IN HIGH-LEVEL MULTILATERAL AGREEMENTS

- **World Humanitarian Summit** – A joint statement provided by social protection actors to the World Humanitarian Summit states ‘... [L]inking social protection and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide’ (Social Protection Interagency Cooperation Board (SPIAC-B) (2016). <https://ipcig.org/pub/sites/default/files/SPIACBstatementWHS.pdf>
- **The Grand Bargain** – As part of the World Humanitarian Summit, signatories of the Grand Bargain noted that ‘Delivering (humanitarian) cash should, where possible and appropriate, use, link or align with local and national mechanisms such as social protection system’ (Core Commitment 3), and that aid organisations and donors should commit to ‘Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts’ (Core Commitment 10). https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/grand_bargain_final_22_may_final-2_0.pdf
- **The Common Donor Approach for Humanitarian Cash Programming** states that ‘Donors expect to see cash programmes use, link to or align with local and national mechanisms such as social protection systems, where possible and appropriate’ (The Common Donor Approach for Humanitarian Cash Programming, 2019). <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/common-donor-approach-feb-19.pdf>
- **The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)** – The SDG outcome document, ‘Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development’, recognises the disproportionate impacts of covariate shocks on the most vulnerable. SDG 1 calls for an end to (extreme) poverty in all its manifestations by 2030, including through ensuring social protection for the poor and vulnerable, increasing access to basic services, and supporting people harmed by climate-related extreme events and other economic, social, and environmental shocks and disasters. Target 1.3 (Goal 1) seeks to implement nationally appropriate social protection systems and measures for all, including floors, and by 2030 achieve substantial coverage of the poor and the vulnerable. Target 1.5 (Goal 1), which relates to adaptive social protection, aims to build the resilience of the poor and those in vulnerable situations and to reduce their exposure and vulnerability to climate-related extreme events and other economic, social, and environmental shocks and disasters (World Bank, 2018). <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/sdg1>
- The ‘**New Way of Working**’, signed by the Secretary-General and eight UN Principals at the World Humanitarian Summit, and endorsed by the World Bank and IOM, hinged on three objectives: 1) Reinforce – do not replace – national and local systems; 2) Transcend the humanitarian–development divide by working toward collective outcomes, based on comparative advantage and over multi-year timelines; 3) Anticipate – do not wait for – crises (OCHA, 2017). www.agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/20170228%20NWoW%2013%20high%20res.pdf
- Specific commitments were signed for refugee situations under the United Nations General Assembly *New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants* (2016), including a commitment to ‘develop national strategies for the protection of refugees within the framework of national social protection systems’. www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/generalassembly/docs/globalcompact/A_RES_71_1.pdf

ANNEX VI – UNBUNDLED VISUALISATION/COUNTRY CONTEXT TYPOLOGY VISUALISATION

‘Unbundled’

Seyfert et. al. (2019), describe how the different policy and programmatic issues to consider when linking HA to SP can be disaggregated (the paper focused on contexts of displacement and refugees, but could be applied more broadly). They are then set against an adapted OPM framework that assesses each issue against a level of integration, from very little integration (parallel system) to full integration (National Systems led). The point of the paper was not to regard HA and SP as two impenetrable systems, but rather to consider issue by issue how to better integrate and align the two approaches.

	Parallel System	Alignment	Piggyback	National Systems Led
Financing	█			
Legal and policy framework		█		
Setting eligibility criteria and qualifying conditions		█		
Setting transfer type, level, frequency, duration			█	
Governance and coordination				█
Outreach	█			
Registration		█		
Enrolment	█			
Payment			█	
Case management				█
Complaints and appeals				█
Protection			█	
VAM/M&E		█		
Information management	█			

Source: Seyfert et al., 2019.

Country context scenarios

The below based on Winder Rossi et al. (2017) summarises different scenarios that combine the maturity of the existing SP system based on state capacity with its flexibility to respond to shocks.

N	Type of SP context	Description
1	Shattered or severely weakened system	Context where there is no formal provision of social protection and/or existing structures (formal and non-formal) have been shattered or severely weakened by crises or conflict.
2	Nascent social assistance system	Initial components of a social protection systems are being put in place, providing short to medium term support mostly in relation to acute risks, threats or crisis, Yet, a coherent system is not developed.
3	State SP system unable to respond to repeated crises	A social protection programme or system exists and is institutionalised within the state structure, yet it is rigid and inflexible or too overloaded; is unable to adapt to increasing burden of need in the event of a shock or crisis.
4	Limited shock-responsive national SP system	A SP programme or system exists that includes committed state involvement (even if it is donor funded). The system is partially able to respond to predictable shocks and increase coverage of those households affected by the shock and eligible to receive SP
5	Highly shock-responsive national SP system	An ideal scenario where a social protection system is institutionalised within state structures and is prepared to respond nimbly and flexibly to predictable and unpredictable shocks and stresses.

Source: Adapted from Winder-Rossi et al. (2017).

ANNEX VII – PROTECTION OR SOCIAL PROTECTION?³⁵

What is it?

Protection is the duty to keep safe those who are vulnerable to harm from violence, coercion, or abuse.

Social protection is ‘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’ (ISPA, 2016).

Is it a right? Who is responsible?

Protection is a right and a legal responsibility. The state has primary responsibility for ensuring that people within its borders are safe. When the state does not or cannot do so effectively, national and international organisations can play a part in ensuring that basic obligations are met, by monitoring, investigating, reporting on, and raising awareness of human rights and by providing technical and financial support.

Social protection is often conceived of as a right in accordance with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). Women and men, boys and girls, possess equal, inalienable rights to the basic needs for a viable, dignified life throughout the lifecycle. As such, social protection is a responsibility of the state towards its citizens, but is also provided informally by many different actors, including members of communities themselves.

Both ‘protection’ and ‘social protection’ focus on protection risks and vulnerabilities – but on the protection side the stress is on coercion and violence and on the social protection side it is protection from vulnerability to poverty and deprivation (measured in a variety of ways). Both focus on well-being and the establishment of a dignified life. Progressive understandings of both social protection and protection seek to empower vulnerable people and groups so that they can transform the terms of engagement for safe lives and productive livelihoods.

What is the focus?

Protection has a significant focus on gender-based violence, child protection, the rights of refugees or the stateless, and the rights of minorities or marginalised groups. Protection is a central objective to all humanitarian action, helping people **stay safe from violence, coercion, and abuse**, and taking steps to prevent and reduce risk as well as to restore well-being and dignity for people affected by crisis, particularly the most vulnerable. This also includes ensuring the harm and protection concerns of humanitarian interventions themselves are managed, reduced, or mitigated.

Formal social protection aims to provide sufficient, adequate, and predictable support to address risks across the lifecycle. It is important to understand how men and women, girls and boys may have different needs and challenges at different stages of life.

Neither social protection nor protection can exist in a vacuum and must be accompanied by access to decent education, healthcare, sanitation, and other essential services as well as anti-discrimination action, just labour markets, and legislative frameworks.

What are typical programmes or activities?

Protection programmes include those that aim to prevent or mitigate gender-based violence, reduce negative and irreversible coping strategies (e.g. early and forced marriage, early pregnancy, using child labour), programmes to prevent violence or coercion, and those that create safe spaces in humanitarian contexts or provide support to survivors of violence.

Formal social protection is delivered through three main mechanisms: (i) social assistance (sometimes referred to as ‘social safety nets’) – e.g. food, cash and voucher transfers, school feeding, public works (this can also include social services); (ii) social insurance – maternity, unemployment, health insurance, pensions; and (iii) Active Labour Market Policies (ALMP). As noted, much social protection is also provided informally as support within the community through reciprocity and social networks.

³⁵ This annex draws heavily from Oxfam guidance – Protection or Social Protection (Oxfam, forthcoming).



Various linkages are being explored between humanitarian and social protection activities as outlined in this paper, such as linking social assistance to humanitarian CVA, using common coordination structures and targeting tools, linking with early warning, early action, and preparedness planning, etc. This can help better manage humanitarian crises, and in some cases, the response mechanisms used by humanitarian actors, for example cash transfers, can be used to establish social assistance or to expand, promote, or align with existing social protection systems.



ANNEX VIII – KEY RESOURCES

Relevant literature on this topic has been expanding rapidly in recent years. Below is a selection of some of the most important materials (synthesis reports, toolkits, case studies, etc.)³⁶. For continuous updates, join the [Socialprotection.org Online Community](https://socialprotection.org) on “[Social Protection in Crisis Contexts](https://socialprotection.org)”.

Name and link	Type/function	Date	Institutions involved	Regional focus, if any
Synthesis and toolkits				
Climate resilience through social protection	Synthesis document	2019	IIED	Global
Strengthening the capacity of ASEAN Member States to design and implement risk-informed and shock-responsive social protection systems for resilience (Regional Synthesis Report)	Regional synthesis document	2019	WFP, UNICEF, FAO, EU and OPM	ASIA
Aligning Humanitarian Cash Assistance with National Social Safety Nets in Refugee Settings – Key Considerations and Learning here and accompanying mapping of Safety Nets for refugees here	Reference document/ toolkit	2019	UNHCR	Global
Shock Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean, Synthesis Report and video	Regional synthesis document, video	2019	WFP and OPM	Latin America and Caribbean
Building Shock-Responsive National Social Protection Systems in the MENA region	Regional synthesis document	2019	UNICEF and UNDP-IPC	MENA
Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus. A Game Changer in Supporting People through Crises	Reference document/ toolkit	2019	SPaN/European Commission	Global
SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 1: Benefit Modalities SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 2: Targeting SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 3: Stakeholders SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 4: Operations SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 5: Integrated Financing SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 6 (Missing/forthcoming) SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 7: Nutrition Security SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 8: Vulnerable Groups SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 9: Fragility SPaN Guidance – Operational Note 10: Forced Displacement	Reference document/ toolkit (<i>NOTE: will need access to SP.org Community for these – see above</i>)	2019	SPaN/European Commission	Global

³⁶ Taken from www.unicef.org/media/63846/file



Name and link	Type/function	Date	Institutions involved	Regional focus, if any
Building on government systems for shock preparedness and response: the role of social assistance data and information systems with accompanying infographic and webinar	Synthesis document, infographic, webinar	2019	DFAT and OPM	Global
Social Protection: Delivering on Humanitarian Emergencies and Crises	Position paper	2018	European Commission	Global
Human(itarian) Capital? Lessons on Better Connecting Humanitarian Assistance and Social Protection	Synthesis document	2018	WFP and World Bank	Global
The Role of Cash Transfers in Social Protection, Humanitarian Response and Shock-Responsive Social Protection	Academic working paper	2018	IDS	Global
6 Background papers for the forthcoming World Bank position paper on Adaptive Social Protection (financing, information systems, delivery systems, institutions, programme design)	Synthesis documents, position paper	Unpublished (2018)	OPM and World Bank	Global
Bridging Humanitarian Responses and Long-Term Development through Transformative Changes—Some Initial Reflections from the World Bank's Adaptive Social Protection Program in the Sahel – accompanied by two ITAD blogs - Five key principles for Adaptive Social Protection programming and Is my social protection programme 'shock-responsive' or 'adaptive'?	Journal article; blogs	2018	CIAT and ITAD, building on World Bank Sahel work	Africa
Shock Responsive Social Protection Systems Toolkit	Toolkit	2018	DFID and OPM, supported by ODI and CALP	Global
Shock Responsive Social Protection Systems Synthesis Report , accompanied by a webinar and VIDEO	Synthesis document, webinar, video	2018	DFID and OPM, supported by ODI and CALP	Global
Evidence on Social Protection in Contexts of Fragility and Forced Displacement	Synthesis document	2018	UNICEF	Global
Final Conference Report and Livestream Recordings of the International Conference on Social Protection in contexts of Fragility & Forced Displacement	Position paper; Webinar/ live recording	2018	Multi-stakeholder	Global



Name and link	Type/function	Date	Institutions involved	Regional focus, if any
Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Research Literature Review (2nd edition) – also in French	Literature review	2017	DFID and OPM, supported by ODI and CALP	Global
Social protection and resilience. Supporting livelihoods in protracted crises and in fragile and humanitarian contexts	Position paper	2017	FAO	Global
Shock Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean – Literature Review (in Spanish here and French here)	Literature review	2016	WFP and OPM	Latin America and Caribbean
Working with cash based safety nets in humanitarian contexts: Guidance note for humanitarian practitioners	Toolkit/Guidance	2016	CALP	Global
TOPIC GUIDE: Anticipating and responding to shocks: livelihoods and humanitarian responses	Toolkit/Guidance	2015	ODI	Global
Responding to a crisis: the design and delivery of social protection	Synthesis document	2014	DFID and ODI	Global
Shockwatch: Shock response readiness appraisal toolkit	Toolkit	2013	DFID and ODI	Global
Country case studies and other materials				
Building resilience to climate change through social protection Lessons from MGNREGS, India	Case study	2019	IIED	Asia
Approaches to Providing Cash Based Assistance in Protracted Crises: Lessons from Turkey	Case study	2019	UNICEF	MENA/Europe
Malawi Shock Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) Case Study	Case Study	2019	IDS and Irish Aid	Africa
SPaN case study – Yemen , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	MENA
SPaN case study – Uganda , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	Africa
SPaN case study – Ethiopia , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	Africa
SPaN case study – Lebanon , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	MENA



Name and link	Type/function	Date	Institutions involved	Regional focus, if any
SPaN case study – Bangladesh , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	Asia
SPaN case study – Iraq , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	MENA
SPaN case study – Kenya – Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP), in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	Africa
SPaN case study – Somalia , in English	Case study	2019	SPAN/European Commission	Africa
SPaN podcast and case study – Mali	Podcast/Case study	2019	SPAN/ECHO	Africa
Evaluation of the DG ECHO funded Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) in Turkey (blog too)	Evaluation	2019	WFP, OPM and Development Analytics	MENA/Europe
The potential of Nepal's social security allowance schemes to support emergency flood response, in English	Assessment	2019	UNICEF, DFID and ODI	Asia
Case Studies on Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Dominica, Peru and El Salvador here	Case studies	2017-2019	WFP and OPM	Latin America and Caribbean
Cash Transfers for Disaster Response: Lessons from Tropical Cyclone Winston (Fiji)	Case study	2018	Australian National University	Pacific
Delivering social protection in the midst of conflict and crisis: The case of Yemen	Case study	2018	World Bank	MENA
How to Target Households in Adaptive Social Protection Systems? Evidence from Humanitarian and Development Approaches in Niger	Case study	2018	World Bank	Africa
Webinar Shock-responsive social protection in practice: perspectives from Kenya and Mozambique	Webinar	2018	DFID and OPM	Africa
Webinar Shock-responsive social protection in practice: experiences in Pakistan and the Philippines	Webinar	2018	DFID and OPM	Asia



Name and link	Type/function	Date	Institutions involved	Regional focus, if any
Webinar: Managing Disaster Differently: Shock-Sensitive Social Protection in Malawi	Webinar	2018	GIZ	Africa
Cash Transfer Programmes (CTPs) in Challenging Contexts: Case study on CTP and risks in northern Mali - Final Report , French here	Case study	2018	CALP	Africa
Mali , in English , French and Policy brief	Case study	2018	DFID and OPM	Africa
Kyrgyzstan Supporting national social protection systems to respond to needs at times of crisis: lessons from Kyrgyzstan	Case study	2017	UNICEF	Asia
Lesotho , in English , and Policy brief	Case study	2017	DFID and OPM	Africa
Mozambique , in English , Portuguese and Policy brief	Case study	2017	DFID and OPM	Africa
Sahel , in English , French and Policy brief – accompanied by a Working Paper on Shock-Responsive Social Protection in the Sahel: Community Perspectives also in French	Case study	2017	DFID and OPM	Africa
Pakistan , in English , and Policy brief	Case study	2017	DFID and OPM	Asia
Philippines , in English , and Policy brief	Case study	2017	DFID and OPM	Asia

ANNEX IX – BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abell, T., Chopra, A., Jacobs, A., McCormack, R., Smith, G., and Vir Gupta, A. 2018. *The state of the world's cash report*. Oxford: Cash Learning Partnership.
- Agenda for Humanity. 2016. *The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need*. [ONLINE] Available at: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/system/files/grand_bargain_final_22_may_final-2_0.pdf
- Béné, C., Godfrey-Wood, R., Newsham, A., and Davies, M. 2012. *Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability-Reduction Programmes*. IDS Working Paper 405. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Berens, J., Campo, S., and Howarth, C. 2019. *Data responsibility in humanitarian action: from principle to practice*. WP1688. [ONLINE] Available at: www.wiltonpark.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/WP1688-Report-1.pdf
- Browne, E. 2014. *Social protection, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (Rapid Literature Review)*. Birmingham: GSDRC.
- Brück, T., Cuesta, J., De Hoop, J., Gentilini, U., and Peterman, A. 2019. *Social Protection in Contexts of Fragility and Forced Displacement: Introduction to a Special Issue. The Journal of Development Studies* 55.1: 1–6. [ONLINE] Available at: www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/00220388.2019.1687882?needAccess=true
- Buchanan-Smith, M. and Maxwell, S. 1994. *Linking Relief and Development: An Introduction and Overview. IDS Bulletin* 25.4. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Burns, J., Frize, J., Jaspars, S., Maxwell, D., and Young, H. 2011. *Targeting and Distribution in Complex Emergencies: Participatory Management of Humanitarian Food Assistance. Food Policy* 36.4: 535–43.
- Carpenter, S., Slater, R., and Mallett, R. 2012. *Social protection and basic services in fragile and conflict-affected situations: a global review of the evidence*. Working paper 8. London: Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium.
- Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP). 2017. *Glossary of cash transfer programming (CTP) terminology*. Oxford: Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP).
- Cherrier, C. 2014. *Cash Transfers and Resilience: Strengthening linkages between emergency cash transfers and national social transfer programmes in the Sahel*. [ONLINE] Available at: www.calpnetwork.org/publication/cash-transfers-and-resilience-strengthening-linkages-between-emergency-cash-transfers-and-national-social-transfer-programmes-in-the-sahel-discussion-paper
- Cherrier, C., Rowe, G., Hobson, M., and Smith, G. 2019. *Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus. A Game Changer in Supporting People through Crises. Tools and Methods Series* 26. Brussels: European Commission.
- Cherrier (forthcoming). *Links with humanitarian cash transfers*. In E. Schüring and M. Loewe (eds.), *Handbook on Social Protection Systems*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing/Bonn: Bonn-Rhein-Sieg University of Applied Sciences.
- Chirchir, R. and Farooq, S. 2016. *Single Registries and Social Registries: clarifying the terminological confusion*. Development Pathways' Perspectives on social policy in international development Issue 23. Orpington: Development Pathways.
- Cornelius, A., Béné, C., and Howland, F. 2018. *Is my social protection programme 'shock-responsive' or 'adaptive'?*. [ONLINE] Available at: www.braced.org/news/i/Is-my-social-protection-programme-shock-responsive-or-adaptive
- Davies, M., Guenther, B., Leavy, J., Mitchell, T., and T. Tanner. 2009. *Climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and social protection: Complementary roles in agriculture and rural growth*. Working Paper 320. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies (IDS).
- Denney, L. and Mallett, R. 2017. *Service delivery and state capacity: Findings from the Secure Livelihoods*. London: Secure Livelihoods Research Consortium.
- Development Initiatives. 2018. *Global humanitarian assistance report 2017*. London: Development Initiatives.
- Development Initiatives. 2019. *Global Humanitarian Assistance Report 2018*. UK: Development Initiatives.
- Devereux, S. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. 2004. *Transformative social protection*. IDS Working Paper 232. Brighton: IDS.

- DFID. 2015a. *Humanitarian Guidance Note: Ageing and Disability in Humanitarian Response*. London: DFID.
- DFID. 2015b. *Disability Framework – One Year On Leaving No One Behind*. London: DFID.
- Gentilini, Ugo. 2016. *Sorting through the Hype: Exploring the Interface between Humanitarian Assistance and Safety Nets*. World Bank, *Social Protection and Labor Policy Note 19*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
- Gentilini, Ugo, Sarah Laughton, and Clare O'Brien. 2018. *Humanitarian Capital? Lessons on Better Connecting Humanitarian Assistance and Social Protection*. WFP and World Bank, *Social Protection and Labor Discussion Paper 1802*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group.
- Government of Malawi / UNICEF. 2017. *Review of a Policy Decision – The Automatic Inclusion of Social Cash Transfer Programme Beneficiaries into the Food Emergency Response Caseload*. Lilongwe: Malawi
- Groce, N., Kett, M., Lang, R., and Trani, J-F. 2011. *Disability and Poverty: the need for a more nuanced understanding of implications for development policy and practice*. *Third World Quarterly* 32.8: 1493–1513.
- Handicap International. 2015. *Disability in humanitarian context: Views from affected people and field organisations*. France: Handicap International.
- Harvey, P. and Pavanello, S. 2019. *Multi-Purpose Cash and Sectoral Outcomes: a Review of Evidence and Learning*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Harvey, P., Proudlock, K., Clay, E., Riley, B., and Jaspars, S. 2010. *Food aid and food assistance in emergency and transitional contexts: a review of current thinking*. London: Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG).
- HelpAge. 2012. *Older people in emergencies; identifying and reducing risks*. London: HelpAge.
- HelpAge. 2014. *Minimum Standards: including older people in disaster risk management*. London: HelpAge.
- Hoffman, J. Harvey, P., Haver, K., and Murphy, B. 2010. *Delivering Money – Cash Transfer Mechanisms in Emergencies*. London: Save the Children UK/Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP).
- Holmes, R. and Costella, C. with Bailey, M., Kruczkiewicz, A., Poulter, R., Sharp, K., and Scott, L. 2017. *Towards A Shock Sensitive Social Protection System for Malawi*. London: ODI and The Hague: Red Cross Climate Centre.
- Holmes, R., Jones, N., and Domingo, P. 2019. *The politics of gender-responsive social protection*. *ODI Working and discussion papers*. London: ODI.
- Hosein, G. and Nyst, C. 2014. *An exploration of how development and humanitarian aid initiatives are enabling surveillance in developing countries*. I&N Working Paper, [Online]. 2014/1.
- ILO. 2017. *World Social Protection Report 2017-2019*. Geneva: International Labour Organisation.
- IPCC. 2012. *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: a special report of Working Groups I and II of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ISPA. 2018. *Codi Core Diagnostic Instrument – What Matters Guidance Note*. [ONLINE]. Available at: <https://ispatools.org/tools/CODI-What-Matters.pdf>
- Kukrety, N. 2016. *Working with Cash Based Safety Nets in Humanitarian Contexts: Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners*. Oxford: Cash Learning Partnership.
- Kuner, C., and Marelli, M. 2017. *Handbook On Data Protection In Humanitarian Action*. Geneva: The International Committee of the Red Cross.
- Kidd, S., Gelders, B., and Bailey-Athias, D. 2017. *Exclusion by design: An assessment of the effectiveness of the proxy means test poverty targeting mechanism*. ESS – Working Paper No. 56. Geneva: ILO/Development Pathways.
- Kidd, S., Wapling, L., Schjoedt, R., and Gelders, B. 2019. *Leaving No-one Behind: Building Inclusive Social Protection Systems for Persons with Disabilities*. Working Paper: February 2019. Kent: Development Pathways.
- Konyndyk, J. 2018. *Rethinking the Humanitarian Business Model*. CGD Brief, May 2018. Washington DC: Center for Global Development.

- Kukrety, N. 2016. *Working with Cash Based Safety Nets in Humanitarian Contexts: Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners*. Oxford: Cash Learning Partnership.
- Kuriakose, A., Heltberg, R., Wiseman, W., Costella, C., Cipryk, R., and Cornelius, S. 2013. *Climate-responsive social protection*. Discussion paper no. 1210. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Longhurst, D., and Sabates-Wheeler, R. 2019. *Malawi Shock Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) Case Study*. IDS Working Paper 528. Brighton: IDS.
- Mishra, A. 2017. *Child Outcomes of Cash Transfer Programming. What works and what doesn't for children in humanitarian and development contexts*. London: Save the Children UK.
- Mitchell, A. 2018. *Harnessing Social Protection for Forcibly Displaced People – Conceptual Overview*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- Mleinek, H. and Davis, M. 2012. *Disability and Social Protection in Indonesia*. Bonn: GIZ.
- Mont, D. 2010. *Social Protection and Disability*. In T. Barron and J. M. Ncube (eds.), *Poverty and Disability* (pp. 317–39). London: Leonard Cheshire Disability.
- O'Brien, C., Holmes, R., Scott, Z., with Barca, V. 2018a. *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Toolkit: Appraising the use of social protection in addressing large-scale shocks*, Oxford: Oxford Policy Management
- O'Brien, C., Scott, Z., Smith, G., Barca, V., Kardan, A., Holmes, R., Watson, C., and Congrave, J. 2018b. *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Research: Synthesis Report*. Oxford: Oxford Policy Management.
- OCHA. 2017. *New Way of Working*. Geneva: OCHA.
- Overseas Development Institute. 2018. *Forecasting hazards, averting disasters – Implementing forecast-based early action at scale*. London, UK: Overseas Development Institute.
- Overseas Development Institute and Centre for Global Development. 2015. *Doing Cash Differently – How Cash Transfers can Transform Humanitarian Aid. Report of the High Level Panel on Humanitarian Cash Transfers*. London: Overseas Development Institute (ODI).
- Oxfam (forthcoming). *Protection or Social Protection?* Oxford: Oxfam.
- Pearce, E. 2013. *Disability Inclusion in the Syrian Refugee Response in Lebanon*. New York: Women's Refugee Commission (WRC).
- Roelen, K., Devereux, S., Abdulai, A., Martorano, B., Palermo, T., and Ragno, L. 2017. *How to Make 'Cash Plus' Work: Linking Cash Transfers to Services and Sectors*. Innocenti Working Paper 2017-10. Florence: UNICEF Office of Research.
- Rammaciato, J. 2017. *Cash-based Transfers – Analytical Paper on WHS Self-Reporting on the Agenda for Humanity*. Rome: World Food Programme
- Roelen, K., Longhurst, D., Sabates-Wheeler, R. 2018. *The Role of Cash Transfers in Social Protection, Humanitarian Response and Shock-Responsive Social Protection*. IDS Working Paper 517. Brighton: IDS.
- Rohwerder, B. 2018. *Disability Stigma in Developing Countries*. K4D Helpdesk Report. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Schnitzer, P. 2016. *How to Target Households in Adaptive Social Protection Systems? Relative Efficiency of Proxy Means Test and Household Economy Analysis in Niger*. Social Protection and Labour discussion paper no. 1612. Washington: World Bank.
- Seyfert, K., Barca, V., Gentilini, U., Luthria, M., and Abbadly, S. 2019. *Unbundled: A framework for connecting safety nets and humanitarian assistance in refugee settings*. World Bank Discussion Paper No. 1935. Washington: World Bank Group.
- Sherwood, E. and Pearce, E. 2016. *Working to Improve Our Own Futures: Inclusion of Women and Girls with Disabilities in Humanitarian Action*. New York: WRC.
- Sphere Association. 2018. *The Sphere Handbook: Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response, fourth edition*. Geneva: The Sphere Association.

- SPIAC-B Social Protection Interagency Cooperation Board. 2019. *Collaborating for Policy Coherence and Development Impact*. [ONLINE] Available at: www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/@dgreports/@nylo/documents/genericdocument/wcms_644769.pdf
- Steets, J., Binder, A., Derzsi-Horvath, A., Krüger, S., and Ruppert L. 2016. *Drivers and Inhibitors of Change in the Humanitarian System – Summary Report*. Berlin: GPPI.
- The Sphere Project. 2011. *The Sphere Project – Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response*. Geneva: The Sphere Project.
- TRANSFORM (forthcoming). *Shock Responsive Social Protection Systems – Manual for a Leadership and Transformation Curriculum On Building and Managing Social Protection Floors in Africa*. [ONLINE] Available at: <http://socialprotection.org/institutions/transform>
- Ulrichs, M. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. 2018. *Social Protection and Humanitarian Response: What is the Scope for Integration?* IDS Working Paper 516. Brighton: IDS.
- UNHCR. 2019a. *Global Trends – Forced Displacement in 2018*. [ONLINE] Available at: www.unhcr.org/5d08d7ee7.pdf
- UNHCR. 2019b. *Working With Persons With Disabilities In Forced Displacement*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- UNICEF. 2018. *UNICEF Guidance on Risk-Informed Programming*. New York: UNICEF.
- UNICEF and WFP. 2018. *Operational Trial of a Vertical Expansion Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme – CASE STUDY*. Malawi: UNICEF/WFP.
- UN Office For Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR). 2017. *Terminology*. [ONLINE] Available at: www.unisdr.org/we/inform/terminology#letter-d.
- Venton, C., Fitzgibbon, C., Shitarek, T., Coulter, L., Dooley, Olivia. 2012. *The Economics of Early Response and Disaster Resilience: Lessons from Kenya and Ethiopia*. London: DFID
- Vincent, K. and Cull, T. 2012. *Adaptive Social Protection – Making concepts a reality – Guidance notes for practitioners*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies.
- Whitehead, J. 2013. *The Yemen Cash Transfer Programme – How Oxfam used social welfare fund lists and the Post Office system to distribute funds and rebuild donor trust*. Oxford: Oxfam.
- Wilton Park. 2019. *Data responsibility in humanitarian action: from principle to practice*. WP1688. Steyning: Wilton Park.
- Winder Rossi, N., Spano, F., Sabates-Wheeler, R., and Kohnstamm, S. 2017. *Social Protection and Resilience. Supporting Livelihoods in Protracted Crises and in Fragile and Humanitarian Contexts*. FAO Position Paper. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations/IDS.
- World Bank. 2015. *The State of Social Safety Nets 2015*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2017. *Strategic Collaboration between World Bank Group and World Food Programme Bridging Humanitarian Assistance and Social Protection Systems – MAURITANIA CASE STUDY*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2018. *The State of Social Safety Nets 2018*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. 2020. *Sahel Adaptive Social Protection Program (ASPP)*. [ONLINE]. Available at: www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sahel-adaptive-social-protection-program-trust-fund#5. [Accessed 21/02/20].
- World Food Programme. 2006. *Targeting in Emergencies*. Executive Board Policy Note. Rome: World Food Programme.
- World Food Programme. 2014. *Cash and Vouchers Manual – 2nd ed*. Rome: World Food Programme (WFP).
- World Food Programme. 2019. *WFP'S Strategic Engagement on Adaptive Social Protection – A Case Study of WFP and World Bank Partnership in Mauritania*. Rome: World Food Programme.
- World Humanitarian Summit. 2016. *Commitments to Action*. [Online] Available at: www.agendaforhumanity.org/sites/default/files/resources/2017/Jul/WHS_commitment_to_Action_8September2016.pdf



The Cash Learning Partnership

Social protection and humanitarian assistance are both designed to help people cope with shocks, and the case for linking them has become increasingly clear. Such linkages shape much 'nexus' thinking and have been adopted as policy by most of the major development and humanitarian players. This has led to a growing body of work on shock responsive and adaptive social protection as well as some new financing initiatives. It leaves however the question as to why it remains difficult to make change happen, systematically and at scale, and whether it is always the right thing to do. This report examines the state of the art in our thinking around linking social protection and humanitarian assistance, particularly through the use of cash. It flags some of the challenges being encountered through a review of country contexts and programmatic considerations, and it identifies key entry points to move the agenda forward, with a focus on enhancing our collective commitment to improving outcomes for people affected by crisis. The research was commissioned by CaLP and undertaken by Humanitarian Outcomes, with the generous support of the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO).

This report has been commissioned by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)
and was generously funded by the German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO).

