



European  
Commission

# Operational

# Note No 1

## *Benefit Modalities*

May 2019



## Irish Aid

An Roinn Gnóthaí Eachtracha agus Trádála  
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade

# SPaN

Supporting people through crisis



*Guidance Package on Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus*

DEVCO  
ECHO  
NEAR



## Acknowledgement

This operational note has been written by Daniel Longhurst and Rachel Sabates-Wheeler. The production of this operational note has been co-financed by IrishAid.

The operational note is part of a series of notes the European Commission has invited experts to contribute to. It is part of the EU [‘Guidance Package on Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus’](#) (SPaN). The Guidance Package initiative is jointly led by the European Commission’s Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development (DEVCO), Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) and Directorate-General for Neighbourhood and Enlargement Negotiations (NEAR) with the support of DEVCO Unit 04 and the MKS programme. As this is an emergent field of knowledge, the guidance and recommendations of the Operational Notes reflect the independent views of the authors. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the official position of the European Commission.

# Introduction

**Social protection is included as a central pillar in a number of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), most notably Goal 1 – to end poverty in all its forms everywhere.**<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, as the Reference Document for this operational note mentions (European Commission 2018), there is now a clear international consensus and commitment to utilising social protection and social protection systems in fragile and conflict-affected environments to more effectively, efficiently and sustainably respond to affected populations.<sup>2</sup> These commitments are embodied in global commitments such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the Grand Bargain (European Commission 2018).<sup>3</sup> The EU commitment to move from food aid to food assistance in humanitarian contexts, including cash and voucher programming, provision of relevant services, inputs, skills or knowledge, provides the historical context for the discussion in this operational note on benefit modalities.<sup>4</sup> In addition, the relationship to the role of social protection in EU development cooperation is outlined here.<sup>5</sup>

This operational note is designed to give the reader a more detailed understanding of the actual and potential use of different benefit modalities when using social protection approaches to programme across the humanitarian – development nexus. It is designed to be short, practical and field-focused, providing a think piece that raises key issues while signposting the reader to further resources. This guidance is not designed as a ‘how to’ for modality programming – these resources can be found elsewhere, with some key ones included in the resources section under ‘Emerging guidance and tools’, below. Rather, this guidance note attempts to draw together the emergent learning around using social protection tools for programming in contexts of fragility.

To better understand the concept of using ‘social protection across the nexus’, and the part played by benefit modalities within this nexus, we begin by explaining some of the jargon.

**First**, ‘benefit modality’ essentially refers to those noted in *Annex II* of the reference document: cash and/or voucher, in-kind or subsidised (e.g. food, agricultural inputs), service delivery (e.g. primary healthcare, education, welfare services and accompanying measures (e.g. advocacy, trainings, public works programmes) (CaLP 2017).<sup>6</sup> Benefits can be provided in multiple modalities, directly to households or to communities. Other commonly used terms for complementary programming that can include one or more benefit modalities within a package of interventions to achieve multiple objectives are: cash plus, graduation, resilience or shock-responsive social protection. These are also discussed here, but the primary focus remains on the role played by the modalities themselves. A *benefit modality* needs to be understood in relation to a *delivery mechanism*, which refers to the means of delivering a benefit modality (for example a smart card, mobile devices and agents, bank card/accounts, cash in envelopes, food distribution etc.).

- 1 Social protection is explicitly referred to as an instrument in SDG Goal 1 (Eradication of Poverty, Target 1.3), SDG 5 (Gender equality, Target 5.4), and SDG10 (Reduction of Income Inequality, Target 10.4), and also key for the achievement of SDGs 2,3,4, 16, 17 (ending hunger, healthy lives, quality education, decent work and economic growth, peaceful and inclusive societies and partnerships for the goals).
- 2 Social protection encompasses a set of contributory and non-contributory schemes, through various mechanisms such as cash transfers (conditional or unconditional), social insurance schemes, access to social services and associated developmental measures to promote livelihood, social inclusion and human development ([https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/supporting-social-protection-systems-20151125\\_en.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/sites/devco/files/supporting-social-protection-systems-20151125_en.pdf)). Social protection systems refers to the national institutional architecture (such as, MIS systems, appeals and complaints mechanisms, joined up delivery across sectors, etc.) required to deliver social protection in line with commitments on human rights and progressive universal access for those in need.
- 3 Grand Bargain Core Commitment 7: Humanitarian financing – Investing in Humanity, including scaling up and more systematically considering the use of cash transfers in conjunction with national social protection schemes.
- 4 Commission Communication on Humanitarian Food Assistance COM (2010) 126 – <http://aei.pitt.edu/38218/>
- 5 Commission Communication on Social Protection in EU Development Cooperation COM (2012) 446 <http://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2012/EN/1-2012-446-EN-F1-1.Pdf>.
- 6 The full definition is taken from the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) website – <http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/glossary>















## Coordination, collaboration, trade-offs

**Effective collaboration and coordination is perhaps the keystone principle for SRSP and also its biggest challenge.** Without it, a concept designed to bring actors together risks further fragmentation as everyone attempts their own versions of SRSP. Collaboration and coordination in turn demand trade-offs and compromise.

**As noted, modalities are linked to decisions made partly by an assessment of context, and partly due to institutional experience, capacity, constraints or bias.** Coordinating transfers between chronic and acute situations requires engaging with cluster mechanisms for humanitarian response, and sector working groups for social protection, each with their own compositions, mandate and implementation capacity, which complicates the task of coordination, implementation and monitoring for SRSP (for more detail see O'Brien et al. 2018). Sometimes a Cash Working Group exists that can act as entry point, as these include many of the institutional players across social protection and humanitarian contexts.

The silos found in international organisations are also found in government, where SP and humanitarian affairs/DRM are mostly handled separately, with their own coordination mechanisms, donors, funding channels and conditionality, and different entry points into international agreements, some of which have been developed and nurtured over decades (Browne, 2014). Frequently different ministries or departments cannot work together without a formal decree or signed protocol, and are competing for scant resources.

**When blending partners and programmes, a balance has to be struck between programme objectives and a wider vision for (ideally government-led) shock-responsive social protection systems, now and in the future.** Modalities can become a key technical battle ground, but evidence from case studies shows that compromise can be found in blending modalities (for instance providing cash transfers alongside in-kind nutritional supplements in Mauritania). Alternatively, negotiating common transfer values between humanitarian and government-led social assistance programmes (for instance in Kenya (urban food subsidy), or Nepal (ECTP post-2015 earthquake), where humanitarians reduced their transfers to align with social assistance levels) is a way to bring harmonisation between the two sectors.

**The same close coordination across sectors and actors is needed at decentralised levels, including alignment of national and district government offices and committees.** Oftentimes, the aims and operating principles of SRSP are not understood outside the capital and require continuous awareness raising and training to embed, otherwise misunderstanding can lead to programming disruption. Roles and responsibilities have to be clear, enshrined in policy documents (national DRM and SP policies), partnership agreements (memoranda of understanding – MoUs) and operational agreements (SOPs).

**Different players will have prominence within different contexts. Where a social protection system is non-existent, for instance due to conflict, humanitarian actors might be the first and primary providers, and can design their interventions to provide the basis for social assistance programmes in the future, working with government structures (DRM, social protection and welfare ministries) to progressively take on the responsibility for targeting, information systems, and delivery.** Within more mature social protection systems, the government should be the primary provider of SRSP and play the primary role; however, even in settings where social protection programmes or systems are institutionalised, they might not yet be flexible enough to adapt in the case of a crisis to incorporate additional caseloads (Winder Rossi et al. 2017). Depending on the size of the disaster, the response may be deemed beyond the capacity of the national authorities, and international appeals may be issued. Conflict can increase the need for SRSP while changing the nature of the support required and undermining capacity for response, and affecting which actors get involved in programme delivery (Kukrety 2016; Roelen et al. 2018).



Options for complementary programming (alongside a modality of choice) include:

1. **provision of information** (such as behaviour-change communication (BCC), sensitisation meetings, climate information),
2. **provision of additional benefits and support** (such as supplementary feeding or psycho-social support),
3. **provision or facilitation of access to services** (such as through health insurance or setting up village savings and loans groups),
4. **implementation of case management** (ensuring referrals to other sectors),
5. **strengthening the quality of existing services and linking to them.**

It is in fact now widely acknowledged that transfer programmes and services are mutually reinforcing – transfer programmes should not be implemented in contexts without quality services, whilst evidence shows that these programmes have positive impacts, particularly on education and health service uptake (Mishra 2017). Examples include the Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty (LEAP) programme in Ghana and the Integrated Nutrition and Social Cash Transfer (IN-SCT) pilot in Ethiopia (Roelen et al., 2018).

At a national level, cash plus can leverage synergies between social sector strategies and global movements, such as Universal Health Coverage (UHC) or Education for All (EFA). In fact, instead of being wedded to a social protection label called ‘cash plus’ it might be beneficial to analyse the possibility of more and larger outcomes by strengthening the synergies of social transfer programmes with other national service delivery and access to service strategies.

Unsurprisingly, conflict is associated with the deterioration of delivery systems and service provision, yet these same services can also be key to peace building, recovery, and re-establishment of state legitimacy (Carpenter et al., 2012). Whilst the scope for employing graduation and cash plus approaches in certain fragile and shock-prone contexts may be limited, some key points have emerged through the research:

1. **Several fragile contexts are in fact testing ‘accompanying measures’ alongside regular safety nets** (see for instance the work of the World Bank in the Sahel) to understand which combinations are most likely to support building household resilience to shocks (World Bank 2018a).
2. **Employing a ‘conflict-sensitive’ approach to programming and delivering social protection and services in a way that does not inadvertently contribute to conflict is a major challenge, but is also seen as a key mechanism for supporting peace processes, community cohesion and state legitimacy.** Evidence also points to supporting pre-existing informal structures for service delivery which can be built on in conflict contexts, and ensuring that flexible transitional funding modalities are in place to support the continuation and development of service provision in fragile contexts (this is discussed again in Section 3 below) (Carpenter et al. 2012).
3. **A longer-term exit strategy and transition vision is needed for vulnerable recipients beyond delivery through SRSP mechanisms for shock response, even if full graduation strategies may not be possible.** This includes coordinating with government from the outset and building its capacity, investing in flexible financing mechanisms and discussing fiscal space, and testing and monitoring different complementary investments etc. One big drawback is that many current graduation models are simply too complex and expensive to apply to fragile contexts, especially when providing several services to the same household in the midst of widespread need which can be perceived very negatively by communities themselves.







The issues that can arise from the use of e-payment structures, and their blending for SRSP, have been documented elsewhere (see for instance the resources and references in Ford, 2017). Perhaps one of the most pertinent big-picture questions is whether the institutions collecting all the data generated from e-payment platforms are sufficiently prepared and experienced to store and protect it, and whether combining humanitarian and social protection systems and data could be paving the way for future human rights violations, enhanced state surveillance or unchecked private sector use (Nyst and Hosein, 2014).



to natural disasters are low, since this falls outside of their mandate. For example, in Lesotho while there is strong political will to expand the Universal Old Age Pension and the Child Grant, there is little interest in adapting these programmes to be shock-responsive (which explains why there is little collaboration at the national level between social protection and DRM) (Kardan et al. 2017).

**Similarly, the humanitarian sector faces challenges around coordination of multiple actors responding to certain crises.** The growing interest in cash-based approaches is considered to be an opportunity to increase partner coordination around a transfer modality that is more flexible and fungible than in-kind assistance (CaLP 2014). Initiatives like the Cash Working Groups initiated by Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) aim to coordinate cash transfer programmes, focusing on technical issues, but a recent evaluation in the Sahel highlighted the added benefit of the groups' participation through strategy development to contribute to policy processes (CaLP 2016; O'Brien et al. 2017). A Cash Working Group was also set up in the Philippines in 2012 and revived after Typhoon Haiyan to coordinate cash-based disaster response (Smith et al. 2017).

**Lastly, whilst many of the examples provided in this operational noted have referred to utilising national social protection systems to deliver humanitarian assistance, this may not always be advisable.** Humanitarian approaches can align to or coordinate with SP systems, with a view to future integration or not, depending on context, capacity, desire for coordination and the sensitivity of a situation. Likewise, national capacity needs to be built in both SP and DRM sectors, ideally with a view to enhanced coordination and integration, but again noting that context will determine to what degree this is possible or desirable.

#### To be kept in mind when operationalising the nexus:

- Be aware of the political economy of building SRSP systems – foster linkages between short-term humanitarian assistance and longer-term programmes.
- A large number of local, national and international actors – each with their own interests, funding priorities and institutional set-ups – will be required to collaborate and coordinate to ensure more effective linkages. Actors may see blending of systems as loss of prestige and resource mobilisation potential.
- The institutional identity of national agencies implementing social protection programmes can make or break better coordination between social protection or disaster management agencies.
- Potential for better linkages between national SP and DRM authorities is inhibited by individual donor's bilateral collaboration with different national agencies; need to encourage multi-donor platforms and incentivising multi-sector coordination at the national level.
- Design with a long-term view, build capacity for modalities appropriate to context.
- Enshrine operational decisions (including on modality choices) in protocols – MoUs, SOPs, decrees.

## Funding strategy and modalities

**A look at global trends shows that whilst humanitarian assistance still makes up a small percentage of Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) (USD 27 billion compared to USD 167 billion in 2016), it has grown faster than overall ODA in the last decade.** Meanwhile, 74 per cent of all humanitarian funding in 2016 went to protracted crises of eight years or more in length, and for the 20 largest recipients of humanitarian assistance, increases in humanitarian assistance have not been met by increases in non-humanitarian ODA (Development Initiatives 2018). This means that the majority of humanitarian funding is going to protracted emergencies, but that non-humanitarian ODA is not keeping up with increases in humanitarian expenditure.

**What does this mean for SRSP?** First, there is a greater requirement for longer-term programmes and funding to meet the chronic needs of vulnerable people, and there is a need to align funding modalities and transfer modalities to efficiently and effectively meet this need wherever feasible. Resourcing SRSP touches on two key issues – who pays, and how do they pay? Should humanitarian donors pay for vertical expansion top-ups or horizontal expansion, or should it be the government or through contingency funds from SP actors?

The strategy for resourcing would ideally be multi-pronged and context-specific:

- **create contingent financing within social assistance funding structures** (by government, within either funds / Multi-Donor Trust Funds (MDTFs), from a specific donor);
- **devise single delivery mechanisms** to flexibly channel and scale different resources to the same household through one coordination mechanism;
- **create SOPs for the use of aligned humanitarian resources or protocols** for when to utilise humanitarian mechanisms when the capacity of a SP system is exceeded, and beyond these, transferring risk to pooling mechanisms such as climate-risk insurance for catastrophic covariate shocks.

**Other mechanisms include crisis modifiers (front-loading financing from other parts of a programme to address shock-based need) and catastrophe bonds such as those offered by the World Bank to countries, which provide low-interest, quick-access loans in the aftermath of shocks based on pre-agreed contingency plans.** For this, risk layering is useful (matching the risk and shocks a country faces with the financial tools and programmatic responses best suited to address them), and more research is needed on donor requirements (both SP and humanitarian) for the use of their funds in fragile contexts, in terms of public financial management, reporting, timeliness and accountability. Fragmented coordination is often driven by siloed donor policies and independent donor bilateral agreements with respective national agencies. Effective coordination is shaped by multi-donor platforms, multi-sector coordination, and pooled resources at the national level.

**Available resources can dictate modality choice.** As in-kind will remain a modality of choice for many international donors and national governments (national strategic grain reserves linked to legislation that regulates commodity prices remain a legitimate humanitarian *and* social protection tool), especially in times of crisis, SRSP systems and funding strategies will need to be built to enable these in-kind resources to complement cash and service delivery. This is the case for the PSNP in Ethiopia, where different actors can channel their humanitarian assistance funds through common platforms that use the same targeting and delivery mechanisms.

#### To be kept in mind when operationalising the nexus:

- Increases in humanitarian assistance have not been matched by increases in non-humanitarian ODA. The majority of humanitarian funding is going to protracted emergencies.
- Increasing requirement for longer-term programmes and funding to meet the chronic needs of vulnerable people. It is therefore necessary to align funding and transfer modalities to meet this need efficiently and effectively.
- Modality flexibility may be required based on shock typology, impact and evolution, available resources or partner requirements.
- Donor influence on funding mechanisms and modality choice is key to greater coordination or silos.
- Strategy for resourcing would ideally be multi-pronged and context specific:
  - Create contingent financing within social assistance funding structures.
  - Devise single delivery mechanisms to channel different resources flexibly to the same household.
  - Create SOPs for the use of humanitarian resources aligned with SP resources.
  - Consider use of crisis modifiers and/or catastrophe bonds.



lines requires systemic, multi-annual solutions that take as their starting point the ways in which the lives of the most vulnerable are affected by fluctuations across the year, including agricultural livelihoods, migratory patterns, flows of households income, and of course exposure to climate shocks. Seasonality also impacts discussions on how to integrate shock response into SP systems, by interrogating: when transfers are made (during or just before the effects of a shock are felt, or back when the shock was first predicted to prevent negative coping); which type of modality to use (with longer term multi-annual planning); which modality is more suitable for different times of the year or season; and the amount to provide.

**This in turn requires looking at entry points multi-annually. Climate shocks and the crises they can engender occur over a (minimum) two-year cycle.** For instance, a poor agricultural season drives up need for the next lean-season response (with a gap of anything between 3-8 months depending on the number of rainy/ planting periods in a country), with impacts felt by households on average anything up to four years after each shock (oft-cited examples include Hoddinott and Knippenberg's longitudinal studies in Ethiopia (2017)). Therefore anticipatory action has multiple windows – when the shock is predicted, when the shock hits, when the effects of the shock are felt (which is not always when the shock hits, especially for slow onset), after the shock, and then likewise for the following season, regardless of its performance (adjusted for need and household requirements etc.). Currently most attention is focused on providing life-saving response at the point where the effects of a shock are most acutely felt through humanitarian mechanisms which, by definition, are (or should be) short-term, life-saving, and inevitably more costly. As shocks pass, many households are deregistered and forgotten until the cycle repeats.

**By contrast, shock-responsive seasonal top-ups could be designed with different criteria in mind, with smaller values and earlier timings not tied to the humanitarian response and the peak of shock impacts.** Likewise, a larger one-off transfer can be provided for investments prior to these shocks and impacts. Then *potentially additional* transfers, for instance either horizontal or vertical, could be made for additional caseloads, with humanitarian mechanisms employed when SRSP mechanism capacity is exceeded. Thinking seasonally interrogates definitions of efficiency versus effectiveness. Using one delivery mechanism for two different types of transfer during a lean-season response is efficient (potentially saving time and money), but the effectiveness of this approach in terms of outcomes for recipients is less clear (and would need longer-term evaluation). Providing top-ups aligned to the seasonal calendar (in terms of timing and value) could move the discussion from one focused on efficiency, to one more about effectiveness, with hopefully a slow reduction in humanitarian need over time. More research into seasonally appropriate top-ups is required for SRSP, taking into account important periods such as agricultural investment, school terms, the start of negative coping, annual inflation rates for key commodities, peaks in clinic admissions for communicable diseases, and peaks in food and nutrition insecurity.

#### To be kept in mind when operationalising the nexus:

- Most shocks are predictable, and therefore issues are structural, pointing towards the need for long term solutions, despite gap being filled in many contexts by humanitarians.
- Viewing the lives and needs of affected people through the lens of seasonality, and understanding need as (often) cyclical and multi-annual, affects the modality choice, value, timing of transfer and partner choice.
- Need to define between seasonal need / fluctuations and unanticipated shock-based transfers/top-ups.

## Risk layering

**Supporting the spectrum of risks and activities from prevention to response, recovery and resilience across the nexus requires blended and differentiated activities, actors, financing mechanisms and modalities.** Undertaking 'risk layering' exercises can be of benefit to understand which modalities to use when matching the risks people face with the most appropriate programmatic modalities, coverage and capacity, and aiming to achieve maximum risk coverage before, during and after shocks. This refers not only to cash, in-kind, voucher or service delivery, but also contributory and non-contributory modalities (the former including potential insurance mechanisms or pension platforms, for instance).

**Although not explored in detail in this operational note for the reasons cited at the outset, addressing the full range of risks and their impacts in nexus programming, as well as ensuring the right actors are engaged and sustainability is addressed, should include considerations of contributory mechanisms such as insurance.** Insurance plays an important role in the wider landscape of SRSP, albeit with caveats. It can be expensive, complex to set up and difficult to get buy-in from poor and vulnerable households due to the unpredictable nature of their income, the lack of immediate returns, and their risk profile. However, insurance has a clear role to play in SRSP and a wider social contract for SP by transferring the risk of catastrophic and or large-scale shocks to insurance providers. This would potentially reduce the risk profile of the insured over the longer term, thereby facilitating wider access to other goods and services (such as loans).

### To be kept in mind when operationalising the nexus:

#### *For humanitarian actors*

- The humanitarian sector faces challenges around coordination of multiple actors responding to certain crises. The increasing interest in cash-based approaches is considered to be an opportunity to increase coordination across agencies, which can now rally around a transfer modality that is more flexible and fungible than in-kind assistance.
- Cash working groups tend to focus on the technical issues linked to cash transfers, but a recent evaluation in the Sahel highlighted the added benefit of the groups' participation through strategy development to contribute to policy processes.

#### *For development actors*

- Reference to national social protection systems implicitly assumes sectoral coherence. In reality the majority of SP sectors are highly fragmented.
- Sectoral harmonisation is required where programmes operated by different agencies and under different operational guidelines are being brought together under national social protection strategies. Development partners can play a key role in advocating for greater coherence including with DRM actors
- Examples of SRSP systems often refer to specific programmes that are situated within that wider, fragmented social protection landscape.
- Development partners can work SRSP into programmes, including through crisis modifiers.

# Annex 1

## Emerging guidance and tools

CaLP – Social protection and humanitarian cash transfer programming

<http://www.cashlearning.org/thematic-area/social-protection-and-humanitarian-cash-transfer-programming>

CaLP - Guidance Note for Humanitarian practitioners. Working with cash based safety nets in humanitarian contexts (includes useful guidelines for programming and case studies)

<http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calp-humanitarian-pratitioners-guidance-notes-en-web-.pdf>

CaLP - Comparison of humanitarian market analysis tools (and links to tools)

<http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/comparative-table-of-market-analysis-tools-final.pdf>

CaLP - Vouchers delivery guide booklet

<http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/library/25-vouchers---a-quick-delivery-guide-booklet-version>

DG ECHO - Guidance on cash based assistance (including vouchers) (technical notes, case studies, programme cycle management, council conclusions etc.)

[https://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-transfers-and-vouchers\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-transfers-and-vouchers_en)

DG-ECHO funding guidelines for the use of cash and vouchers in humanitarian crises (includes decision tree, checklist, lesson learned, creating proposals, etc.)

[http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/ECHO\\_Cash\\_Vouchers\\_Guidelines.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/echo/files/policies/sectoral/ECHO_Cash_Vouchers_Guidelines.pdf)

ECHO Tools and Methods Series, Reference Document No. 14, 'Social transfers in the fight against hunger'

<https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/file/13725/download?token=CL73kuK3>

ECHO Staff Handbook on 'Operating in situations of conflict and fragility'

<https://europa.eu/capacity4dev/public-fragility/document/operating-situations-conflict-and-fragility-eu-staff-handbook>

HPG Guidance on evaluating the transfer modality decision making chain in emergency programming

<https://www.odi.org/publications/9285-cash-vouchers-or-kind-guidance-evaluating-how-transfers-are-made-emergency-programming>

IDS - Adaptive Social Protection (conceptual material, case studies, evaluations)

<https://www.ids.ac.uk/projects/adaptive-social-protection/>

OPM (case studies, SRSP global synthesis report and tool kit)

<https://www.opml.co.uk/projects/shock-responsive-social-protection-systems>

World Bank – Adaptive Social Protection (see documents section for case studies on aligning humanitarian and SP systems, poverty and vulnerability analysis, research on differing targeting methodologies, etc.)

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sahel-adaptive-social-protection-program-trust-fund>

WFP – SRSP in Latin America and the Caribbean (various resources)

<https://www.wfp.org/content/shock-responsive-social-protection-latin-america-and-caribbean>

GIZ, World Bank and WFP - SRSP in Malawi (report)

<https://www.odi.org/publications/11024-towards-shock-sensitive-social-protection-system-malawi>

# Annex 2

## Cheat sheet tables

Table 1 – Modality types

MODALITY	DESCRIPTION
CASH	<p><b>Cash transfers are payments provided by either government or non-state actors that often target the poorest and most vulnerable in society.</b> They are the transfer of resources using market mechanisms and essentially respond to problems of ‘access’ not ‘availability’, e.g. commodities or services are available but people can’t afford them. They can be known variously as ‘cash and vouchers’, ‘cash-based interventions’, ‘market-based interventions’, and ‘cash transfer programming’. SP practitioners refer mostly to ‘cash transfers’, and a common term in humanitarian circles is ‘cash-based transfers’ (which includes vouchers as a proxy for cash) (CaLP 2017). For the sake of simplicity in this section, as SRSP is a blending of SP and humanitarian worlds, we will refer only to ‘<u>cash transfers</u>’ which is taken to include vouchers.</p> <p><b>Cash transfers have expanded rapidly in the past decade across a diversity of contexts</b> – originally starting as a core element of social assistance programmes, they have been increasingly used in humanitarian response. As the reference document for this operational note highlights, across all sectors, one third of ECHO humanitarian operations in 2016 were linked to cash-based interventions and over half of the European Commission’s humanitarian food assistance was provided in the form of cash-based responses (European Commission 2018). This reflects the same upward trend for all the main humanitarian actors.<sup>22</sup></p> <p><b>In social protection, cash transfers can either be unconditional</b> (no compliance with further conditions required), <b>or conditional</b> (cash is transferred upon compliance with certain conditions, such as children accessing health and education services, or where adult members of the household complete works as part of a public works programmes (PWPs)). Cash transfers are generally payments to households or individuals that are non-contributory, direct and regular (mostly monthly or bi-monthly). They are also known as ‘social assistance’, ‘social transfers’ or ‘social safety nets’ (these are also wider categories that can also include in-kind payments such as school feeding or indirect tuition waivers or subsidies). They can be implemented by government, NGOs, or financial service providers (FSPs), and are usually funded through taxation or donors (Roelen et al., 2018). The number of developing countries implementing conditional cash transfers more than doubled from 27 in 2008 to 64 in 2014, and as of 2014, 130 countries had at least one unconditional cash transfer programme, with 94 having at least one public works programme (World Bank, 2015). It is also worth noting however that such programmes frequently only cover a small proportion of the population, offer low benefits, and suffer from weak institutionalisation (ILO, 2017; Roelen et al., 2018)</p> <p><b>‘Cash based transfers’ (CBTs) in humanitarian terminology also include vouchers as a proxy for cash or services, and are becoming increasingly used for humanitarian response, although in-kind is still the modality of choice for now.</b> Cash transfers are used to meet the core needs of vulnerable people, to protect lives and livelihoods, alleviate suffering, and maintain dignity before, during, and after shocks (The Sphere Project 2011; CALP 2017). They are designed to address acute or unanticipated need, although this line is often blurred as emergencies become protracted in nature. This includes when national government capacity is exceeded, or when governments are unwilling to act or are party to the crisis, and this alignment or otherwise to government policy and systems is highly relevant to SRSP programming, discussed later. International standards such as the Sphere Standards, (Survival) Minimum Expenditure Basket ((S)MEB) define the parameters for use of cash transfers in humanitarian response, though their application varies based on context and resources (The Sphere Project 2011; CaLP 2017). In line with the use of social protection cash transfers, humanitarian cash transfers can be unconditional or conditional, restricted or unrestricted, although for the most part they are unconditional, as needs are considered urgent and therefore conditionality inappropriate. Depending on the circumstances, cash transfers may be used on their own or in conjunction with other modalities such as food (a ‘mixed-modality basket’) (CaLP 2017).</p>

22 Recent international commitments such as the Grand Bargain (Agenda for Humanity, 2016) and World Humanitarian Summit (World Humanitarian Summit, 2016) have driven the increase of humanitarian assistance provided through cash transfers. WFP and UNHCR, the two largest humanitarian agencies, both delivered 50 per cent of their support in the form of cash in 2017 (Rammaciato, 2017), and together accounted for about two thirds of the total USD 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 have key donors such as DFID and ECHO.

<p><b>VOUCHER</b></p>	<p><b>Vouchers can come in different forms (e.g. paper or electronic cards), and can be a proxy either for cash, commodities or services.</b> They can be more flexible than in-kind modalities, but come with restrictions on how they can be used. In places where local markets are functioning and commodities are available but unaffordable for shock-affected households, paper or electronic cards ('e-vouchers' or 'e-cards') can allow recipients to redeem pre-defined goods or services from pre-defined traders. Vouchers are also sometimes used in place of cash where there are high security or inflation risks, or when there is a desire to restrict what the recipient uses the transfer for (for example, to help address malnutrition, or ensure access to high quality inputs such as seed fairs). Vouchers bring lots of the benefits of cash (providing recipients with choice and spending power, boosting local economies, and reducing logistical costs) but also their own challenges and conditions (such as needing pre-approved local traders with the sufficient capacity to engage in the scheme, requiring established infrastructure and available technology, ensuring e-cards abide by national legislation on data management and protection etc.) (Technical Brief note 3 (Voucher) in ECHO 2018; CALP 2011)</p>
<p><b>IN-KIND</b></p>	<p><b>The most common in-kind modality in humanitarian settings is food</b> (provided either by the international community or national governments), as the most basic need in emergencies and most frequently the highest expenditure in poor households. Other in-kind items include shelter and educational materials, agricultural inputs, and household kits. The past twenty years, however, have seen a rise in the number of natural disasters, protracted conflicts and major humanitarian emergencies, whilst rapid urbanisation and an ageing population are adding to the complexity of crises. This has led to a greater focus on DRM alongside response measures and has prompted an increasing number of agencies and donors to shift their terminology from aid to assistance to allow them to include the provision of cash to cover recipient needs in place of in-kind commodities, which for food-related purposes falls within definitions of food assistance (Harvey et al. 2010).</p>
<p><b>BASIC SERVICES AND SERVICE DELIVERY</b></p>	<p><b>Service delivery has become a central pillar of social protection approaches in the last decade.</b> Access to services is seen as crucial to improving human development outcomes and fundamental, too, as part of rights-based approaches that states and other actors are under obligation to respect and promote. These are required to ensure that all individuals attain a minimum standard of living and can live a life of dignity, and directly correspond to addressing the multi-dimensional aspects of poverty and risks across the life cycle, by helping prevent shocks and stresses from having a harmful effect on well-being. Basic services most commonly include primary healthcare, education, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), nutrition, and safety, security and justice services (ODI 2004).</p> <p>Whilst conflict is associated with the deterioration of delivery systems and service provision, these same services can also be key to peace building, recovery, and re-establishment of state legitimacy when governments take ownership and coordinate across actors (Carpenter et al. 2012).</p>
<p><b>ACCOMPANYING MEASURES</b></p>	<p><b>Another related concept is 'accompanying measures', which are services or inputs provided alongside a benefit modality.</b> These can include nutritional trainings, maternal and infant health messaging, entrepreneurial trainings, formation of village savings and loans groups, or provision of a one-off cash grant or productive assets such as livestock. They are often linked to a broader graduation or cash plus strategy.</p>



# Annex 3

## Acronym list

Active Labour Market Policies	ALMP
Automatic Teller Machine	ATM
Disaster Risk Financing	DRF
Disaster Risk Management	DRM
Financial Service Provider	FSP
Grievance and Referral Mechanisms	GRMs
Horizontal expansion	HE
Household Economy Approach	HEA
Internally Displaced People	IDPs
Inter-Agency Social Protection	ISPA
Management Information systems	MIS
Memoranda of Understanding	MoU
Monitoring and Evaluation	M+E
Multi-Donor Trust Fund	MDTF
National Safety Net Programme	NSNP
Non-Government Organisation	NGO
Overseas Development Assistance	ODA
Public Financial Management	PFM
Proxy Means Testing	PMT
Standard Operating Procedures	SOPs
Shock Responsive Social Protection	SRSP
Social Protection	SP
Vertical Expansion	VE

# References

- 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
- Ahmed, A., Hoddinott, J., Roy, S., Sraboni, E., Quabili, W. and Margolies, A. (2016), *Which kinds of social safety net transfers work best for the ultra poor in Bangladesh? Operation and impacts of the Transfer Modality Research Initiative*. Dhaka: IFPRI and World Food Programme.
- Attah, R., Barca, V., Kardan, A., MacAuslan, I., Merttens, F., and Pellerano, L. (2016). *Can Social Protection Affect Psychosocial Wellbeing and Why Does This Matter? Lessons from Cash Transfers in Sub-Saharan Africa*. *The Journal of Development Studies*, 52(8), 1115-1131.
- Baird, S., Ferreira, F. H., Özler, B., and Woolcock, M. (2013). 'Relative effectiveness of conditional and unconditional cash transfers for schooling outcomes in developing countries: a systematic review'. *Campbell systematic reviews*, 9(8).
- Banerjee, A., Duflo, E., Goldberg, N., Karlan, D., Osei, R., Parienté, W., Shapiro, J., Thuysbaert, B. and Udry, C., (2015). 'A multifaceted program causes lasting progress for the very poor: Evidence from six countries'. *Science*, 348(6236), p.1260799.
- Barrientos, A., Byrne, J., Peña, P. et al. (2014). 'Social transfers and child protection in the South'. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 47, Part 2, 105-112.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2014.07.011>
- Bastagli, F., Hagen-Zanker, J., Harman, L., Barca, V., Sturge, G., Schmidt, T., and Pellerano, L. (2016). *Cash transfers: what does the evidence say? A rigorous review of programme impact and of the role of design and implementation features*. London: ODI.
- Blattman, C., Jamison, J. C. and Sheridan, M. (2017). 'Reducing Crime and Violence: Experimental Evidence from Cognitive Behavioral Therapy in Liberia'. *American Economic Review*, 107(4), 1165-1206.
- Browne, E. 2014. *Social protection, climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction (Rapid Literature Review)*. Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.
- 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 (2017) *Glossary of Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) Terminology*, Oxford: Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)
- CALP. (2011). *Vouchers - A Quick Delivery Guide*.  
<http://www.cashlearning.org/resources/library/25-vouchers---a-quick-delivery-guide-booklet-version>
- Cherrier, C. (2014). *Cash Transfers and Resilience: Strengthening linkages between emergency cash transfers and national social transfer programmes in the Sahel*.  
[http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/cash-transfers-and-resilience---discussion-paper-\(2\).pdf](http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/cash-transfers-and-resilience---discussion-paper-(2).pdf)
- Daidone, S., Davis, B., Handa, S. and Winters, P. 2016. *The Household and Individual-Level Economic Impacts of Cash Transfer Programmes in Sub-Saharan Africa*. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
- Davis, B., Handa, S., Hypher, N., Winder Rossi, N., Winters, P., and Yablonski, J. (Eds.). (2016). *From Evidence to Action: The Story of Cash Transfers and Impact Evaluation in Sub Saharan Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Development Initiatives. 2018. *Global Humanitarian Assistance Report (2018)*. UK: Development Initiatives.
- DFID. (2011). *Cash Transfers*. Evidence Paper, London: Department for International Development
- DFID. (2016). *The Economic Case for Early Humanitarian Response to the Ethiopia (2015/2016) Drought*.  
<https://www.gov.uk/dfid-research-outputs/the-economic-case-for-early-humanitarian-response-to-the-ethiopia-2015-2016-drought>
- European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO). (2018). *Cash transfers and vouchers*.  
[https://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-transfers-and-vouchers\\_en](https://ec.europa.eu/echo/what/humanitarian-aid/cash-transfers-and-vouchers_en).
- European Commission. (2018). *Social Protection across the Humanitarian-Development Nexus - A game changer in supporting people through crises*. Brussels: European Commission.
- Ford, E., (2017). *The potential of digital cash transfers to strengthen the link between humanitarian assistance and social protection*. Bath Papers in International Development and Wellbeing, [Online]. No: 54/2017.  
<http://www.bath.ac.uk/cds/publications/bdp54.pdf>
- 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

- Hallegatte, S., Bangalore, M., Bonzanigo, L., Fay, M., Kane, T., Narloch, U., Rozenberg, J., Treguer, D., and Vogt-Schilb, A. (2016). *Shock Waves : Managing the Impacts of Climate Change on Poverty*. *Climate Change and Development*. Washington, DC: World Bank
- 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)
- Hidrobo, M., Hoddinott, J., Peterman, A., Margolies, A., and Moreira, V. (2012). *Cash, Food, or Vouchers? Evidence from a Randomized Experiment in Northern Ecuador*. IFPRI Discussion Paper No. 01234.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2197461>
- 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)
- 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.  
<https://www.idrc.ca/sites/default/files/sp/Documents%20EN/WP2014-1-AidingSurveillance-web-Nov21.pdf>
- 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.
- Idris, I. (2017). *Cash Transfer Platforms in Humanitarian Contexts* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report 1416). Birmingham, UK: GSDRC, University of Birmingham.
- ILO. (2017). *World Social Protection Report 2017–2019*. Geneva: International Labour Organization (ILO)
- Juillard, H. (2016). *Pre-Crisis Market Analysis (PCMA)*, New York: International Rescue Committee (IRC)
- Kardan, A., Bailey, S., Solorzano, A. and Fidalgo, L. (2017a). *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Research Case Study: Mozambique*. Oxford: Oxford Policy Management
- Kardan, A., O'Brien, C. and Masasa, M. (2017b). *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Research Case Study: Lesotho*. Oxford: Oxford Policy Management
- Knippenberg, E., and Hoddinott, J. (2017). *Shocks, social protection, and resilience: Evidence from Ethiopia*. ESSP Working Paper 109. Ethiopia: International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and Ethiopian Development Research Institute (EDRI).
- Kukrety, N. (2016). *Working with Cash Based Safety Nets in Humanitarian Contexts: Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners*. Oxford: Cash Learning Partnership
- Leturque, H. (2017). *Strategic Collaboration between World Bank Group and World Food Programme: Bridging Humanitarian Assistance and Social Protection Systems - Mauritania case study*.  
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/241671517827262697/pdf/123144-WP-StrategiccollaborationsWFPWBMauritania-PUBLIC.pdf>.
- Longhurst, D., and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2018). *Malawi Shock Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) Case Study (forthcoming)*. IDS Working Paper. Brighton: IDS
- O'Brien, C., Holmes, R., Scott, Z. with Barca, V. (2018). *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Toolkit: Appraising the use of social protection in addressing large-scale shocks*. Oxford: Oxford Policy Management
- 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)
- Oxford English Dictionary (OED). (2018). OED.  
<http://www.oed.com>.
- ODI. (2004). *Basic services and social protection*.  
<https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/odi-assets/publications-opinion-files/1702.pdf>.
- Oxford Policy Management. (2018). *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems (SRSP)*.  
<https://www.opml.co.uk/projects/shock-responsive-social-protection-systems>.
- Palermo, T., Veras Soares F. and Yablonksi, J. 'Overview of Cash Plus and Systems Linkages.' Presentation to 8th Transfer Project Workshop, Dakar, Senegal, (7 June 2017).
- 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, [Online]. Volume 2018 No 517.  
<https://www.ids.ac.uk/publications/the-role-of-cash-transfers-in-social-protection-humanitarian-response-and-shock-responsive-social-protection/>

- Razavi, S. (2007). *The Political and Social Economy of Care in a Development Context*. UNRISD Gender and Development Programme Paper No. 3, Geneva: United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD)
- 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
- ReliefWeb. (2018). *Statement from the principals of OCHA, UNHCR, WFP and UNICEF on cash assistance*. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2018-12-05-FINAL%20Statement%20on%20Cash.pdf>
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Devereux, S. (2010). 'Cash transfers and high food prices: Explaining outcomes on Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Programme'. *Food Policy*, 35(4), 274-285.
- Schimmel, V. (2015). 'UNHCR Cash Programming in Emergencies: Implementation and Coordination Experience during the Syrian Refugee Response in Jordan', *Field Exchange* 48, Oxford: Emergency Nutrition Network
- Ulrichs, M. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2018). *Social Protection and Humanitarian Response: What is the Scope for Integration?* IDS Working Paper 516, Brighton: IDS
- UNICEF, WFP. (2018). *Operational Trial of a Vertical Expansion Malawi Social Cash Transfer Programme - CASE STUDY*. Malawi: UNICEF/WFP
- Watson, C. and Palermo, T. (2016). *Options for a 'Cash Plus' Intervention to Enhance Adolescent Well-being in Tanzania. An introduction and review of the evidence from different programme models in Eastern and Southern Africa*. Florence: UNICEF
- WFP. (2014). *Cash and Vouchers Manual*. 2nd ed., Rome: World Food Programme (WFP)
- 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. (2018). *The State of Social Safety Nets 2018*. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/427871521040513398/pdf/124300-PUB-PUBLIC.pdf>.
- World Bank. (2018a). *Sahel Adaptive Social Protection Program (ASPP)*. <http://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/sahel-adaptive-social-protection-program-trust-fund>.



## Contact information

### European Commission

Directorate-General for International Cooperation and Development

Rue de la Loi 41 - B-1049 Brussels

Fax: +32 (0)2 299 64 07

E-mail: [uropeaid-info@ec.europa.eu](mailto:uropeaid-info@ec.europa.eu)

**SPaN**  
Supporting people through crisis