Working Groups - Participants’ Presentations

Group 7

2 elephants in the room
Bridging the divide between humanitarian and safety nets programs

Fanen Ade, Macmillan Bonomali, Seonghee Choi, Rachida Khanum, Sencer Kiremitci, Sarah Laughton, Antoine Renard, Qhobela Selloane, Nynne Warring, Christine Wright
“Unfortunately, there’s another elephant in the room.”
Agenda

1. Humanitarian Assistance / Social Safety Net – Any Bridge?

2. Bridging rationale

3. Key bridging challenges / Emerging Practices
In your country, has humanitarian assistance/response been an “opportunity” to build-up your Social Safety Net (SSN), or to strengthen your existing SSN?

A = Yes
B = No
C = Not relevant / No interaction between Humanitarian - SSN
Humanitarian programs are designed with life-saving purposes. Timeline: short time horizons and in line with humanitarian principles.

Safety nets tend to adopt a longer-term view. They are a component of broader social protection/country systems, are enshrined in legislation in some cases, and are often financed by governments themselves.

Objectives/Timeline/Coverage/Political – Donor agenda
Humanitarian – Social Safety Net
Is it a bridge too far?

Recipients of Humanitarian Assistance, 2010-2014

Source: ALNAP (2015)
What do you believe is the largest transfer provider?

A = Humanitarian Assistance
B = Country Social Safety Nets
C = Remittance
Bridging rationale

Recurrence of shocks and type of shocks
Natural disasters have occurred increasingly frequently since the 1960s
SSN face various type of shocks: chronic, structural crisis needs; seasonal variations; and exceptional needs that give rise to a humanitarian crisis

SSN - Coverage opportunity (ASPIRE 2015)
1.9 billion people via SSN (in-kind transfers & cash-based transfers)
USD 329 billion in 2015 - Total spending on social safety nets in 120 developing countries

Humanitarian Assistance – Scope (ALNAP 2015)
USD 25 billion in 2014 – Total humanitarian expenditures (ALNAP 2015)

Increased number of SSN/Humanitarian joint responses
SDGs – Vision 2030 (Oct 2015) : a common framework for prioritising action
Where people live in extreme poverty and hunger without basic services, these should be populations of concern to both development and humanitarian actors and that both have a role.

World Humanitarian Summit / Grand Bargain (May 2016)
SPIAC – “support the further expansion and strengthening of social protection systems to continue to address chronic vulnerabilities and to scale up the utilization of social protection as a means of responding to shocks and protracted crises”

Principles 2 and 10 – “work to remove or reduce barriers that prevent organisations and donors from partnering with local and national responders”
“Increase social protection programmes and strengthen national and local systems and coping mechanisms in order to build resilience in fragile contexts”.

Context will still matter (Humanitarian Principles)
Questions – Clicker survey

In terms of the humanitarian – development SSN nexus, what were the key challenges you faced?

A = Targeting
B = Coordination
C = Delivery System
D = Value of assistance
E = Tension among humanitarian assisted population / SSN assisted population
F = Donor Agenda / Conditions
G = All of the above
Key challenges in bridging

- **HUMANITARIAN CRISIS / STATE OF EMERGENCY**
  - Somalia
  - Ireland
  - Ecuador

- **SEASONAL NATURAL DISASTER / SHOCK**
  - Benin
  - Ireland
  - Lebanon

- **PROTRACTED / STRUCTURAL CRISIS**
  - Haiti
  - Lebanon
  - Turkey

**Type of shocks**

- ** Strength of national SSN:**
  - Non-existent/Nascent
  - Fragile/Commitment/Expanding
  - Mature
Issue: Establishment of the Transfer Value:
- Refugees/IDPs - Host Population
- Humanitarian vs Chronic

Emerging practices:
Agreed Minimum Expenditure Basket (Gvt/Communities/Huma - Dev Partners)
Example: Cameroon (2017) / Mali (2017)
Different transfer modality for top-up
Example: Fiji (2016), Ecuador (2016)
Alignment to Country Transfer Value (SSN, Minimum Wage, etc.)
Example: Turkey, Niger
Issue:
Coordination among different ministries or institutions
• MoSA / Ministry of Interior – Civil Protection / Ministry of Human Affairs, etc.)
• Humanitarian Stakeholders.

Emerging practices:
Coordination cell
Example: LAC Region
Protocol among ministries and reliance a joint household database / Integrated Social Assistance System
Example: Turkey (2016 – 2017)
Memorandum of Understanding among key Humanitarian Stakeholders
Example: Lebanon (2016 - 2017)
Challenges in bridging

Issue:
Use of separate delivery systems

Emerging Practices
Integrated system for beneficiary information management and advance Social Registry (as EPR)
Alignment up to Integration to National SSN Delivery Status

Examples
Piggybacking + Horizontal: Philippines (4P - 2014), Turkey (MoFSP - 2016 + protracted)
Piggybacking + Horizontal + Vertical: Ecuador (2016)
Huma Response to strengthen Delivery System for country SSN: Lebanon (2016 – ongoing)

Transfer modality to remain flexible / Potential in optimizing digital transfer
So a mouse & an elephant?
Literature


The state of the Humanitarian System (ALNAP – 2015)


Bridging the humanitarian-development divide - Background Paper for the World Humanitarian Summit side event - “Making the SDGs work for Humanitarian Needs” (ACF – NRC – SDSN – May 2016)


The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need (May 2016)

Upcoming:

Study on Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean. OPM/WFP (2017)