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**Short Summary**

The first Berlin Global Learning Forum, hosted by German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ), Program: Global Alliances for Social Protection, jointly with the World Bank Group, took place from 24–26 June 2015 with the objective of encouraging global knowledge sharing by means of peer-to-peer learning among social protection practitioners in strong relation to the G7 and G20 agenda. The Berlin Forum complements the “South-South Learning Forum” organized by the “Global Practice on Social Protection and Labor” of the World Bank Group since 2010. The last “South-South Learning Forum” took place 2014 in Rio de Janeiro and the next one will be organized in November this year in Beijing. This „Berlin Forum“ therefore serves as a bridge between Rio and Beijing. A subsequent Berlin Forum in 2016 will build the connection to the South-South Learning Forum expected for March 2017.

The Forum was officially opened by Dr. Heike Kuhn, BMZ’s Head of Division of Sectoral and Thematic Policies; Poverty Reduction; Social Protection; Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities. Her speech highlighted the importance of social protection for sustainable urbanization and how German Development cooperation is promoting the issues in international fora and bilateral programs. Arup Banerji, Senior Director, Social Protection and Labor Global Practice of the World Bank Group, framed the forum issue of social protection in urban areas. Against the backdrop of an ever more urbanizing world, where soon two third of the population will live in urban areas and given the rising share of extreme poverty in cities, Banerji identified the challenge of providing livelihoods, services, and social protection to those in need.

The first session on “Institutional and Financial Challenges in Delivering Social Protection in Urban Settings” practitioners from Rio de Janeiro, Hamburg, and Beijing offered insights from their respective cities. Two cross-cutting themes were identified that connected all three cases: (1) the importance of accurate and up-to-date data; and (2) the importance of right-based systems.

In the second session on “Social Assistance and Productive Inclusion”, case studies from El Salvador, the Philippines, and Germany offered an insight into diverse approaches to reduce dependency on social assistance by supporting people to enter the labor market and hence, help to break the cycle of poverty.

The second forum day started with a field trip to the Berlin borough of Neukölln, where the participants got an impression of area-based social interventions and approaches to social assistance and productive inclusion. A meeting with District Mayor Dr. Franziska Giffey in Neukölln’s Town Hall concluded the field trip. Mayor Giffey provided further insights into the local government’s efforts to fight unemployment in this challenging urban setting, where people from diverse ethnic and social backgrounds live together, focusing on early education.

In the session on “Harnessing Safety Nets to Provide Health Insurance to the Poor”, participants from the Philippines, Peru, and India presented approaches to universal health coverage and identified challenges in targeting, identifying beneficiaries and encouraging them to make use of their rights, as well as in preventing misuse of the system. Afterwards, participants reflected in a Global Café session on different country based topics and experiences of social protection in small working groups.

The forum concluded with a working session, in which participants reflected on what they learned from other countries’ experiences, what challenges their countries face regarding social protection, their priority areas in learning, and on how global initiatives and partnerships could support to strengthen social protection in urban settings.

A need for more space for in-depth, technical discussions was identified, as well as a strong interest in learning how to put certain ideas into practice. Topics that were not covered by the Berlin Global Learning Forum but could be on the agenda for future meetings are for example government structures and accountability, political economy of social protection, respectively effects of political changes on social protection programs, as well as coordination and harmonization between the federal and the local level and how to include civil society.

**Welcome and Introduction**

The first Berlin Global Learning Forum on “Emerging Social Protection Systems in an Urbanizing World” was opened by Heike Kuhn, Head of Division, Sectoral and
Thematic Policies; Poverty Reduction; Social Protection; Inclusion of Persons with Disabilities, BMZ. Kuhn emphasized Germany’s longstanding experience with social protection, going back to Bismarck’s social reforms, and the social state as a constitutional principle. Though relatively small when compared to so-called mega cities, Berlin is a particularly suitable place to host such a forum since the city had (and still has) to overcome particular social challenges after its reunification.

Around the globe, cities are growing rapidly and in 2008 the urban population outnumbered those living in rural areas for the first time. These rapidly growing cities face various challenges like growing informal settlements and slums, climate change, the need for investment and infrastructure, urban poverty and inequality, a growing informal economy and unemployment. The pressing question is hence, how to ensure social protection and a minimum standard of living even for the marginalized and most vulnerable.

Kuhn pointed out the growing attention, the issue of social protection is getting on a global level. While the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights has already defined it as a human right in 1966, ILO’s recommendation 202 demands a worldwide minimum standard for social protection, the current UN special rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights sees this concept of social protection floors as key for poverty reduction, and, most recently, the G7 at their 2015 summit in Elmau under German presidency, stated to further advocate for universal accessible health care.

In this new format aimed at peer-to-peer learning, the focus was on developing sustainable partnerships among participants from the global South, with those participants from the industrialized countries to be in the listening mode.

Following this introduction, Arup Banerji, Senior Director, Social Protection and Labor Global Practice, The World Bank Group, framed the forum, emphasizing that social protection is increasingly recognized as one of the core pillars of development. Against the backdrop of an ever more urbanizing world, where soon two-thirds of the population will live in urban areas, it becomes ever more important to look at social protection in urban settings: the share of extreme poverty in cities is rising, it is different from rural poverty and the issue is not very well researched so far. Banerja identified the challenge of providing livelihoods, services like education, health and sanitation, and social protection to those in need. However, urbanization does not only provide challenges, but also opportunities, since about three thirds of the global economic product will soon be generated in cities. Hence, it balances opportunities and risks, stemming from agglomeration and congestion. Agglomeration effects of cities can be seen as positive externalities because they entail the creation of jobs and could make service delivery easier. Congestion effects, on the other hand, bring about problems like a lack of housing and could make service delivery more difficult. Churning poverty in urban areas is characterized by high transportation costs that prevent people from profiting from the employment opportunities cities have to offer; people living in slums without proper access to sanitary facilities, water, healthcare or education; high risks in the physical and social environment, with a high level of violence and crimes. The urban poor are nomadic, harder to locate, do not work in the formal sector and hence, have lower or no access to social safety nets. Food subsidies, for example, have found to be extremely inefficient to reach those they aim to target, but often benefit the middle class instead.

While urban planning is a crucial aspect to improve social protection, it still does not target the essentials. Therefore, practitioners need to critically reflect on program design and implementation and learn from emerging practices. However, they should not come up with patterns, but rather rethink and adapt these practices according to context.

Figure 1: Multi-layered model for the “Development of Urban Safety Nets”; Source: Linda Gibbs, Bloomberg Associates.
Institutional and Financial Challenges in Delivering Social Protection Systems in Urban Settings

Former New York City Deputy Mayor of Health and Human Services and Principal Social Services, Linda Gibbs, opened the session with reflections on the development of urban safety nets in New York City. Dividing the world in two parts, poor and non-poor, she stated, would be oversimplified. There are also people who are not only poor, but live in deep poverty or those who are not poor, but near to be so. All these different groups have different problems that would require different kinds of assistance. Hence, it is crucial to identify the problem we are trying to solve: what are we trying to do, whom are we trying to help and how? Here, it is important to not only think about emergency assistance, but also about social mobility: how can we help to lift people out of poverty, but also prevent that others are “pushed down the ladder” in times of crises?

While for those in deep poverty, the need is mostly to provide emergency food and soup kitchens, cash transfers may provide an income for poor people that goes beyond immediate daily needs and creates opportunity for social mobility. To advance opportunities for the near poor, one can advance skills and education and develop their workforce. Time-limited benefits can help to buffer shocks like Hurricane Sandy to prevent people to slide into poverty and training can help those with outdated skills, especially elderly, to get through an economic crisis. Besides income transfers, facilitated access to the labor market may prevent the poor from getting into deep poverty. However, to help those in deep poverty, there is a need to engage in chronic conditions.

Hence the pressing question remains how to help those who do not manage to lift themselves out of poverty: how to get people out of multi-generational cycles of poverty? Here, Gibbs emphasized the importance of communities in breaking these cycles. Especially young males face the danger to be disconnected from the labor market, but programs aimed at facilitating access remained empty. Hence, programs were relocated into housing development and a club-like structure was created, in which individuals took up mentoring responsibilities for others. Finally, she made a strong case for being creative within the regulatory framework, critically reflecting on who programs are designed for, what they should achieve and not to hesitate to correct or end programs if they are found to be ineffective.

In the following discussion, Gibbs elaborated on New York City’s efforts in helping to lift young men out of poverty. She identified two problems in the existing protections schemes: (1) on the national level they are mainly targeted at children and heads of household that care for children are mostly women; (2) there is a legacy of racism in the United States, so young unemployed men of color are often perceived as an issue of public safety, for which the criminal justice system can provide a solution. Here, the cities have to step in since nobody is willing to touch the issue on a national level and mayors have some more flexibility. In New York, the focus is on health education, employment and justice and all of these angles are tackled simultaneously. Further, she elaborated on the relation between national and local governments. Traditionally, cities would fill gaps where country, state or national programs do not fit and lately, a tendency can be observed that despite the usually rigid regulations of national or state programs, more space is given for local variations.

Ulrich Hoerning of The World Bank Group introduced the following panel discussion by explaining coordination between different levels of operational environment. For political, administrative and fiscal decentralization, it is necessary to balance top down integration of the central government’s national policies and programs with innovative bottom up approaches of local level governments. Hence, the different levels have to coordinate the introduction of regulatory policy frameworks and the implementation of programs, as well as their financing.

---

**Central government**

- Top down integration of national policies and programs
- Regulatory framework (political decentralization)
- Coordination between central and local level governments
- Implementation of programs (administrative decentralization)
- Financing programs (fiscal decentralization)
- Bottom-up generation of approaches of local level governments

**Local/city government**

---

Figure 2: Coordination between central and local governments for “Delivering Social Protection and Labor Systems in Urban Settings”; Source: Ulrich Hoerning, The World Bank Group.
The panelists, currently acting practitioners from Rio de Janeiro, Hamburg, and Beijing, offered insights from their respective cities and identified two cross-cutting themes that connected all three cases: (1) the importance of accurate and up-to-date data; and (2) the importance of rule-based systems.

Adilson Nougeira Pires, Deputy Mayor of Social Affairs, City of Rio de Janeiro, presented a special cash transfer program for Rio de Janeiro that went beyond the national level, because living costs are much higher in Rio than for example in rural areas. This program includes three levels of government: the local, the regional and the national. The program put in place in Rio functions similar to the national program: local authorities are the first point of call for registration, informing people of their rights and to ensure that goals are met. This is particularly important in a country like Brazil with 200 million inhabitants, where the national government may provide financial means, but cannot reach every community. Currently, the Olympic Games are seen as an opportunity for social development in Rio, since access to public transport all over the city is being improved. Moreover, the Olympics allowed investments from private partners: only one third of the costs will be borne by public sources, the rest is covered by private sources and is generating further employment opportunities.

Torsten Sevecke, Head of District, Administration of Hamburg-Eimsbüttel, Freie und Hansestadt Hamburg, gave insights into how to build safe communities for children, youth and families. With the lowest unemployment rate in Hamburg (about 4%), no visible poverty, no slums, but the highest population density in Germany, the highest rate of schools and the highest rate of Sport Utility Vehicles, the initial situation in his district differs tremendously from the one of the previous case. Still, the district takes care of about 1,000 children in need. In Hamburg, the district is responsible for delivering social protection to the people; it has operational responsibility for networks and coordinates national and state systems in the district. In Eimsbüttel, there has been a district planning process for 20 years that combines all planning from housing to streets, etc. All social data is stored in one system and the database is used for decisions on all different kinds of development. The planning process is built on the philosophy to go through the life of a human being and construct social systems around that. Therefore, the need for special programs is small, but the regular structures should have more power to provide a stable and good social system, with, among others, good schools and competent job agencies.

Weidong Li, Deputy Director, Center of Monitoring and Verification of Low Income Families, Ministry of Civil Affairs, China, gave an account of the Chinese social assistance program Dibao and its implementation in Beijing. While the local government determines the threshold for eligibility by income coefficient measures, costs are borne by both, the central and the local government. Hence, when the central government was not transferring its share, Beijing had to shorten the budget. Moreover, it is difficult to accommodate urbanization in Dibao, since the program is based on a household card system (hukou), and people with a rural card do not receive the same services as those with an urban one. Also, the systems linkages with job promotion are weak.

In the discussion it was touched upon the question of linkages between job promotion and local protection programs. In China, there are subsidies for private sector employers that employ Dibao beneficiaries; the public sector creates more jobs for beneficiaries, and there are positive and negative incentives to take up jobs: if a beneficiary takes up a low-income job, s/he can still get benefits for three years; but if the beneficiary does not accept a job, eligibility for benefits are cancelled. In Rio, there is the observation that in some families people are dependent on Bolsa Familia benefits in the fifth generation and that there are jobs that would not help to change the people’s “mindset” and raise their self-esteem. Hence, there is an initiative that aims at moving people to other kinds of employment and to foster their creativity, so that eventually they would not be reliant on programs anymore. In Hamburg, the focus is on reducing youth unemployment. Therefore, the number of players in the field has been reduced; social protection and unemployment are now thought together. Moreover, every person that leaves school has one address to go to; hence, almost nobody will leave school without being taken care of.
Moreover, continuity and consistency of program introduction, but also termination in times of political change was emphasized; as well as the necessity to be flexible and able to adapt programs according to performance evaluations.

Linking Social Assistance and Productive Inclusion

The session was introduced by Roberta Gatti of The World Bank Group, who explained what productive inclusion is, namely interventions that enhance income-generating capacities of the poor by strengthening their participation in the labor market, increasing productivity in household activities as well as improving access to markets. Social protection programs offer a strong entry point, with, for example, strengthened reaching-out capacities of conditional cash transfer (CCT) programs and institutional changes that enhanced mandates for poverty reduction. Yet, there are important challenges to be addressed: poverty reduction has limits, especially in rural areas, graduated youth face unemployment, fiscal and financial crises slow down poverty reduction and the working population is shrinking in ageing societies. There are diverse options for implementing these kinds of programs, but notably, in rural areas they are called productive inclusion, but in urban areas activation programs. This means, that in urban areas opportunities are already there, but need to be activated. When talking about how to implement productive inclusion measures, there are some important questions to consider: (1) Which set of beneficiaries should be targeted and how are we reaching out to them? (2) What ‘bundle of services’ should be offered and how should this be done? (3) How do we coordinate institutions and stakeholders across ministries and the private sector? (4) How should benefits, labor contracts and taxation policies be designed?

Afterwards, case studies from El Salvador, the Philippines, and Germany offered an insight into diverse approaches to reduce dependency on social assistance by supporting people to enter the labor market and hence, help to break the cycle of poverty.

Jesus Valencia Argueta, Jefe, Diseño y Evaluación, Fondo de Inversión para el Desarrollo Local (FISDL) and Carlos Gómez, Chief Executive Officer, Salvadorian Institute for Professional Training (INSAFORP), introduced El Salvador’s Program for Temporary Income Support (PATI). In the context of high unemployment rates, lacking education and worsening gang-based violence, foundations for universal social protection were laid in 2009 and the speakers are working on PATI in those areas most affected by violence in the last five years. In the wake of the financial crisis, there was a need for a program specifically targeting the poorest that are bearing the effects of the crisis. An urban poverty map helps with geographical targeting based on the following criteria: weak access to formal labor market, low intergenerational mobility, inadequate access to basic services as well as low levels of skills for work. PATI’s main objective is to offer short-term protection; hence, it is temporary for every beneficiary. Next to cash transfers, the program has a training component, which is a condition for receiving transfers. Moreover, it aims at municipal and institutional strengthening by training and technical assistance. There is an impact assessment directly after the participation in the program and again six months after participation. While the primary aim is to get people into the productive sector, PATI is also fostering community spirit and is therefore functioning as a violence prevention program. The diagnostic tools to evaluate the impact of PATI improved over time, so that PATI training could be tailored more specifically to the needs of potential employers or set the basis for labor market integration through entrepreneurship.

Marlene Febes Peralta, Director III (Assistant Regional Director), Department of Social Welfare and Development, offered insights into the Sustainable Livelihoods Program (SLP) in the Philippines. The goal of the program is to improve capacities of Pantawid families (families receiving CCTs) through micro enterprise development and employment facilitation. It offers (technical-vocational) skills training and financial assistance to
Dr. Rolf Schmachtenberg, Director General, Participation, Matters concerning People with Disabilities, Social Compensation, Social Assistance, Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (BMAS), introduced the German social system and its three pillars of social insurance, social welfare and social compensation. Each of these pillars combines support for living and activation in one system, though this holistic approach is relatively new in Germany. Since activation is multidimensional and based on co-production between agents and clients, there is a need to create a system that allows for co-production: mutual exchange, duties and rights. Merging unemployment and social assistance went along with the huge task to create new infrastructures and required an amendment of the constitution. Due to the complex regulations of the German federal system, it needed to be established that the federal level has the right to create an institution that combines tasks from the federal and municipal level. Schmachtenberg introduced three examples based on the same legal framework but with local variations from three different cities in different parts of Germany: Bielefeld, Kiel and Mannheim.

In the discussion it was talked about case management systems. In El Salvador, there is an IT-based system that allows prioritizing cases, when demand extends the allocated budget, combining geographical and demographic targeting. In Germany, in theory the Jobcenter should collect all information and the client’s “integration contract” should include both, activities to be undertaken by the client and support given by the Jobcenter. However, in reality this is still mostly divided into two parts. The integration contract’s provisions can include services from other agencies. In the Philippines, house material is used as an indicator for the level of household wealth: (1) house made of light material, (2) made of mixed material, (3) made of concrete and stone. Level 1 is a priority for the SLP. Moreover, cooperation between the central and the local government and implementation of central programs on the local level was identified as a challenge, requiring capacity development of local governments.

Field Trip to the Berlin Borough of Neukölln

The second day of the Berlin Forum started with a field trip to the Berlin borough of Neukölln. In two groups, participants learned about area-based social interventions in challenging urban settings and approaches to social protection and productive inclusion. Afterwards, a meeting with Mayor Dr. Franziska Giffey in Neukölln’s Town Hall concluded the field trip.

Group 1: Area-based social intervention in a challenging urban setting

The first group’s visit to the Neighborhood Center Neukölln had the objective to gain insights into local approaches to promote social, educational and productive inclusion, citizens’ participation and responsibility. The trip was coordinated and guided by Arnold Mengelkoch, Officer for Migration Issues.

The Neighborhood Center in Neukölln was founded after the Second World War on the initiative of Christian American associations. It is democratically structured and organized by people from the area. It offers social activities for all age groups and in the whole North of Neukölln. A special focus is on fostering integration of people who recently moved to the area. Currently, these are mainly Roma from Bulgaria and Romania. The Neighborhood Center tries to find suitable solutions for different demands and by now has seven employees who either speak Bulgarian or Romanian. To make such offers financially possible, district authority and free sponsors have to cooperate, which worked very well in this example. Still, financing activities is quite complicated since means come from four to five different sources; a fact people frequenting the Neighborhood Center should not necessarily realize, but they should rather see the holistic offer the Center provides. Most of the visitors in the Neighborhood Center are children, youth or parents. Qualified staff is found via job advertisements, while assistants from within the community are recruited through personal contacts.
After this general introduction into the Neighborhood Centers activities by Director Bernhard Heeb, the participants learned about two specific projects: “Have a say in Neukölln” and the “Borough Mothers”.

“Have a say in Neukölln”, introduced by Annette Wallentin, is an initiative that aims at fostering democracy and political and social participation of people with migration background. Compared to their share in inhabitants in the area, people with migration background are underrepresented in decision-making committees, which can be seen as a democratic deficit. This is often related to the way how these committees operate: they often operate in an exclusionary manner, using language and procedures that are also used in working environments like agendas, list of speakers or minutes. People hence feel excluded because they do not know the “rules of the game”. The project offers information about rights and possibilities on the one hand, like seminars on elections, but also offers training for members of parents’ councils in school and gives advice to associations on legal and financial matters. It does not only foster better representation of people with migration background in local decision-making bodies, but in turn also helps them to develop skills that are useful on a professional level as well. Participants get trained in how to act in the “work world” and also receive an opportunity for networking with potential employers.

The “Borough Mothers” are formerly unemployed migrant women from different countries, who have children and were looking for work. They receive a six-months training and afterwards have the rights to visit other mothers or families and share their knowledge with them in their native language. The Borough Mothers are also aware of public consulting services and accompany the families to the respective locations. Generally there are always about 100 women working as Borough Mothers in Neukölln, sharing knowledge for example about childcare and school, healthy nutrition, children’s rights, health prevention, sexual education and media use. Having a school degree is not a prerequisite for becoming a Borough Mother, but they need a good knowledge of German and the mother tongue, open-mindedness and the willingness to learn something new and to reflect. The training comprises a theoretical and a practical component and participants receive a certificate after completion.

Nadja from Lebanon has been a Borough Mother since 2014. She started her work with visiting her neighbors to build trust. For each family they visit, Borough Mothers prepare an individual folder with material on the topics they talked about and which could be useful for the families. A successful experience was to help a Syrian family to enroll their daughter in childcare.

Naima from Morocco has been living in Neukölln for 13 years. She advertises her services in childcare institutions at pediatricians or gynecologists, in family centers or at school parties.

Generally, Borough Mothers also cooperate with social services: if social workers have any problems, a Mother can accompany them. The program is now successfully running for 10 years, over 8,000 families have been visited, each of them ten times, and the concept has been exported to other parts of Germany and abroad. Some of the Mothers are paid by the district administration and paid according to collective wage agreements. Others, however, are financed by the Jobcenter and receive the minimum wage. The project has an annual budget of 600,000€ provided by several sources, not including the salaries. However, though the project is running successfully and even won a prize in Australia, it is still considered to be a “model project” and not permanent. Project leader Maria Macher is struggling every two years for continued financing.
Group 2: Social Assistance and Productive Inclusion at the local level

The visits of the second group had the objective to learn about elements of the German Social Assistance and Productive Inclusion Model from a local perspective and to discuss strengths and limitations. It was coordinated and guided by Cordula Simon, Officer for European and International Affairs of the Borough of Neukölln.

At first, the participants visited the Job and Career Information Center (BIZ), introduced by Director Nadine Stielow. Job and Career Information Centers offer information and advice regarding education, vocational training, job profiles and the labor market to the clients of employment agencies and job centers, as well as to the general public. They also organize vocational orientation campaigns for special interest groups such as secondary-school students before graduation. Institutionally, they belong to the Federal Employment Agency, which is organized in a head office, regional directorates, employment agencies and branch offices as well as job center. Visitors are provided with information organized in four areas of interest: (1) professions and careers, (2) vocational training and university education, (3) job applications, and (4) international internship and career options. The Center provides leaflets, access to folders, books, digital media and online databases. Users can inform themselves regarding job profiles, check for vacancies for vocational training on a national or local level, find job offers in the central database of the employment agency and receive assistance in preparing a professional job application. The latter is especially helpful for young people who do not receive this assistance or do not have a role model at home. The use of the Center is free of charge and, with the exception of organized campaigns, demand driven. It is not necessarily linked with individual advisory services and case management, offered by employment agency or job center. As an important instrument of labor market intermediation, the work of the Centers should contribute to a better matching of supply and demand. However, to measure their impact is difficult, as clients do not give a systematic feedback regarding their knowledge gains, actions taken or the results of their job applications.

Secondly, the participants got to know Kubus gGmbH, a non-profit company that offers a broad range of social services, especially for young people and vulnerable groups. Kubus operates a number of public programs in the area of active labor market policy and productive inclusion. Program funding derives from different government levels and various sectors, ranging from the European Social Fund to the Borough of Neukölln.

Executive Director Siegfried Klaßen offered a brief introduction to the history of the German Social Protection System, mentioning important milestones, beginning with the social insurance legislation under Chancellor Otto von Bismarck that introduced health-, accident- and pension insurances. The 2001-2005 labor market policy reforms, however, redefined principles, institutions and services of labor market policy. This new legal framework constitutes the basis for the implementation of public financed social projects by private non-profit agencies like Kubus.

Target groups of their work are the long-term unemployed and job-seekers, who have to overcome multiple barriers to succeed in the labor market. This includes young people with a low educational background and without vocational training, migrants with language difficulties, single parents with multiple care obligations, persons with health impairments and elderly people with qualifications that are no longer required. Program participants often face additional multifaceted difficulties, including problems of addiction (alcohol, drugs, internet addiction etc.), financial debts, illiteracy, lack of care for hygiene, social exclusion and others. Therefore, personal stabilization, (re-) activation, the learning of professional virtues, the step by step solution of pressing social problems (debts, addictions, etc.), the joint development of professional prospects, the connection to qualification measures and vocational training are important objectives and pre-conditions for a labor market integration.

The following four programs are productive inclusion instruments that have been implemented by Kubus in various opportunities:
• “Job Opportunities (One-Euro-Jobs)”: Beneficiaries of social transfer payments receive a small top-up fee for their work in this program (1.50 Euro/hour).

• “Citizens’ Jobs”: Public sector jobs with a “common good content” are created on the local level to include long-term unemployed into a productive activity. This program is financed by the federal government.

• Wage subsidies: The Employer receives a 75% wage subsidy in case of hiring a long-term unemployed person. The program participant signs a fixed-term contract with social security benefits (except unemployment insurance).

• “Active Center”/”Praxis Center”: Participants are motivated and led carefully towards apprenticeship, training and jobs. Objective is to improve employability, self-organization and job stability.

Many years of hands-on experience at Kubus have shown that there are clients that do not have a chance to find a job in the regular “first” labor market. Their only options are protected jobs in the “second” labor market, a reality, which often is not reflected in program designs. Kubus also includes tailor and metal workshops. However, most of the products produced here are transferred to social institutions as for example public childcare, because labor market programs may not enter in competition with regular companies. They shall not interfere in market competition, not replace existing jobs and shall contribute to matters of public interest – principles that sometimes are challenging to comply with.

**Reception by Borough Mayor of the City of Berlin/Neukölln**

Borough Mayor Dr. Franziska Giffey welcomed all participants in the Town Hall of Neukölln and gave insights into the borough’s situation and her work. Neukölln has more than 325,000 inhabitants from 160 nations and due to high unemployment rates a reputation as a “problem area”. Her target as a mayor is to positively transform Neukölln’s reputation, which calls for innovative solutions to reach people from such diverse social and ethnic backgrounds. Schools, especially in Northern Neukölln, sometimes have up to 90% of students with migration background and lots of students leave school without obtaining a certificate. The reasons for this problem are found in very early childhood, in the families and social conditions they grow up in. Mayor Giffey emphasized that she is convinced of the need for a strong state to solve this problem: strong kindergartens, good language training and close cooperation with parents. When children come to kindergarten only at the age of five and do not speak German, though s/he was born in Germany, chances are missed to lay the basis for better education already in an early age. Hence, she supports the implementation of early and regular kindergarten visits and all-day schools.

Regarding the district’s financial situation, Mayor Giffey pointed out the very limited flexibility her authority has regarding how to spend the annual budget of 70-80 million €, because 74% are used for welfare benefits and another 12% for personnel costs. Only 2% from the regular budget can be used for investments. About 80% from these flexible 2% are invested into school buildings. Hence, the district is acquiring funding from other sources like the European Union to be more flexible. It becomes obvious that social development in the district, if less people would be dependent on welfare benefits, would lead to more flexibility regarding the budget. The district also tries to find private partners, to convince companies to engage in schools, for example to provide breakfast, or to offer vocational training. Moreover, there is financial support from private foundations and (senior) citizens who volunteer in schools. However, at the same time, parents have to be reminded of their duties to send their children to school and are fined when they fail to do so.

Apart from the social problems, Neukölln also offers opportunities and has creative potential. Philipp Morris has its biggest European manufacturing site in Neukölln, there is pacemaker production, one of the biggest cultural festivals in Berlin and also lots of opportunities in the multicultural environment. However, it is necessary to see the high rate of non-German origin not as a problem, but rather as a potential. To make use of this potential, additional effort is necessary, like, for example, offering Turkish and Arabic language lessons in school.
Harnessing Safety Nets to Provide Health Insurance to the Poor

Jennifer Hennig, Coordinator Latin America, Global Alliances for Social Protection, GIZ, Peru introduced the session on universal health coverage (UHC) with a cubic model of costs, services and population. The cube visualizes the way from current pooled funds towards universal coverage. To reach universal coverage, one would need to include further services, extend services to those who are currently not covered, as well as reduce fees for services, respectively increase the proportion of costs, which is covered.

Hennig raised the following guiding questions for the session: how to determine eligibility and what are challenges of implementation? What are challenges of enrolling poor and vulnerable beneficiaries? How does the division of roles and responsibilities work? And what are challenges to ensure that services are actually being provided?

Participants from the Philippines, Peru, and India presented approaches to UHC and identified challenges in targeting, identifying beneficiaries and encourage them to make use of their rights, as well as in preventing misuse of the system.

Leizel Lagrada, Independent Consultant, Health Policy Development and Planning Bureau, Joint Learning Network for Universal Health Coverage (JLN) introduced the Philippines’ approach to UHC, the National Health Insurance Program (NHIP). Here, health insurance was expanded from the employed to the informal sector and the contribution of the premium has been shifted, now being fully subsidized to enroll the poor. There is automatic availment for pregnant women and hospitals can pay for premiums as well. If you are identified as poor, you are automatically listed as being eligible for the program and these lists are also posted publicly, so that the community can control them and possible irregularities could be reported. The great opportunity is that the program has a mandate to enroll everyone, but how to do it remains a challenge, as well as to monitor that government facilities do not charge the poor.

Pedro Grillo, Jefe de Seguro Integral de Salud (SIS), talked about Peru’s subsidized health insurance system, which is divided into five different stages and financed through taxes. Since 2010 the health insurance’s budget has more than tripled, and the number of people without health insurance has decreased from 64% in 2004 to 20% in 2015; 50% are covered by the national system. Moreover, identification in Peru has improved significantly, from 25% in 2011 who could be identified by a national document to 96% this year, which makes the verification of members much easier. Still, targeting vulnerable groups remains a challenge. In the future, the Peruvian system aims at focusing more on prevention than on reaction.

Hennig raised the following guiding questions for the session: how to determine eligibility and what are challenges of implementation? What are challenges of enrolling poor and vulnerable beneficiaries? How does the division of roles and responsibilities work? And what are challenges to ensure that services are actually being provided?

Participants from the Philippines, Peru, and India presented approaches to UHC and identified challenges in targeting, identifying beneficiaries and encourage them to make use of their rights, as well as in preventing misuse of the system.
Onkar Singh Meena, Secretary of Health and Family Welfare, State Nodal Agency, Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana (RSBY), State Government of West Bengal, India, introduced RSBY, a health insurance system that covers an identified group of families. It has been implemented in every Indian state since its launch in 2008 and beneficiaries are provided healthcare through Public Private Partnerships. Selection criteria are determined nationally and cover also unorganized workers. The premium of 2.5–5€ per annum per family is covered by the government, who also monitors implementation. Enrollment is done by local bodies and identification is based on a “smart card” that includes a photo and fingerprint information.

After enrollment, patients can receive cashless treatments in hospitals and claims are settled between the hospital and the insurer. Therefore, the patient’s card is swiped on the biometric card reader and his or her fingerprints are taken. This information is verified by the system and consequently, insured sums are approved. Meena describes experiences with the enrollment system as generally good; however, there are some problems with the misuse of the scheme.

In the discussion, it was pointed out again that reaching those who actually should be targeted is a real challenge. Moreover, another challenge is preventing misuse of UHC systems. This does not only hold true for misuse by those customers who should not be targeted by the respective programs, but also for healthcare facilities that should not charge the poor, who sometimes might not be properly aware of their rights.

Global Café

In the Global Café session, participants reflected in small working groups on different topics, focusing on first-hand country experiences in the design and implementation of social protection systems. To give an insight, this report will exemplary touch upon three cases of these sessions.

(1) Spatial Challenges and Solutions in Social Protection – Targeting and Housing Rental – the Cases of Haïti and Rio de Janeiro: Rio has developed new knowledge management tools. The Rio+Social Program connects public and private service supply with local demands to improve to reach people in Rio’s informal settlements, the favelas. The methodology of this program is based on physical presence in the respective slum areas, data processing and systematization to identify needs and priorities, as well as local participation. Moreover, it is supported by innovative territory and land management tools that for example help to map new streets that otherwise would not be captured by official city maps. With the improvement of information supply and management it would consequently be important to overcome the gap between information production and policy implementation and focus on evidence-based policy making.

(5) Providing Subsidized Health Insurance for the Poor and Linking it Through an Integrated MIS – the Cases of Turkey and Indonesia: In Turkey, a first attempt by the Ministry of Family and Social Affairs to create a new Integrated Management Information System failed in 2004, followed by a second attempt in 2008, which is much more successful. Challenges were the persuasion of other institutions to use the same system and the streamlining of IT systems so that information can be shared. By now, approximately 9000 people in Turkey, including users from municipalities and NGOs, use the system. In Indonesia, the reform of the social security system, which started in 2014, is combined with the creation of a huge information system under the umbrella of social security that stores data of 250 million people. The single pool creates a dynamic database system that will eventually allow joint operations between health insurance and non-health social security.

(6) Integrating Violence-Prevention Measures into Social Protection Programs – the Cases of the City of Rio de Janeiro and South Africa: In South Africa, the Community Works Programme (CWP) should contribute to building safe and cohesive communities through the provision of basic public goods and social services, as well as providing access to a minimum level of regular work opportunities at grassroots level. The program engages multiple stakeholders to facilitate cooperation, strengthen links with other structures to prevent crimes and violence, develop capacities in social, health and educational sectors and establish monitoring, evaluation and accountability.
Learning Needs, Lessons Learned and — Looking Ahead

The forum concluded with a working session, in which participants reflected on (1) what they learned from other countries’ experiences, (2) what challenges their countries face regarding social protection, (3) their priority areas in learning, and on (4) how global initiatives and partnerships could help to support social protection in urban settings. Discussion groups were composed randomly and results are reflected here in the order they were presented in the reporting session.

The group at Table 5 reported that (1) they gained knowledge about social rights and advocacy, learned about different social offers and interventions that are available elsewhere, that successful inclusion in the labor market and social protection requires a robust system with a solid foundation and about territory-based strategies of rolling out interventions. (2) Challenges were identified regarding accumulated vulnerability in specific territories, access of authorities to violence-ridden areas, how to ensure social assistance for those outside the system and regarding the potential growth in poverty. (3) Priority areas in learning include the questions how to integrate different levels of a social protection system, how to better assist targeted persons and how to help the development of those less than five years old without discrimination? (4) Partners can help in creating a space for discussion, but also in following up on the forum to work more in-depth on pressing issues.

Table 6 identified (1) the need for integration and “packaging” of social protection measures as an important lesson from the forum, as well as they insight that several countries have similar problems, especially regarding technology issues. (2) Challenges identified were making sure that the poor enjoy their rights, dealing with center-periphery differences, urbanization and resettlement issues, urban planning and lack of regulations as well as inter-agency coordination. (3) Priority areas in learning are the integration of social protection systems, targeting of beneficiaries and implementation of initiatives, as well as resource prioritization strategies and database management. (4) Partnerships could be intensified through social media outreach and networking.

Table 8 learned about (1) database systems, how to reach out to vulnerable groups, migration issues and coordination between different agencies. (2) The identification of vulnerable groups was seen as a particular challenge, as was the empowerment of the vulnerable, database management and migration problems. More generally, providing housing and access to education and transport are demanding tasks as well. (3) The participants of this group would like to learn more about identification and tracking of beneficiaries, about how to tackle corruption, how to use technologies and about how to evaluate programs and use them sustainably. (4) They propose smaller group meetings on more specific topics and to raise social protection issues at larger meetings like the G20 summit. They further called upon inviting “people we are talking about”, meaning the urban poor, to meetings as well.

Table 9 identified (1) a common vision among forum participants: an integrated, intersected social protection system. However, in many countries there is no effective interconnection between different territories. (2) Mobility of the urban poor is a challenge, as is involvement in illegal activities. Social protection is often only focused on individuals or families and neglects the environment and structural conditions. (3) They would like to learn about how to bring development issues discussed in other fora into the conversation. Moreover, it is important to discuss questions of “targeting vs. universalization” and how social protection systems can broaden rights. (4) It would be useful to have an IT-based network for exchange, which could be useful not only for participants, but also for their clients. Participants could then act as mediators.

The group at table 10 learned about (1) similar challenges in different countries and with different approaches to implementing solutions, depending specific contexts: there is no “one-size-fits-all” approach. Youth unemployment is a critical factor that requires more attention and there is a need for better support and coordinate with local governments. (2+3) An important challenge is to take stock: what works and what does not? Hence, there is a need to learn about monitoring and evaluation tools and indicators to measure the impact of initiatives. Moreover, it is challenging to avoid duplication of efforts, but
rather ensure complementarity. Improved IT (skills and technology) could be helpful in this regard. (4) Global initiatives and partnerships are useful to learn from each other and improve good practices. Specific meetings would be useful, but also cross-cutting meetings that would take up current issues and feed into different debates. Partners can help with providing an overview of different debates and efforts.

Table 11 also emphasized (1) the context specificity of interventions and the importance of communities as main agents of implementation. (2) It is a big challenge for governments to respond to demands for services that grow faster than their capacities. Moreover, it is challenging to decentralize and to transport discussions on the national level to the local level. (3) They would like to learn more about issues of migration from rural to urban areas, not only in the home country, but also abroad, for example as migrant workers. Moreover, learning needs include approaches to targeting, timelines of projects and combinations of programs and stakeholders. (4) Participants at the table suggest to further focus on challenges rather than on successes and to improve the forum design so that it allows for a deepening of discussions. More study tours to different countries would also be of interest.

Table 7 learned (1) that UHC is a global issue and that top-up income programs are popular initiatives for social protection. Moreover, they emphasized Mayor Giffey’s statement that one should see immigrants as a potential and not as a problem. (2) The identification of beneficiaries, corruption, political interference, a lack of adequate infrastructure and funding and migration are all challenges identified by the group. (3) They would like to learn more about monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment, about political economy issues and how to enhance accountability, transparency and coordination between stakeholders and about how to make funding sustainable. (4) There should be a documentation of the forum and sharing of best practices and general. It would also be useful to work in commissions dealing with concrete findings in focus areas. The forum could help in facilitating bilateral cooperation.

To sum up, an important lesson that was learned is the fact that different countries face similar problems, but that there are different approaches to solve these problems depending on the country-specific “starting position”. These different approaches may offer fruitful inspiration for other countries with similar problems. Challenges range from the identification of vulnerable groups over growing demand for public services or political interference to IT problems and practical challenges in monitoring and evaluation. A need for more space for in-depth, technical discussions was identified, as well as a strong interest in learning how to put certain ideas and approaches into practice. Topics that were not covered by the Berlin Global Learning Forum but could be on the agenda for future meetings are: (1) government structures and accountability, (2) political economy, respectively effects of political changes on social protection programs, and (3) coordination and harmonization between the federal and the local level and how to include civil society.

Linking South-South Learning from Rio via Berlin to Beijing

In the closing panel discussion, BMZ’s Heike Kuhn reflected on what she had experienced during the last days. She emphasized the importance of peer-to-peer-learning, the need for commitment from the top to improve social protection and the interconnectedness between different issues like social protection, education and migration.

The World Bank’s Arup Banerji emphasized the importance of generating evidence, acknowledges that eventually, issues of governance and institutions would need to be tackled and learned two lessons for Beijing for successful South-South conversations: (1) facilitate informal connections, (2) make sure to not only talk about successes, but also about failures.

Antonio Claret, Former Vice Minister of Social Assistance and Human Rights, Ministry of Social Development, Brazil, drew on the Bolsa Familia program and identified engaging all relevant actors as a key factor for success. In the future, Brazil will follow a twofold strategy of alleviating poverty and trying to break intergenerational cycles. A risk that should be avoided is that income generation repeats poverty production, namely when jobs are created that do not pay well. An important lesson from the forum was that other countries, including Germany, face similar challenges, as for example seen on the field trip.
Vivi Yulaswati, Director of Social Protection and Welfare, Ministry of National Development Planning (BAPPENAS), Indonesia, learned about better opportunities for improving equality and inclusiveness, and protecting rights. The field trip offered a view on a local government taking up a strong role, engaging partners and a clear division of labor. But it also revealed gaps in the system and the implication of targeting: how can it be ensured that no one (for example migrants) is left behind? In Beijing, she wants to learn more about community-based urban practices, innovations and the possibility in the use of big data, smart cities and age-friendly environments.

Juan Manuel Lopez Arroyo, Head of the Unit of Planning and International Relations, Secretaría Desarrollo Social (SEDESOL), Mexico, takes home a lot of impulses to adjust and improve the Mexican model of social protection. The consequences of migration to cities used to be neglected; hence, there is need for a social and urban intervention approach that takes into account the constant flow of people. In general, the forum raised more questions than answers but it became clear that one should move away from individual benefits and patronage towards a vision based on productive inclusion. He then invited participants to take part in a seminar hold in Monterrey, Mexico on 24th-26th of August and suggested to set up a working group with Latin American colleagues.

The World Bank’s Ruslan Yemtsov then wrapped up the Berlin Global Learning Forum in emphasizing that it was just the beginning of the working process and that there is a need to go deeper into certain issues: the challenge here is to make intellectual interaction sustainable. Important topics distilled from the Berlin Forum are the “system’s agenda”, urban planning, the role of civil society/NGOs, and how to target or identify the urban poor.
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