

SOCIAL PROTECTION AND JOBS  
**SOUTH** LEARNING  
**2018** FORUM  
FEBRUARY 19-22 | FRANKFURT, GERMANY

Building Resilience through Adaptive  
Social Protection



PROGRAM

An aerial photograph of a city, likely Copenhagen, showing a wide river (the Øresund) flowing through the center. Several bridges cross the river, including a prominent suspension bridge in the foreground. The city is densely packed with buildings, green spaces, and trees. The sky is blue with scattered white clouds.

# Contents

<b>Welcome letter</b> .....	1
<b>Agenda</b> .....	2
<b>Plenary Session Descriptions</b> .....	3
<b>Interactive Session Descriptions</b> .....	14
<b>WB Organizing Team</b> .....	15
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	16

SOCIAL PROTECTION AND JOBS  
**SOUTH SOUTH** LEARNING  
FORUM  
2018

Dear Participant,

We are delighted to welcome you to Frankfurt, Germany, for the 2018 South-South Learning Forum (SSLF) on “Building Household Resilience to Shocks through Adaptive Social Protection”. Recent events have revealed the devastating impact of shocks on those whose lives and livelihoods that have been destroyed—be that by natural disasters, pandemics, or conflicts and resultant forced displacement. Often, these shocks disproportionately affect the poorest and most vulnerable households that are among the most exposed to and the least able to cope with these events. Traditional approaches to social protection are not always well-suited to meeting the unique and widespread needs that result from such crises. Nevertheless, working in increasingly challenging environments, social protection practitioners worldwide are developing innovative solutions and best practices to better prepare for, and respond to such shocks. Ultimately, such initiatives seek to enable households to better manage these risks and to build their resilience for the future. This is what we call, “Adaptive Social Protection” (ASP).

The Forum’s agenda is designed to promote knowledge exchange through a range of learning methods: plenary presentations delivered by practitioners will explore central issues to ASP. In addition, participants will have the opportunity to engage and learn from each other during interactive discussions that aim to build networks for continued collaboration beyond the Forum. Finally, a one-day field trip visit to various locations in and around Germany will bring the discussions to life as we will have the opportunity to visit with key policy makers and front line implementers of household resilience building and shock-responsive programs.

Originally, the Forum was to be held in Dakar, Senegal, given its experiences in building adaptive social protection systems. Despite having to postpone, we are pleased that the Senegalese Government is co-hosting with us in Frankfurt so we may showcase both their and Germany’s experiences in building dynamic social protection systems that are capable of responding to all matter of crises. Accordingly, we must express our deepest gratitude to the Government of Senegal’s *Délégation Générale à la Protection Sociale et à la Solidarité Nationale* (DGPSN) for their generous support and sharing their own experiences. We are also very grateful for the financial support from: the RSR (Rapid Social Response) Program which in turn is supported by the Russian Federation, Sweden, Norway, the United Kingdom and Australia; the Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR); the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ) and the *Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit* (GIZ) GmbH; the African, Caribbean and Pacific—European Union Africa Disaster Risk Financing (ACP-EU ADRF) Program; the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency; the Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade; and *L’Agence Francaise de Developpement* (AFD).

Throughout the Forum, we hope that you are each able to actively learn from the diversity of experience you will encounter during your time here, with fellow participants hailing from more than 70 countries, from every region of the world.

**Michal Rutkowski**

Senior Director, Social Protection and Labor, World Bank Group



Monday, February 19		Tuesday, February 20		Wednesday, February 21		Thursday, February 22	
7:30–9:00	Registration (Register early from 17:00–19:00 on Sunday, February 18)	9:00–10:30	Nuts & Bolts of ASP for Shock Response Chair: Philippe Leite <i>The Philippines, Chile, Turkey</i>	8:30–10:00	Building Household Resilience to Shocks Chair: Carlo del Ninno Niger, Bangladesh, Peru	9:00–10:30	Capturing Lessons Learned Anush Bezgharyan & Christof Kersting
9:00–9:15	Official Welcome & Opening by the World Bank Keith Hansen, Vice President, World Bank Group	10:30–11:00	Coffee	10:00–10:30	Coffee	10:30–11:00	Coffee
9:15–9:45	Adaptive Social Protection: Framing the Issues Michal Rutkowski, Senior Director, World Bank Group	11:00–12:30	Nuts & Bolts of ASP for Shock Response Chair: Kenichi Chavez <i>West Bank &amp; Gaza, Jamaica, Indonesia</i>	10:30–12:00	Enhancing the Linkages Between Humanitarian Assistance & Social Protection Chair: Sarah Coll-Black <i>Yemen, Ethiopia, Pakistan</i>	11:00–12:30	Forum Closing Adaptive Social Protection: A Forward Look
9:45–10:00	Preparation for Lessons Learned Session Anush Bezgharyan, Practice Manager, World Bank Group	12:30–14:00	Lunch	12:00–12:45	Lunch	12:30–14:00	Lunch
10:00–10:30	Coffee	14:00–15:30	Financing ASP Chair: Barry Maher <i>Uganda, Mexico, Fiji, Sierra Leone</i>	12:45–17:00	Field Visits		
10:30–10:45	Welcome Remarks from the Government of Germany Thomas Silberhorn, Parliamentary State Secretary to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development	15:30–16:00	Coffee	19:00	Closing Dinner		
10:45–11:15	Developing Adaptive Social Protection in Senegal Anta Sarr Diacko, Déléguée Générale, Délégation Générale à la Protection Sociale et à la Solidarité Nationale	16:00–17:30	Nuts & Bolts of ASP for Shock Response <i>Global Café</i>				
11:15–12:30	Ministerial Panel Reflections on Adaptive Social Protection	17:30–18:00	Preparation for Field Visits				
12:30–14:00	Lunch						
14:00–15:30	Social protection and shocks (assigned parallel sessions)						
	<i>Natural Disasters</i> Chair: Ruslan Yemstov Stéphane Hallegatte <i>Japan, Madagascar, Mexico</i>						
	<i>Economic Shocks</i> Chair: Giuseppe Zampaglione Yemstov <i>Egypt, Bangladesh, Ukraine, Liberia</i>						
	<i>Forced Displacement</i> Chair: Ruslan Yemstov Stéphane Hallegatte <i>Japan, Madagascar, Mexico</i>						
15:30–16:00	Coffee						
16:00–17:30	Social Protection & Shocks <i>Global Café</i>						
18:30	Opening Reception						

Legend

- Opening/Closing
- Special Session
- Plenary
- Interactive

Schedule subject to change

# Plenary Session Descriptions

*(Subject to change—please see smartphone app for latest information)*

## Official Welcome & Opening

Keith Hansen, World Bank Group Vice-President for Human Development, will welcome participants and formally open the Forum with remarks on the importance of Human Development and Adaptive Social Protection in the context of shocks such as disasters, forced displacement and pandemics.



## Adaptive Social Protection (ASP): Framing the Issues

Michal Rutkowski, World Bank Group Senior Director, Social Protection & Jobs, will deliver a presentation that frames the topic of ASP and aligns it to the agenda and content of the Forum. The framing session will present the need for ASP in a global context of multiple and interconnected risks and shocks facing households and policymakers alike. ASP will be defined as two inter-related approaches that are centered on building the resilience of vulnerable households before shocks occur and investing in making social protection more responsive to shocks after they have occurred. Acknowledging that ASP is an emerging area in the field of social protection, the framing will present the fundamental building blocks on “how to” design and implement these approaches, captured in a ASP “roadmap” and including:

1. Government leadership
2. Adaptive social protection systems (composed of information, programs and their delivery processes, and finance)
3. Institutional arrangements for internal and external actors

## Preparation for Capturing Lessons Learned

Anush Bezhanyan, World Bank Group Practice Manager, Social Protection & Jobs, will briefly outline the approach

to structured learning throughout the Forum, which will culminate in the interactive “Lessons Learned” session on Thursday, February 22. Aligned to the prior Framing session, participants will be encouraged to structure their learning around the ASP Roadmap and its key building blocks and prepare to provide their feedback during the Lessons Learned session accordingly.

## Welcome Remarks from the Government of Germany

Thomas Silberhorn, Parliamentary State Secretary to the Federal Minister for Economic Cooperation and Development, will provide remarks on behalf of Germany as co-host to the Forum.

## Developing Adaptive Social Protection in Senegal

Anta Sarr Diacko, General Delegate for Social Protection and National Solidarity of the Government of Senegal and co-host of the Forum, will present the building blocks of Senegal’s safety nets system and how they are being used to respond to shocks and build the resilience of the most vulnerable households. Since 2013, Senegal has worked continuously in building a National Unique Registry. So far, they have registered 28% of the population and will soon include every poor household of the country. In parallel, they are implementing a national cash transfer program with beneficiaries in every village and neighborhood of the country—covering around 18%

of the population. Recently, they have started using both the National Unique Registry and the cash transfer program organizational set up to respond to shocks in a more efficient way. Also, a productive safety nets program is being implemented and strategic partnerships between the cash transfer program and resilience programs are being signed to increase the productive capacities of the most vulnerable households, and hence increase their resilience to shocks.

## Ministerial Panel: Reflections on Adaptive Social Protection

To round out the morning presentations, this “Davos” style panel will provide several Ministerial-level attendees with the opportunity to reflect on the topic of Adaptive Social Protection, as presented by the World Bank Group during the preceding session, “Adaptive Social Protection: Framing the Issues” and by the Government of Senegal (Forum co-hosts) during their special session, “Developing Adaptive Social Protection in Senegal”. Drawing on their own experiences, the panelists will describe their own experiences of responding to shocks, developing adaptive social protection and the key lessons learned from these experiences that may be of use for participants to bear in mind during the Forum.

## Social Protection & Shocks: Parallel Sessions

For these three afternoon sessions, participants will be divided into groups to examine the role of social protection in relation to three different types of shocks: natural disasters, forced displacement and economic shocks. These parallel sessions will provide a venue for participants learn in greater depth about the nuances of certain shock types, both in terms of their impacts on households and their implications for developing and implementing adaptive social protection. Participants were assigned to one of the parallel sessions based on the preferences expressed during registration.

### Parallel Session 1: Economic Shocks

#### SESSION LEAD

**Ruslan Yemstov**, Lead Economist, World Bank Group

#### SPEAKERS

**Ghada Waly**, Minister of Social Solidarity, Egypt

**Vitalii Muzychenko**, Director, Department of State Social Assistance, Ministry of Social Policy, Ukraine

**Gabriel Fernandez**, National Social Protection Coordinator, Liberia

#### BACKGROUND

The recent and rapid succession of different crises has demonstrated that if people are left unprotected, poverty increases and political stability are compromised. With each new economic crisis, the demands for policy makers to respond to shocks come fast and furiously. The nature of crises can differ—it can be a financial or external trade shock, a change in regulations or subsidy regime, the loss of investor confidence or a breakdown of the banking sector. All crises have an impact of livelihoods by affecting the cost of living, earnings, savings or employment, however. Economic shocks, especially those affecting the livelihoods of the

poor and vulnerable, can push many near-poor into poverty and undermine future prospects for escaping destitution.

Safety nets can be used to protect vulnerable and poor people in the face of economic shocks: cash transfers or in-kind aid (food) may shield against sudden increases in food prices, employment in labor-intensive public works and unemployment benefits can compensate for the loss of employment, fee waivers for essential services including health, education, and heating help to protect access by the poor. As with all other types of shocks, two groups of people need protection: those who are already poor, and those who are pushed into poverty by the shock. These groups can be very different, and require different policy responses. Other social protection instruments such as contributory insurance programs and labor market interventions can also help to mitigate negative consequences of economic shocks. However, the role of such programs is typically underappreciated.

In all cases, crisis-readiness requires programs that are “adaptive”. This session will discuss what is this “adaptability” to crisis requires. Four main features are necessary:

1. Strong leadership and preparedness based on a pre-existing plan of action related to an agreed strategy, including institutional clarity on decision making during the crisis.
2. Adequate information, monitoring and warning systems that help to trigger and prioritize the action.
3. Flexible delivery and the ability to scale-up or launch programs that can supply expanded income support and that can be scaled up and down by changing parameters for eligibility, frequency, duration and level of benefits as well as types of services and support.
4. Flexible finances, including contingency budgets or ability to reallocate and/or create fiscal space.

Continuing global volatility and persistent poverty increase the urgency for developing countries to build adaptive social protection and improve future crisis preparedness. This work involves strong partnership among all partners in development, and sharing of lessons among countries. This session will provide a platform for such exchange between countries that have developed solutions in each of the features required for crisis responsiveness.

#### COUNTRY CASES

The focus will be on countries that have been trying to mitigate, absorb or respond to economic crises of various kinds. The panelists will reflect on what was done in response to an economic shock; how coherent the response was with respect to the pre-existing strategy (if any); how adequate was the response in preventing a deterioration in poverty; and how it was financed, etc. Country cases will be featured for in-depth discussion (with some also represented at the global cafes), each representing a different context or type of economic shock.

#### Egypt

In July 2014, the Government of Egypt embarked on major social and economic reforms with the dual objectives of fiscal consolidation and protection of the poor. These changes occurred in the context of severe fiscal crisis and economic difficulties. The Government introduced comprehensive price increases for fossil fuels and electricity and initiated reforms in health, education, and social safety nets. For the latter, the Ministry of Social Solidarity established new tools for targeting the poor (a proxy means test) for the core cash transfer programs—*Takaful and Karama*. The programs have scaled-up in record time reaching most of the country extreme poor—an achievement that was not attainable in Egypt for decades. How did the Government use the information available

to plan its response to crisis? How was coordination of action ensured? How were these new scaled-up safety nets financed?

## Ukraine

Ukraine provides a case on how to use an economic shock to build momentum to reform social safety nets. Ukraine lost access to subsidized gas and other energy sources (estimated at about 7% of GDP) and its energy sector was on the brink of collapse. In April 2016, the Government passed a resolution which set residential and industrial gas prices at the “import parity” level, thereby eliminating subsidies. The Government launched the Housing Utility Subsidy program (HUS) which provides social support for utilities payments for low-income households. Every household was provided with an application form to apply for HUS and massive media campaign ensured full outreach to all population groups. To improve targeting, a central monitoring system was initiated to track benefits and consumption levels across the income distribution. How was it possible to launch and rapidly expand the new social safety nets program even in the conditions of severe economic shock? The presentation will focus on how modern information technology was used to ensure rapid scale-up of the program.

## Liberia

The Ministry of Gender, Children and Social Protection is responsible for advising and implementing the Liberian Government’s social assistance policy for vulnerable groups. During an early state of the Social Cash Transfer program (SCT) Liberia was hit by the Ebola outbreak, and the SCT was pivotal for the response to the program to accommodate the economic shock that follows the Ebola outbreak, despite being nascent program. The session will discuss the lessons learned from the response to the shock and how the country is transforming its system to be better prepared for future shocks.

## Parallel Session 2: Natural Disasters

### SESSION LEAD

**Stéphane Hallegatte**, Lead Economist, Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery

### SPEAKERS

**Shoichi Tawaki**, Director, Crisis Management Department, Sendai City, Japan

**Rindra Rakotoarisoa**, Regional Director, *Fonds d’Inversion de Développement*, Madagascar

**Julio Manuel Valera Piedras**, Director General of Outreach and Operations, *PROSPERA*, Mexico

### BACKGROUND

Drawing from “Unbreakable: Building the Resilience of the Poor in the Face of Natural Disasters” (2017) by Stéphane Hallegatte, Adrien Vogt-Schilb, Mook Banalore, and Julie Rozenberg.

Disaster risk is an obstacle for people to escape poverty. First, disasters impair asset accumulation through their impacts on dwellings, livestock, and other household assets. They also affect incomes through their effects on infrastructure services, for instance when people cannot access their employment location or lose their agricultural production. When a large-scale disaster occurs, it can leave people with reduced income and large reconstruction needs, forcing the poorer people to cut on essential consumption such as food intake, education, and health care. When children are affected, irreversible impacts through impaired physical and cognitive development or lost education can reduce future incomes and prospects over decades. And even if a disaster does not occur, the existence of a risk can be enough to reduce income, by reducing the incentive to save and investment in assets that could be lost in a hazard. As a result, better risk management—either by reducing the risk *ex ante* or

by making people more resilient, *i.e.*, better able to cope with and recover from disasters—contributes to poverty reduction and economic growth.

This session explores how social protection program and policies can contribute to this agenda and be leveraged to promote resilience, focusing on program design and institutional features that can improve planning and response. According to a growing body of evidence adaptive social protection can act as an important insurance mechanism for the poor. According to recent estimates post-disaster transfers have a benefit-cost ration above 1.3 across a sample of 117 countries. And in 11 countries selected, every \$1 spent on post disaster transfers yielded well-being benefits of more than \$4.

Although social safety nets have an inherent focus on improving resilience, a growing body of evidence reveals that explicit program modifications can help promote these outcomes. For poor households—and to cover the largest shocks—easily scalable social safety nets needed. Three key approaches stand out in this regard (i) increasing the amount transferred by an existing program to its beneficiaries or relaxing rules and conditionality so that the transfers increase (ii) extending the coverage of an existing program to include new beneficiaries and (iii) introducing extraordinary payments or creating an entirely new program (Bastagli 2014).

Experience suggests that adaptive social protection must be balanced with timeliness in the administration of a selected intervention. To extend support to new beneficiaries a country must be able to identify and reach them rapidly. A challenge is to strikes a balance between providing rapid support when needed and precise targeting. A further challenge is to discern the most appropriate intervention type.

## COUNTRY CASES

The session provides a framing introduction on natural disasters and shocks. The session considers an array of shock types, realizing that not all disasters are equal in their devastation and will require variations in social protection approach. The session draws focus on the adaptive ability of a social protection system across vastly different capacity contexts.

### Japan

The experience of the Sendai City local government's response to and recovery from the devastating earthquake and tsunami in 2011 will be presented. The case study will focus on the comprehensive disaster response system at the national level, as well as the specific roles of local governments in implementing emergency social assistance. The local government of Sendai City has used a package of emergency interventions, emergency operation manuals and a geo-referenced information system, prepared ex-ante, to deliver support accurately as well as promptly. After the 2011 mega-disaster, not all prepared systems were effectively used due to the unprecedented scale of the disaster. On-site, "live" modifications through collaborations with communities, NGOs, and the private sector enabled the city to adapt and deal with a challenging and fluctuating situation. Lessons from the 2011 disaster response are now integrated in the city's Masterplan and system as a preparation against future disasters, demonstrating the importance

of institutional learning and adaptation as a result of such experiences.

### Madagascar

The experiences of the Drought Emergency Cash Transfer Program in southern Madagascar will be presented, particularly the first systematic governmental response to a recent drought caused by the El Niño phenomenon. In a short time, Madagascar established an ambitious drought response program, providing cash transfers, nutrition services and livelihood recovery grants to 65,000 households in the most remote and drought affected regions of the country. This country case will show how—building on the existing safety net programs—the country established this resilience-oriented safety net program which was designed to progressively evolve from emergency response to human and productive development of households. There will also be a focus on innovations employed in this context of extreme poverty and low capacity, including efforts to build linkages with social services (vaccination, family planning, primary education), with rural development programs and through creative complementary measures such as community theatre, behavioral nudges (for productive inclusion) and strengthening early childhood development through a "mother leader" model.

### Mexico

The considerable experience of Mexico in responding to an array of natural

disasters will be presented with a focus on the Government's response to three violent earthquakes in September 2017. Mexico's Ministry for Social Development (SEDESOL), is the principal government ministry responsible for the design and delivery of social protection programs in Mexico. SEDESOL manages several SP programs relevant to disaster response in Mexico, including the long-running *PROSPERA* CCT (previously *Oportunidades*) and the Temporary Employment Program. SEDESOL also manages a Single Beneficiary Registry with data on all beneficiaries of the programs it manages. SEDESOL benefits from clear institutional coordination arrangements and legal frameworks to assist in the deployment of these programs in post-disaster contexts. Through these arrangements and programs, Mexico is one of the primary examples of scalability and adaptiveness in the face of disasters. In particular, the Temporary Employment Program (PET) provides income support to populations affected by emergencies through the provision of temporary economic support for their participation in family or community benefit projects, providing consistent economic support in wages equivalent to 99% of a general daily minimum wage. Additionally, *PROSPERA* (one of the most studied and rigorously evaluated CCTs, globally) has been used in response to past emergency events through horizontal and vertical expansions that will be presented at this session.

## Parallel Session 3: Forced Displacement

### SESSION LEAD

**Giuseppe Zampaglione**, Lead Social Protection Specialist, World Bank Group

### SPEAKERS

**Md. Zillar Rahman**, Secretary, Ministry of Social Welfare, Government of Bangladesh

**Virginie Baikoua**, Minister of Humanitarian Action and National Reconciliation, Government of the Central African Republic

**Nemesio Roys**, Director General, Department for Social Prosperity, Colombia

**Mustafa Sencer Kiremitçi**, Social Policy Expert, Ministry of Family and Social Policies, Government of Turkey

### BACKGROUND

Forced displacement has increased at an alarming rate in recent years. At the end of 2015 there were around 65 million Forcibly Displaced (FD) people in the world, a significant increase from the pretty steady level of 40m of the first decade of the 2000s. Of the 65 million FD, about 40 million were Internally

Displaced People (IDPs), 20 million refugees (of which 3 million asylum-seekers) and about 5 million Palestinian refugees. Forced displacement, mainly concerns developing countries, which host 99 percent of the world's Internally Displaced People (IDPs) and 89 percent of the world's refugees. More than 50 percent of IDPs are in fragile countries. Forced displacement also intersects with an ever-larger phenomenon: human mobility resulting from economic migration. At the end of 2015 there were an estimated 250 million international migrants (a 60 million increase from 10 years before), and 740 million internal migrants.

It is increasingly clear that forced displacement requires long-term and sustainable solutions. Mostly considered as a temporary situation, forced displacement has been traditionally addressed through humanitarian assistance to provide emergency support to affected populations, especially refugees. However, the scale, nature and speed of FD has reversed this approach. In fact, 75 percent of the estimated 65 million forcibly displaced people are in protracted displacement and are expected to remain so. This has resulted in greater pressure on access to natural resources (especially land and water), basic services and economic opportunities. Moreover, especially in capacity—and resource-constrained environments, forced displacement can have deep political and social implications by igniting tensions between host and hosted communities and by undermining government's stability. Although humanitarian assistance is and will be still needed for immediate response, alone it can hardly achieve durable and sustainable solutions. Longer-term development responses and comprehensive strategies, also including host communities, are to be put in place.

To provide an effective response to these issues, social protection is adapting well tested tools of social assistance. Safety nets are called on to support the basic needs of the displaced populations while promoting their resilience and restoring their livelihoods as a long-term solution.

Emerging approaches to developing more adaptive social protection (ASP) systems in the field of forced displacement are particularly concerned with integrating more effective tools for vulnerability and needs assessment, data management, identification of beneficiaries, determination of benefits and services, payments and implementation mechanisms, grievance redress mechanisms, and monitoring and evaluation. Once benefits are delivered, their portability also proves crucial. Finally, an ASP approach to FD recognizes the benefits of contingency planning in situations of violence and forced displacement to ensure effective flexibility and scalability of programming.

## COUNTRY CASES

This session will look at the ways in which social protection can be used to respond to the various challenges posed by forced displacement. It will discuss when to transition from short-term to long-term solutions and how to design and implement such solutions. Three different cases will be discussed, two of which are related to internal displacement (Colombia and Central African Republic) and two to refugees (Turkey and Bangladesh).

### Bangladesh

Bangladesh is coping with one the fastest-growing forced displacements in recent history. Currently, the country hosts almost one million *Rohingyas*, who fled persecution in Myanmar. Bangladesh is actively responding to the ongoing crisis through a deep involvement in humanitarian assistance and in the scale-up of existing social protection system to target the most vulnerable. The Ministry of Social Welfare is one of the key agencies involved in the crisis response.

### Central African Republic

The Central African Republic has been facing enormous challenges in dealing with forced displacement. More than 900,000 people, almost 20 percent of

the population, are displaced and tensions in some locations run so high that some speak of a looming genocide. The Government is leading with the Ministry of Humanitarian Action and National Reconciliation the support to IDPs. The government has decisively approached the relocation of IDPs from the camp of *Mpoko* and is now expanding its support to other camps and FD-affected communities. The approach is to ensure continuity between short-term emergency interventions and long-term actions to help build a safety nets system.

### Colombia

Colombia's Investment Fund for Peace (DPS) supports Colombian returnees who left Venezuela in the wake of the closure of the border between the two countries in 2015. Based on an ex-post inter-agency agreement with the National Disaster Risk Management Fund and on a coordination platform among key stakeholders, the intervention plan includes identification of the affected population, generation of opportunities for productive inclusion, coverage of travel expenses for return to the place of origin, and interventions targeted to adolescence and early childhood development.

### Turkey

Turkey's Integrated Social Assistance System (ISAS) provides a clear example of how technological progress has reshaped social protection implementation and delivery mechanisms and how it has allowed social protection to offer more than a simple assistance delivery to the displaced populations. ISAS is an innovative and highly integrated e-government system that facilitates all the steps related to the management and delivery of social assistance. It provides 112 web-based services in one easily accessible online portal. Notably, ISAS has been used to scale up social assistance programs in response to the influx of Syrian refugees in Turkey.

### BACKGROUND

The previous day's sessions opened the Forum with a high-level look at different shock types, their nuances, and a selection of country experiences of social protection being utilized in response to them. Digging beneath these wide-ranging conversations and examples of government led social protection shock responses, the second day of the Forum will examine some of the fundamental nuts and bolts behind the design and implementation of adaptive social protection shock responses.

What are the key preparedness measures required of ASP to better enable response to shocks? And what are some of the fundamental considerations for post-shock implementation? With reference to the ASP roadmap presented during the framing session, these three nuts and bolts sessions will attempt to provide some answers to these questions through select country experiences of preparedness and response that speak to the *institutional arrangements* and the building blocks of *Adaptive Social Protection Systems*—1) information, 2) programs and their delivery processes and 3) finance. Each of these thematic elements of the ASP roadmap will be complemented by further country cases presented by speakers at the global café in the afternoon.

### From Preparedness to Response

#### SESSION LEAD

**Phillippe Leite**, Senior Social Protection Economist, World Bank Group

#### SPEAKERS

**Maryanne E. R. Darauay**, Director, Social Development Staff, National Economic and Development Authority Central Office, The Philippines

**Juan Eduardo Faúndez Molina**, Vice Minister, Ministry of Social Development, Chile

**Mustafa Sencer Kiremitçi**, Social Policy Expert, Ministry of Family and Social Policy, Turkey

#### FIRST SESSION

This session will focus on preparing the nuts and bolts for Adaptive Social Protection, *ex ante*, in order to be better able to deliver an ASP response, *ex post*. The Philippines will present its experience with defining institutional arrangements by focusing on Inter-agency coordination, national-sub-national level coordination, setting pre-defined roles for SP in shock response, civil society participation and formalized vs. ad hoc arrangements. Chile and Turkey will both share their experiences on adapting a robust SP system to better protect the population and respond to a shock. Chile will focus on the development of adaptive information through their disaster assessment tool and its linkages to the integrated social registry. Turkey will describe how its Integrated Social Assistance System was capable of quickly adapting to incorporate the most vulnerable Syrian refugee families affected by the crisis to be protected by the Turkish social programs.

#### COUNTRY CASES

##### The Philippines

The Philippine Development Plan takes into account the country's international commitments such as the 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. One of the objectives under the current plan is to develop more resilient communities and individuals by reducing their exposure to risks, mitigating the impact of risks, and accelerating recovery when the risk materializes. To do this, the country's institutional arrangements link their social protection programs to the Philippines' National Disaster Risk and Reduction Management System.

##### Chile

The role of Minister of Social Development focuses on the design and implementation of social development policies, plans and programs, especially those aimed at eradicating poverty and providing social protection to vulnerable individuals or groups, promoting mobility and social integration, while ensuring the coordination, consistency and coherence of policies, plans and programs. As part of the coordination mechanism, the discussion will focus on the use of an integrated information system for ASP (the use of the social registry to support the selection of users of social benefits, both prior to and in response to shocks). A special emphasis will be given to Early Warning Systems and the Emergency Basic Fact Sheet (*Ficha Basica de Emergencia* (FIBE)). FIBE aims to gather detailed information on families affected by emergencies, in order to provide adequate support and response. This instrument is part of the System of Evaluation of Damage and Needs, linked to the social registry, and implemented in 2015.

##### Turkey

Turkey's Ministry of Family and Social Policy is responsible for implementing the Integrated Social Assistance System (ISAS) or *Bütünleşik* system, an e-government system that electronically integrates and facilitates all steps related to the management of social assistance, including application, eligibility, delivery, and auditing. ISAS was later adapted to incorporate the refugee Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN), a cash transfer program to support the most vulnerable Syrian refugee families. Turkey will serve as an example of the nuts and bolts adaptation of a well-structured system to serve as a central tool to prepare and respond to a shock.

#### SESSION LEAD

**Kenichi Nishikawa**, Senior Social Protection Economist, World Bank Group

## SPEAKERS

**Khaled Bajes Theeb Abu Khattab**, Deputy Director General, Poverty Alleviation, Ministry of Social Development, West Bank & Gaza

**Colette Roberts Ridsen**, Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Labor and Social Security, Jamaica

**Harapak Gaol**, Director, Social Disaster Victims, Ministry of Social Affairs, Indonesia

## SECOND SESSION

This session will focus on country experiences of responding to shocks, with a focus on some of the key nuts and bolts adaptations that enabled delivery to affected households. First, Indonesia will describe the process of registering victims of disasters and supporting them with existing social assistance programs. Second, West Bank and Gaza will describe how the current Social Assistance System and Cash Transfers Program are being used and delivered to the shock affected population since 2009, with a focus on beneficiary selection and enrolment. Finally, Jamaica will describe the processes along the delivery chain that allowed the country to provide disaster victims with in-kind benefits to first mitigate the impact of a shock and later to help recover in the long-term.

## COUNTRY CASES

### West Bank & Gaza

The Ministry of Social Development's Cash Transfer Program is a tool for responding to shocks due to its screening methods and use of communities, civil society organizations and the various stakeholders to make the project more responsive to people needs, and to ensure greater transparency, awareness, and trust in the selection of project beneficiaries among citizens and key stakeholders. This presentation will examine the selection and enrollment of beneficiaries as well as the cash transfer mechanism as a response tool in the aftermath of a shock.

### Jamaica

The Ministry of Labor and Social Security is responsible for coordinating and implementing the National Emergency Welfare and Shelter Plan in the aftermath of a natural disaster. This plan is designed to utilize social protection programs to provide disaster victims with social assistance benefits during the response phase, as well as a recovery component that partially subsidizes the cost of re-starting their regular lives in the aftermath of a disaster. The discussion will center on the effective use of in-kind transfers as an integral part of the Plan.

### Indonesia

See latest information on smartphone app.

## Financing ASP

### SESSION LEAD

**Barry Maher**, Senior Financial Sector Specialist, World Bank Group

### PANELISTS

**Martin Owor**, Commissioner, Department of Disaster Preparedness and Response, Uganda

**Luis Felipe Puente Espinosa**, National Coordinator of Civil Protection, Ministry of the Interior, Mexico

**Kelera Kolivuso Ravono**, Principal Economic Planning Officer, Ministry of Economy, Fiji

### DISCUSSANT

**Momodu Kargbo**, Minister of Finance, Sierra Leone

### BACKGROUND

This final session of the nuts and bolts series of plenaries looks at the central role of finance as one of the three key building blocks of Adaptive Social Protection Systems. Rapid assistance during a crisis is essential to build the resilience and protect the welfare of poor households. The ex-post appeals process by which humanitarian systems operates

can suffer from delays in mobilization, during which livelihoods, in particular of the poor, suffer.

Disaster risk finance (DRF) approaches can play a role in supporting ASP delivery mechanisms to react and respond quickly. Understanding the projected financial costs of such mechanisms in advance can enable governments and donors to develop, and calculate the costs of, contingency plans to finance rapid response. Tools can be developed to support governments develop DRF strategies, using financing instruments (such as insurance, contingency funds, contingency credit) to commit in advance who will pay for a shock response. More specifically, depending on the frequency and severity of risks to be managed, governments and/or development partners can combine (or layer) financing instruments that address different needs and have different cost implications. Such an approach prioritizes cheaper sources of funding, ensuring that the most expensive instruments are used only in exceptional circumstances<sup>1</sup>.

Additionally, financial risk management approaches, such as risk assessment/risk modelling and scenario analysis, and insurance approaches, such as the identification of "triggers" and establishment of a rules-based system of payout, can and are being adapted for use in the development of social protection systems that can be used to respond to shocks. Finally, by strengthening public financial management and supporting the development of pre-planned strategies, a quicker and more resilient response is possible.

## COUNTRY CASES

A range of examples from different countries and contexts adopted will

<sup>1</sup> For example, sovereign insurance may provide cost-effective cover against severe events, but using it to protect against low-intensity and recurring events may be inefficient and costly. For such disasters, a dedicated contingency fund that retains this lowest layer of risk may be a more appropriate solution.

be presented to showcase the diverse range of approaches Governments have adopted to address the issue of financing safety net scalability in response to a range of shocks including economic, natural disasters, pandemics, and conflict. These examples will range from cash transfer programs that scale up based on “insurance quality” satellite information, to extensive public works programs that utilize a range of information to trigger scale up. The instruments used to finance the cost will be explored, ranging from budget reallocations, contingency funds, contingent grants/loans, insurance/risk transfer, and pre-negotiated contributions from humanitarian and/or development partners. The discussion will review the current state of work in this area, globally and in the Africa region, and share experiences about early lessons.

Given the emerging nature of financing for adaptive social protection, the plenary will showcase the range in approaches that have been adopted by Governments. Three presentations showcasing examples of existing safety net programs which have scaled up in response to shocks will be presented. This will be followed by a brief discussion with the Minister of Finance from Sierra Leone to gain insights from an experienced Minister on the challenges, and opportunities, of financing a crisis response such as the Ebola crisis that recently hit the country.

Key topics of focus for the session include: (i) the financial building blocks of shock-responsive SP systems, with focus on risk models/risk assessments, the definition of triggers and rules for when to respond in addition to pre-planned financing; (ii) latest experiences from policymakers who are designing shock-responsive mechanisms; (iii) financing trade-offs that inevitably occur when designing a scalable safety net (do I scale up more frequently, or scale up to more people) with scenario analysis to analyze potential costs of scaling up, and; (iv) the financial instruments and agreements which are needed to pre-plan financing.

## Uganda

Under the Third Northern Uganda Social Action Fund Project (NUSAF III), Uganda is seeking to ensure that development gains are protected by social safety nets. It has a DRF component in the project which enables the safety net to scale up to provide additional support to poor households in times of crisis. The DRF component has two objectives: (i) to develop the processes and systems in government that can be used to rapidly identify and respond to shock events, and (ii) to finance additional support to vulnerable households immediately following a disaster or shock through an automatic expansion (scaling up) of the safety net activities. *The El Niño* event in 2016 caused drought in Uganda and triggered a scaling up of the safety net. US\$4 million was rapidly mobilized from the project which provided disaster assistance to about 30,000 households (150,000 people).

## Mexico

FONDEN is a financial vehicle by which the federal government in Mexico allocates budget ex ante for post-disaster response and reconstruction. FONDEN's resources are allocated through the Federal Budget. By Law, FONDEN must receive at least 0.4 percent of the annual budget, which can increase after shock events. It uses a range of financial instruments, including insurance and reserve funds, to manage the disaster related contingent liability of the Mexican Government. This session will explore the links between FONDEN, as a vehicle for mobilizing resources, and safety net systems (including the Temporary Employment Program (PET in Spanish) and CADENA) as vehicles for disbursing resources post shock events.

## Fiji

Tropical Cyclone Winston struck Fiji in February 2016 resulting in a large financial cost to both Government and poor households. In response, the Government of Fiji rapidly scaled-up social assistance disbursing FJD \$19.9 million

(US \$9.4 million) in cash transfers through existing social assistance schemes, reaching 44,000 households. How the Government of Fiji rapidly mobilized resources from their budget to finance this response will be discussed.

## Sierra Leone

Impacted by the effects of the Ebola crisis, Sierra Leone rapidly scaled-up their safety nets to provide critical assistance to crisis effected households. Building on this experience, more recently the Government has also scaled-up their safety nets in response to flooding and mudslides. The Sierra Leonean discussant will explain to the panel how they successfully harmonized the support coming in from various donors to finance vertical and horizontal expansion of safety nets implemented by both Government and partner NGOs.

## Building Household Resilience to Shocks

### SESSION LEAD

**Carlo del Ninno**, Lead Economist, World Bank Group

### SPEAKERS

**Yahaya Saadatou Mallam Barmou**, Deputy to the Director of the Office of the Prime Minister, Niger

**Mahmuda Begum**, Additional Secretary, Economic Relations Division, Bangladesh

**Hugo Vila**, Advisor to the Executive Director of FONCODES, Peru

### BACKGROUND

The “Nuts & Bolts” sessions on Tuesday examined how countries used Adaptive Social Protection systems to increase responsiveness of programs and their delivery processes, as part of the three key building blocks which also include information systems and finance.

This session focuses on the role of adaptive social protection programs in building the resilience of the most vulnerable households before a shock

occurs, so that they will be better able to weather the impacts of shocks when they materialize. This session shines a spotlight on the potential role of productive inclusion programs in achieving these outcomes. While regular cash transfer programs can have a range of positive and productive impacts on households<sup>2</sup>, emerging international evidence suggests that a productive inclusion approach that combines cash transfer programs with additional interventions (e.g., in the form of “cash plus”) can promote livelihood diversification, raise households’ earnings, facilitate income-smoothing and ultimately promote sustainable exits from poverty<sup>3</sup>. Given the exposure and vulnerability of poor households to shocks, productive inclusion interventions such as these can directly build the resilience of recipient household by improving their ability to cope with shocks and manage risks in the long term.<sup>4</sup>

## COUNTRY CASES

A new and promising approach to the alleviation of extreme poverty and resilience building, this session will examine some of the most prominent global experiences of designing and implementing productive inclusion interventions. The particular focus of the presentations is on complementary interventions that productive inclusion aligns to traditional safety net programs (e.g., the “plus” component of “cash plus” programs). The session will review experience and evidence from several countries, as well as discuss operational aspects on how to design and deliver such innovations through Adaptive Social Protection Systems.

### Niger

Social safety net programs supported by the Sahel Adaptive Social protection program are complemented by productive

accompanying measures with the objective to improve households’ resilience. The approach is based on previous evidence on the effectiveness of combining cash transfers with productive interventions in the Sahel and around the world. The support package was designed based on international evidence on multi-dimensional graduation interventions, as well as local research on binding constraints for resilience of poor households. It is delivered through varying mechanisms as part of ASP systems in each country. The program includes a multi-country impact evaluation to assess the most cost-effective support package. The presentation will present the regional approach, building on the case of Niger and its adaptive social protection program.

### Bangladesh

Bangladesh is one of the most disaster prone countries in the world. This continued exposure to risk has led the Government to develop over the years several creative and adaptable solutions to promote resiliency in its population. One of the best examples is the VGD Program. Through this program, the Government of Bangladesh, in coordination with WFP and BRAC, has been successfully combining a food-based safety net intervention with a productive inclusion component to graduate destitute rural Bangladeshi women from absolute poverty and engage in income-generating activities. The presentation will discuss the VGD strategy and how this policy instrument has contributed to the population’s resilience in Bangladesh.

### Peru

*Haku Wiñay/Noa Jayatai* is a project implemented by the Social Development Cooperation Fund (FONCODES) of the Ministry of Social Development and Inclusion of Peru (MIDIS), within the framework of the National Development and Social Inclusion Strategy of MIDIS. The project’s main objective is to develop productive and entrepreneurial capacities of targeted rural households in extreme poverty, allowing them to

generate and diversify their incomes and improving their access to food security. The *Haku Wiñay* model includes resilience building activities such as training in climate-smart agricultural techniques and the use of alternative crops, strengthening households’ capacities to incorporate good practices to adapt to climate-related risks and other external shocks. At the same time, the project promotes the use of environmental-friendly technologies such as sprinkler irrigation and water harvesting, contributing to the sustainability of the model.

## Enhancing the Linkages Between Humanitarian Assistance & Social Protection

### SESSION LEAD

**Sarah Coll-Black**, Senior Social Protection Specialist, World Bank Group

### SPEAKERS

**Lamis Al-Iryani**, Former Head, Monitoring and Evaluation, Social Fund for Development, Yemen

**Berhanu Woldemichael**, Director, Food Security Coordination Directorate, Ministry of Agriculture, Ethiopia

**Waseem Sherazi**, Deputy Director Projects, National Database and Registration Authority, Pakistan

### BACKGROUND

Traditionally, international humanitarian assistance encompassed life-saving support provided by external actors, and delivered through and by external organizations. Humanitarian assistance can be provided in cash or in-kind, with the latter absorbing approximately 94% of the humanitarian portfolio. Domestic social assistance or safety net interventions, instead, refer to the provision and implementation of social assistance transfers in cash or in-kind by governments, often as part of long-term (permanent) systems. In other words, interventional humanitarian assistance and domestic social assistance can provide similar interventions. However,

2 for reviews see Alderman et al., 2013, or Bastagli et al., 2016

3 Banerjee et al., 2015; Bandiera et al., 2013

4 Macours et al., 2012

international humanitarian aid is a gap-filler that should be only provided when domestic capacities cannot, more or less temporarily, meet populations' needs. Note that while humanitarian assistance is multi-sectoral (e.g., including food security, water, shelter, etc.), the session will revolve around the humanitarian food security sector since it is often the closest in scope and design to social assistance.

In principle, international humanitarian aid and social assistance present a set of marked differences. Among others, these may revolve around the following features:

- *Objectives and scope.* The overall environment in which humanitarian actors operate is often volatile, chaotic, and pose immediate threats to the lives of affected populations. In this environment, international humanitarian interventions tend to be designed with an emphasis on life-saving purposes, which in some cases (e.g., complex emergencies) may contrast with the principles of government-based assistance. Social assistance programs tend to adopt a longer-term view. They are a component of broader permanent social protection systems, with the latter not only encompassing social assistance (i.e., non-contributory transfers), but also including social insurance (i.e., contributory transfers) and various labor market interventions. Social assistance is often enshrined in legislation, integrated in sectoral policies, financed out of domestic budgets, geared to help address poverty in its many dimensions, and represent a cornerstone in government-citizen social contracts.
- *Engagement of and ownerships by national actors.* Humanitarian funding seldom reach or involves host governments. Notably, only between 0.2 and 3% of total humanitarian funds is channeled through the state, with almost the entire volume of assistance directed outside government structures (e.g., including an estimated 4,480 actors comprising

UN agencies, international and national NGOs, private charities, and others). In part, this model of operating outside or with limited engagement of government systems can be dictated by several legitimate constraints, including possible lack of government sovereignty over a territory, legislation (e.g., for refugees), limited implementation capacities, or concern about the impartiality of governments in complex situations. In general, however, such approach represents a sharp departure from that of social assistance, which are typically provided through governments, and financed via blends of domestic resources, concessional financing, and medium/longer-term programmatic frameworks embedded in national budgets.

- *Operational coordination and implementation.* While operating in similar geographic regions and providing similar interventions (e.g., unconditional cash transfers), safety nets and humanitarian assistance may differ in terms of benefit levels, beneficiary selection, and monitoring. In addition, there have been challenges in ensuring that the two systems provide coordinated assistance. For instance, safety nets may be planned and coordinated via inter-ministerial committees, while humanitarian assistance largely rests on the UN Cluster system (which may not necessarily include national authorities). Similarly, assistance in the same area—e.g., in the form of cash transfers or public works—can be designed and implemented in different ways by the state or humanitarian actors (e.g., transfer size, program duration, targeting criteria, etc.).

While humanitarian assistance should in theory be temporary, in some cases it de-facto “represents the norm instead of the exception”. Taken to the extreme, international humanitarian assistance may even substitute for key government functions. This has led some observers to ponder the risks that protracted humanitarian assistance may pose to

the development of state capacities, which are key for the establishment on permanent safety nets systems.

However, emerging evidence shows that humanitarian assistance and national safety nets can—if strategically conceived and properly designed and coordinated—complement each other. In particular, a range of blend models are highlighting a ‘gray area’ between humanitarian assistance and domestic social protection systems. By distinguishing between (i) the sources of funding (external or domestic), (ii) the channels through which resources flow (external or domestic), and (iii) implementing actors (external or domestic), a range of combinations emerge. Hence, the session will examine the limits and potential for humanitarian assistance and safety nets to co-exist and mutually reinforce each other. The discussion will provide an opportunity to examine how international and national humanitarian structures interact, including through case studies illustrating different combinations of the above three functions. As such, the session will be compelling to countries with an international humanitarian presence as well as to those that are dealing with humanitarian crises through domestic structures.

## COUNTRY CASES

This session will draw on key lessons from implementing different institutional and operational models. Country case studies include Yemen, Ethiopia, and Pakistan. These embody a diversified continuum of settings, arrangements, and partnerships. These include contexts where institutions are severely affected by civil war and assistance is largely externally-provided (Yemen); settings where humanitarian assistance rely on external support but in tandem with a domestic social protection system (Ethiopia); and circumstances when humanitarian and safety net programs are domestically provided (Pakistan). The following table illustrates the models based on identified functions of funding, channels, and implementation.

	Funding source	Channels/structure	Implementation
Yemen	International	International	Domestic
Ethiopia	International	Domestic	Mostly domestic
Pakistan	Domestic	Domestic	Domestic

## Capturing Lessons Learned

The Lessons Learned session is an essential element of the Forum and pursues three core objectives:

1. Strengthening interactive learning and networking
2. Fostering reflections on the Forum's content and implications
3. Discussing possible actionable plans and follow-up initiatives

Participants will be engaged in group discussions (at their tables) moderated by facilitators and revolving around a select number of questions. These are designed to revisit the content offered during the Forum, tease out issues of particular interest, and discuss their applicability in different contexts. Main points agreed by the groups will be summarized and presented in the wider plenary session by selected rapporteurs.

## Adaptive Social Protection: A Forward Look

This closing panel will provide concluding remarks from several high-level attendees at the Forum that attempt to summarize the main lessons that have emerged throughout the Forum. Rooted in the feedback expressed by fellow participants in the preceding "Capturing Lessons Learned" session as well as their own experiences with shocks and ASP, the panelists will discuss what they consider to be the primary opportunities and challenges for advancing Adaptive Social Protection globally.

### Yemen

Yemen illustrates a case of large-scale humanitarian assistance. Yet it also shows that elements of preexisting social protection institutions are still active, such as the Social Fund for Development (SFD). Besides the overwhelmingly humanitarian assistance through INGOs and UN agencies, a range of social assistance programs are implemented by leveraging existing capacity and outreach of Yemeni social protection institutions. The case study will outline current large-scale international humanitarian programs, and discusses how social assistance interventions, e.g., labor-intensive public works implemented by SFD, are connected to and informed by humanitarian efforts and. These include, for examples, ways in which SFD is collaborating with humanitarian agencies around data for targeting, linking public works beneficiaries with nutrition programs implemented by the UN, and how humanitarian efforts are utilizing community networks created by social protection programs.

### Ethiopia

Ethiopia embodies an example of a shock-prone country with a relatively high degree of coordination between humanitarian and social protection actors. The presentation will identify innovations in the way the two spheres

interact, including through the establishment of a joint decision making framework for social protection (PSNP) and appropriate linkages between disaster/humanitarian institutions. Emerging innovative models, e.g., Somali region, will illustrate the blend of funding, channel and implementation modalities across domestic and international actors.

### Pakistan

Pakistan offers insights on an adaptive system composed of several integral institutions with independent mandates. The flagship social protection program, BISP, is complemented by NADRA's support in the identification of beneficiaries and hosting of the national registry. The presentation will shed light on the government's safety net response mechanism to natural and man-made disasters through NADRA. This includes the entity's One Stop Shops in conflict and shock-affected areas, providing flexibility to adapt to local requirements, offering targeting variants, and addressing weak service delivery in areas with sever access constraints. The early-recovery programs delivered encompass unconditional cash transfers, child health-sensitive conditional cash transfers, and an interface for provision of other services. An example from a post-conflict, fragile region, FATA, with limited or no state presence will be provided.

# Interactive Session Descriptions

## Global Cafés

The Global Cafés will feature a series of simultaneous group discussions among the Forum participants, with a focus on first-hand country experiences in designing and implementing Adaptive Social Protection programs and systems. These Global Café sessions will allow the participants to connect with each other at the outset of the Forum, help initiate networking among all participants (including Government representatives, World Bank staff, and representatives from Development Partner Organization). The Global Cafés will also help build collective knowledge of experiences in addressing the impacts of all manner of shocks on households—including natural disasters and climate change, economic and financial crises, conflict and displacement, among others; as well as build a common understanding of how different countries approach similar challenges. During the Forum, there will be two interactive Global Café sessions, held in an informal setting, whereby the participants will be organized in groups of 10 at roundtables. Each table will discuss challenges and lessons learned from a specific Adaptive Social Protection topic of interest, allowing for participants at each table to explore the topic in more depth, as well as engage in conversation and share experiences with other participants joining the same table. Planned discussion topics (**subject to change**) include the following:



## Session 1—Monday, February 19

The first of the Forum’s two Global Cafés will follow the three parallel plenary sessions on Economic Shocks, Natural Disasters and Forced Displacement.

### Economic Shocks

Egypt

Jordan

Indonesia

Ukraine

Russia

### Natural Disasters

Mexico

Japan

Madagascar

Philippines

Ethiopia

Lesotho

Pakistan

Malawi

Fiji

Mauritania

### Displacement

Bangladesh

Colombia

Yemen

Lebanon

DRC

Chad/CAR

Nigeria

Turkey

## Session 2—Tuesday, February, 20

The second Global Café will follow the three plenary sessions on the “Nuts and Bolts of Adaptive Social Protection for Shock Response” which will cover preparedness, response and financing. Planned topics include:

### Institutional Arrangements

Philippines

Japan

Niger

### Adaptive Information: Social Registries

Chile

Senegal

### Adaptive Programs: Cash Transfers

Mauritania

West Bank and Gaza

Tanzania

### Adaptive Programs: In-kind

Iraq

Jamaica

Serbia

### Enrollment Strategies

Turkey

Liberia

Dominican Republic

### Finance

Sierra Leone

Uganda

Mexico

Fiji

### Universal Social Protection

Tunisia

# WB Organizing Team

Should you have any content and logistical issues, please contact any of the members of the organizing team listed below.

## **Kelly Johnson**



Co-Task Team Lead and Senior Social Protection Specialist  
kjohnson2@worldbank.org

## **Thomas Bowen**



Co-Task Team Lead and Social Protection Specialist  
tbowen@worldbank.org

## **Saida Gall**



Senior Program Assistant  
sgall@worldbank.org

## **Yaprak Servi**



Consultant  
yservi@worldbank.org

## **Helena Makarenko**



Program Assistant  
hmakarenko@worldbank.org

## **Adea Kryeziu**



Research Analyst  
akryeziu@worldbank.org

## **Raiden Dillard**



Knowledge Management Officer  
rdillard@worldbank.org

## **Lilian Foo**



Acting Communications Lead  
lfoo@worldbankgroup.org

## **Teresa Schäfer**



Project Manager, greenstorming GmbH  
schaefer@greenstorming.de

## **Sandra Schwinnen**



Project Assistant, greenstorming GmbH  
schwinnen@greenstorming.de

# Acknowledgements

The South-South Learning Forum 2018 would not have been possible without the efforts of the partners below, especially our co-hosts, BMZ and DGPSN. We are extremely grateful for their contributions.

Senegal Government Délégation Générale à la Protection Sociale et à la Solidarité Nationale (DGPSN)

German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (BMZ)

Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH

RSR (Rapid Social Response) Program

Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)

African, Caribbean and Pacific-European Union Africa Disaster Risk Financing Program (ACP-EU ADRF)

Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)

Australian Government Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)

L'Agence Francaise de Developpement (AFD)

## **World Bank Group**

Senegal Country Management Unit

Finance & Markets Global Practice

## **Social Protection & Jobs Global Practice Regional Focal Points:**

### **Africa**

Colin Andrews

Abu Yadetta Hateu

Mariam Denise Brain

### **East Asia & the Pacific**

Claudia Zambra

Corinne "Korky" Bernaldez

### **Europe & Central Asia**

Aleksandra Posarac

Renata Mayer Gukovas

### **Latin America & the Caribbean**

Asha Williams

Mirta Sanchez

### **Middle East & North Africa**

Surat Nsour

Marie Agnes Ndour Huchard

### **South Asia**

Suleiman Namara

Anastasiya Denisova

Amira Nikolas



SOCIAL PROTECTION AND JOBS  
**SOUTH SOUTH** LEARNING FORUM  
**2018**  
FEBRUARY 19-22 | FRANKFURT, GERMANY



**WORLD BANK GROUP**



RAPID SOCIAL RESPONSE



**GFDRR**

Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery



Federal Ministry  
for Economic Cooperation  
and Development

Implemented by:

**giz** Deutsche Gesellschaft  
für Internationale  
Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH



An initiative of the African, Caribbean and Pacific Group of States funded by the European Union



SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL  
DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY



**Australian Government**

**Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade**



**AFD**

AGENCE FRANÇAISE  
DE DÉVELOPPEMENT