

# Documentation of how governments in Europe and Central Asia have responded to disasters and crises through subnational social protection systems

## Legal and policy frameworks review

---

Mihai MAGHERU  
December 8<sup>th</sup> 2021

## Contents:

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
Purpose and objectives .....	iii
Conceptual framework.....	iii
Methodology .....	iii
Core terminology .....	iv
<b>1. Setting the grounds: a 3D approach to SNG configuration .....</b>	<b>6</b>
1.1. Administrative organization of SNGs .....	6
1.2. Core responsibilities of SNGs.....	7
1.3. Financing approach at SNG level.....	7
<b>2. Institutional framework for DRR and SP at SNG level .....</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1. Levels of decentralization and main stakeholders.....	9
2.2. Decentralised DRR roles and responsibilities.....	9
2.3. Decentralised SP roles and responsibilities.....	13
<b>3. Subnational provision of multi-hazard disaster response and preparedness mechanisms, including through social protection.....</b>	<b>15</b>
3.1. Articulation of processes, roles and responsibilities.....	15
3.2. Coordination among the stakeholders.....	17
3.3. Financing arrangements.....	18
<b>4. Annexes .....</b>	<b>20</b>
Annex 1: Details of SNG configuration at ECA regional level.....	20
Annex 2: Examples of institutions per group of stakeholders in decentralised contexts .....	21
Annex 3: Examples of responsibilities of SNG (COFOG).....	22
Annex 4: COVID-19 SP-related measures throughout the region .....	23
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>24</b>

## Acronyms

<b>ASP</b>	Adaptive Social Protection
<b>CaLP</b>	Cash Learning Network
<b>DRA</b>	Disaster Risk Assessment
<b>DRM</b>	Disaster Risk Management
<b>DRR</b>	Disaster Risk Reduction
<b>ECA</b>	Europe and Central Asia
<b>GFDRR</b>	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
<b>ILO</b>	International Labour Organisation
<b>IMF</b>	International Monetary Fund
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>OECD</b>	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
<b>PFM</b>	Public Financial Management
<b>SNG</b>	Subnational Governments
<b>SNG-WOFI</b>	World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment
<b>SP</b>	Social Protection
<b>SRSP(S)</b>	Shock-responsive social protection (system)
<b>UCLG</b>	United Cities and Local Governments
<b>UNDRR</b>	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNICEF</b>	United Nations Children’s Fund
<b>UNICEF CO</b>	UNICEF Country Office
<b>UNICEF ECA-RO</b>	UNICEF Regional Office for Europe and Central Asia
<b>WHO</b>	World Health Organization

## Introduction

The legal and policy frameworks review is part of a series of analytical products elaborated within the documentation on how governments in Europe and Central Asia have responded to disasters and crises through subnational social protection systems. Its design makes it possible to use the document as a standalone analytical piece but its true value is/will be emphasised within the final series of outputs from the research, analysis and social policy related processes.

### Purpose and objectives

The purpose of this report is to provide an analytical overview of how legal and policy frameworks support the subnational provision of multi-hazard disaster response and preparedness mechanisms, including through social protection, in the ECA region. Consequently, the following two objectives were considered:

1. Taking stock of key features and provisions of these frameworks (social protection – SP, disaster risk reduction – DRR, etc.)
2. Identify similarities among the countries in terms of features and provisions, with focus on the roles of subnational governments (SNG), financing arrangements, and coordination.

### Conceptual framework

During a preparatory phase, an inception report detailed the conceptual framework of the documentation, focused on **(i) SNG structure** (one tiered / municipal, two-tiered /municipal and regional three tiered, with an intermediate level between the municipal and regional / federated state), **(ii) COVID-19 social protection responses** (social assistance, social insurance, and labour markets) and **(iii) a series of relevant globally agreed definitions around SP and DRR and also SNG roles and responsibilities.**

### Methodology

Whereas a methodological framework for the entire documentation process was detailed in the inception report, the current legal and policy frameworks review relies on:

1. **Extensive desk review** of a series of relevant national documents (laws and strategies) doubled by global resources from renowned development and humanitarian organisations, with focus on (i) the configuration of SNG in the region, (ii) the roles and competencies of the governments at central and subnational levels in terms of SP and DRR, (iii) the coordination and financing, and (iv) the COVID-19 responses.
2. In addition to the desk review, several **discussions** with UNICEF ECA RO and CO took place, and a **rapid survey** was carried out among the entire UNICEF ECA RO network of social policy or social protection specialists in region, with the aim to delineate the most critical aspects of analysis from the country perspectives and to guide the overall desk review process.

## Core terminology

**Adaptive social protection<sup>1</sup>:** helps to build the resilience of poor and vulnerable households by investing in their capacity to prepare for, cope with, and adapt to shocks: protecting their wellbeing and ensuring that they do not fall into poverty or become trapped in poverty as a result of the impacts.

**Contingency financing<sup>2</sup>:** Contingency funds (disaster funds) refer to funds set aside, ex-ante, as a financial buffer. These vary in form and the ways in which they can be set up. The most basic, a contingency budget, is an often small but flexible pot of funds most governments have available to draw upon in the annual budget in order to meet unanticipated need. The government has the authority to spend this flexible pot on additional financing needs with the fiscal year, such as salary increases, maintenance needs, or natural disaster response, dependent on the Public Finance Management (PFM) law.

**Contingency planning<sup>3</sup>:** A management process that analyses disaster risks and establishes arrangements in advance to enable timely, effective and appropriate responses. Contingency planning results in organized and coordinated courses of action with clearly identified institutional roles and resources, information processes and operational arrangements for specific actors at times of need. Contingency planning is an important part of overall preparedness. Contingency plans need to be regularly updated and exercised.

**Disaster<sup>4</sup>:** A serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society at any scale due to hazardous events interacting with conditions of exposure, vulnerability and capacity, leading to one or more of the following: human, material, economic and environmental losses and impacts.

**Disaster risk reduction<sup>5</sup>:** Disaster risk reduction (DRR) is aimed at preventing new and reducing existing disaster risk and managing residual risk, all of which contribute to strengthening resilience and therefore to the achievement of sustainable development. DRR is the policy objective of disaster risk management (DRM), and its goals and objectives are defined in disaster risk reduction strategies and plans. Disaster risk reduction strategies and policies define goals and objectives across different timescales and with concrete targets, indicators and time frames.

**Preparedness<sup>6</sup>:** The knowledge and capacities developed by governments, response and recovery organizations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to and recover from the impacts of likely, imminent or current disasters. Preparedness action is carried out within the context of disaster risk management and aims to build the capacities needed to efficiently manage all types of emergencies and achieve orderly transitions from response to sustained recovery. Preparedness is based on a sound analysis of disaster risks and good linkages with early warning systems, and includes such activities as contingency planning, the stockpiling of equipment and

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas B., del Ninno C., Andrews C., Coll-Black S., Gentilini U., Johnson K., Kawasoe Y., Kryeziu A., Maher B., Williams A., 2020. **Adaptive Social Protection: Building Resilience to Shocks**. International Development in Focus. Washington, DC: World Bank

<sup>2</sup> Longhurst D., Evans S., Connolly D., Lung F., McCord A., Allan S., Plichta M., (2021) ' **What are future financing options for shock responsive social protection? A technical primer** ', Social Protection Approaches to COVID-19 Expert Advice Service (SPACE), DAI Global UK Ltd, United Kingdom available at [SPACE\\_Financing-SRSP-Full-Version-1.pdf \(calpnetwork.org\)](https://www.calpnetwork.org/SPACE_Financing-SRSP-Full-Version-1.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> [Contingency planning | UNDRR](#)

<sup>4</sup> [Disaster | UNDRR](#)

<sup>5</sup> [Disaster risk reduction | UNDRR](#)

<sup>6</sup> [Preparedness | UNDRR](#)

## Subnational social protection systems

supplies, the development of arrangements for coordination, evacuation and public information, and associated training and field exercises. A preparedness plan establishes arrangements in advance to enable timely, effective and appropriate responses to specific potential hazardous events or emerging disaster situations.

**Response<sup>7</sup>:** Actions taken directly before, during or immediately after a disaster in order to save lives, reduce health impacts, ensure public safety and meet the basic subsistence needs of the people affected. Disaster response is predominantly focused on immediate and short-term needs and is sometimes called disaster relief. Effective, efficient and timely response relies on disaster risk-informed preparedness measures, including the development of the response capacities of individuals, communities, organizations, countries and the international community. The institutional elements of response often include the provision of emergency services and public assistance by public and private sectors and community sectors, as well as community and volunteer participation. “Emergency services” are a critical set of specialized agencies that have specific responsibilities in serving and protecting people and property in emergency and disaster situations. They include civil protection authorities and police and fire services, among many others.

**Shock-responsive social protection<sup>8</sup>:** Social protection is intrinsically intended to be shock-responsive in the sense of supporting people in the event of a shock or help to mitigate their susceptibility to shocks. The concept of a 'shock-responsive social protection system' (SRSPS) refers to covariate shocks, those that affect large numbers of people and/or communities at once. The specific challenge presented by covariate shocks is the implication that many individuals fall in need of social protection benefits simultaneously, while at the same time the consequences of the shock may limit the capacity of the system to deliver. Establishing SRSPS relates to preparedness, response and recovery from a disaster, and thus potentially overlaps with a number of different DRM activities and mechanisms (aligned with UNRDD definitions).

**Social protection<sup>9</sup>:** Social protection is a set of policies and programmes aimed at preventing and protecting all people against poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion, throughout their life cycle placing a particular emphasis on vulnerable groups. This means ensuring adequate protection for all who need it, including children; people of working age in case of maternity, sickness, work injury or for those without jobs; persons with disability and older persons. This protection can be provided through social insurance, tax-funded social benefits, social assistance services, public works programs and other schemes guaranteeing basic income security and access to essential services

**Subnational governments<sup>10</sup>:** A subnational government (SNG) is considered to be a decentralised entity elected through universal suffrage and having general responsibilities and some autonomy with respect to budget, staff and assets.

---

<sup>7</sup> [Response | UNDRR](#)

<sup>8</sup> Oxford Policy Management – OPM (2015), *Shock-responsive social protection systems - A research programme for DFID* Working paper 1: Conceptualising Shock-Responsive Social Protection, compilation, OPM Oct. 2015.

<sup>9</sup> [Social Protection Inter-Agency Cooperation Board, SPIAC-B | socialprotection.org](#)

<sup>10</sup> OECD/UCLG (2016), *Subnational Governments around the world: Structure and finance* at [oecd.org](#)

## 1. Setting the grounds: a 3D approach to SNG configuration

The roles and responsibilities of subnational governments (SNG) are in a continuous process of transformation and are rapidly evolving, including in many cases, growing<sup>11</sup>. At the national level, a large number of countries, globally but also in the region, have undergone or are undergoing decentralisation reforms, and internationally, SNG are playing an increasingly active role in meeting the objectives of global agendas, from the 2030 Agenda<sup>12</sup> to the Addis-Ababa Action Agenda<sup>13</sup>, the Paris Climate Agreement<sup>14</sup>, and the New Urban Agenda<sup>15</sup>.

Overall, the SNG are in charge of providing basic services for all citizens, while also ensuring that all citizens have access to equal opportunities and face no discrimination. In addition, they also promote measures that support cleaner localities, develop strategies for consolidated resilience to reduce the risk and the impact of disasters, and take action to address climate change by reducing their greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, all the actions should be developed while fully respecting the rights of refugees, migrants and internally displaced persons regardless of their migration status, in a context where it is recognized that migration poses challenges but it also brings significant contributions.

A 3D approach to SNG configuration implies analysis at three levels (i) types of subnational governments in terms of administrative organisation, (ii) responsibilities the SNGs have in both DRR and SP areas, and (iii) financing mechanisms and approaches at the level of SNGs.

### 1.1. Administrative organization of SNGs

Based on the World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment (SNG-WOFI)<sup>16</sup> data, it came out<sup>17</sup> that, with the exception of Turkmenistan<sup>18</sup>, all the other ECA countries have a full profile on SNG-WOFI report, allowing for extensive analysis not only in terms of territorial organisation but also in terms of SNG responsibilities (section 1.2.) and finance (section 1.3). The analysis led to the following key findings: (i) The **territorial organisation in the region is broadly uneven**, with countries including as few as 23 SNG, as in the case of Montenegro, to countries with 11,733 SNG, as in the case of Ukraine<sup>19</sup>, (ii) **Almost all countries have SNG at the first tier (20 countries), the municipal level** (except Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan), from 23 in Montenegro to 7,169 in Kazakhstan, (iii) **Only eight countries have intermediate level SNG**, ranging from 10 in Bosnia and Herzegovina to 676 in Ukraine, and (iv) **Five countries do not have regional or state level SNG**, and for the rest of the countries the number ranges from one in Azerbaijan to 81 in Turkey.

---

<sup>11</sup> OECD/UCLG (2019) *2019 Report of the World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment* – Country Profiles at [SNGWOFI 2019 report country profiles.pdf \(sng-wofi.org\)](#)

<sup>12</sup> [2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development web.pdf \(un.org\)](#)

<sup>13</sup> [Addis Ababa Action Agenda ... Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform \(un.org\)](#)

<sup>14</sup> [The Paris Agreement | UNFCCC](#)

<sup>15</sup> [The New Urban Agenda: Key Commitments – United Nations Sustainable Development](#)

<sup>16</sup> [About - SNG-WOFI](#)

<sup>17</sup> See Annex 1 for full detail about the configuration of SNG in each of the 22 ECA countries.

<sup>18</sup> Not part of the SNG-WOFI and the data was taken from Wikipedia: [Districts of Turkmenistan - Wikipedia](#)

<sup>19</sup> Ukraine is currently in a process of administrative decentralisation reform (not captured by SNG-WOFI data in 2019). According to this new configuration, **the current number of SNG is 1,469**, hence in the region, Kazakhstan is now on top with 7,169.

## 1.2. Core responsibilities of SNGs

The SNG have various responsibilities and they very much depend on the degree of decentralisation in the respective countries. The individual country case studies<sup>20</sup> will tackle some of these aspects in detail, with concrete examples of responsibilities distribution among the various layers of SNG. However, for the purpose of this review, an approach of generic characteristics in terms of main groups of responsibilities seems more appropriate, with in mind the prioritization of the most relevant ones for the study.

According to OECD/UCLG (2019, Op. Cit.), nine categories<sup>21</sup> of responsibilities of SNG were analysed globally, and they include: **1. General public services /administration, 2. Public order, safety, and defence, 3. Economic affairs / transports, 4. Environmental protection, 5. Housing and community amenities, 6. Health, 7. Recreation, culture, and religion, 8. Education, 9. Social protection.** This classification allows for a quite straightforward *delineation of SP related responsibilities*, as described under “group 9”, whereas in the case of the *DRR, related responsibilities* seem rather *undelineated*. The main reason is because the DRR responsibilities, by their nature, are to be found in various groups, such as “group 2”, “group 4” and “group 5”. Moreover, some of the SP relevant related responsibilities might also be found in “group 5” (such as the subsidies for housing), or generally in “group 6” (also relevant for DRR) and “group 8”, since one of the SP dimensions is also guaranteeing the access to basic education and health. This information is critical when assessing the coordination and, to a certain extent, the partnerships, and cannot be overlooked when tackling the various aspects of financing; hence, a certain level of cautiousness is necessary in lieu of too strong statements.

## 1.3. Financing approach at SNG level

Public financial management (PFM)<sup>22</sup> is a central element of a functioning administration, underlying all government activities. Even if a PFM approach to the analysis is not within the scope of the current review, some general considerations, such as the *PFM for natural disasters* need to be foreseen. According to the World Bank<sup>23</sup>, combining different instruments is typically more cost-effective than relying on one source of funding. For the government, having rapid access to resources to meet surge demand for emergency assistance entails benefits; these are due to cost efficiencies generated by early procurement and response. For households, early relief can reduce the resort to negative coping strategies, which have been shown to have detrimental long-term consequences.

At sovereign level, financing mechanisms can be grouped into two main categories: (i) *retention*, in which the government decides to assume and manage disaster losses through its budgetary resources, and (ii) *transfer*, in which the government transfers potential future disaster losses to financial or insurance markets by paying a premium.

---

<sup>20</sup> Country case studies are foreseen in Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Tajikistan and Ukraine.

<sup>21</sup> In line with OECD/UN Classification of the functions of government (COFOG). See examples of responsibilities within each category in annex 3.

<sup>22</sup> Transparency International, 2014. *Public financial management topic guide* at [Topic guide \(transparency.org\)](#)

<sup>23</sup> World Bank / GFDRR, 2020. *Disaster finance diagnostic – Albania*, December 2020



## 2. Institutional framework for DRR and SP at SNG level

Each individual country in the region relies on a complex set of legal and policy frameworks that govern subnational provision of multi-hazard disaster response and preparedness mechanisms, including through social protection. The policy objective of anticipating and reducing risk is called disaster risk reduction (DRR). Although often used interchangeably with DRR, **disaster risk management** (DRM) can be thought of as the implementation of DRR, since it describes the actions that aim to achieve the objective of reducing risk; hence, a **discussion around the institutional framework expected to implement the DRR** becomes highly relevant.

Successful DRR<sup>24</sup> results from the combination of top-down, institutional changes and strategies, with bottom-up, local and community-based approaches. DRM programmes should not be standalone but instead be integrated within development planning and practice, since disasters are an indicator of failed or skewed development, of unsustainable economic and social processes, and of ill-adapted societies.

DRM involves activities related to: **prevention** – activities and measures to avoid existing and new disaster risks (often less costly than disaster relief and response); **mitigation** – the lessening or limitation of the adverse impacts of hazards and related disasters; **transfer** – the process of formally or informally shifting the financial consequences of particular risks from one party to another whereby a household, community, enterprise or state authority will obtain resources from the other party after a disaster occurs, in exchange for ongoing or compensatory social or financial benefits provided to that other party; and **preparedness** – the knowledge and capacities of governments, professional response and recovery organisations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to, and recover from the impacts of likely, imminent or current hazard events or conditions.

Regarding **social protection**, according to UNICEF<sup>25</sup>, stronger or less strong SP systems exist in all ECA countries, and some are being further developed as a means to tackle poverty, deprivation, inequity and fragility, thereby improving the resilience of individuals and families to all types of shocks. The main instruments of the social protection system include cash, vouchers, social support services, and fee waivers. In emergency and humanitarian situations, cash-based social assistance programmes are increasingly recognized as quicker, easier to administer and more empowering compared to delivering in-kind aid.

A **shock-responsive social protection system** is one that can respond flexibly in the event of an emergency, especially covariate shocks that affect large numbers of people and/or communities at once. In these situations, a key challenge is that social protection needs may increase exponentially while the shock may at the same time limit the capacity of the system to deliver.

---

<sup>24</sup> [Disaster risk reduction and disaster risk management \(preventionweb.net\)](http://www.preventionweb.net)

<sup>25</sup> UNICEF, 2017. *Resilience, humanitarian assistance and social protection for children in Europe and Central Asia Social Protection*. Regional Issue Brief: 2 August 2017

## Subnational social protection systems

A functioning shock-responsive social protection system should be able to balance between mitigating the impact of a shock on households, including through the implementation of disaster-risk reduction policies or systems for early warning and preparedness for shocks, and ensuring that resources are made available in a timely manner if ex-post assistance is required.

### 2.1. Levels of decentralization and main stakeholders

The institutional configuration of DRM is very complex by nature and understanding the features and provisions of legal and policy frameworks supporting the subnational provision of multi-hazard disaster response and preparedness mechanisms, including through SP, requires a contextualisation of core roles and responsibilities the involved institutions have / are expected to have at all levels of decentralisation.

Schematically, these categories of stakeholders include: (i) National / Central level, with parliamentary and governmental institutions, (ii) Subnational tier 3 level, or regional or state level with the regional/provincial governments, (iii) Subnational tier 2 level, or intermediate level, with district/city governments, and (iv) Subnational tier 1 level, or Municipal level, with the Local governments (in various contexts called local self governments). Examples of these stakeholders are provided in annex 2.

### 2.2. Decentralised DRR roles and responsibilities

Within the ECA region, the DRR roles and responsibilities may vary significantly since the political and administrative frameworks in each country are also very national specific. The roles and responsibilities enumerated below result from the review of various sources of different nature, from legislative and strategy related papers to analyses of administrative or financial nature. The list below is far from being comprehensive, but it captures the core ones that are relevant for the scope of this mapping, including: (i) core roles, (ii) coordination, and (iii) financing, while also considering decision making vs. decision implementation, as a means to better delineate what is expected from SNG to implement and/or take decision upon at their level of responsibility.

**The central level** is important to consider in order to contextualise and articulate the role of SNG in the broader picture. Its configuration includes several dimensions:

Table 1: DRR roles and responsibilities at central level:

Central level			
	Core roles	Coordination	Financing
<b>Parliament / Assembly</b>			
<b>Decision making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Issue relevant legislation</li> <li>Decide on extending the initial state of emergency (by Govt.)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve state budget with corresponding areas and institutions</li> </ul>
<b>Coordination body / Council of ministers</b>			
<b>Decision making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Approve policies, national emergency plans, and risk assessment documents</li> <li>Decide whether to declare the state of emergency</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate among all the relevant ministries</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Establish right to compensation</li> </ul>
<b>Ministry of Finance / Economy</b>			
<b>Decision making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Design and develop financing strategies, annual budgets and funds reallocations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate PFM processes across participating institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate PFM processes across participating institutions</li> </ul>
Central level			
	Core roles	Coordination	Financing
<b>Ministry<sup>26</sup> of Defence/ Emergency / Interior, / etc. responsible for civil protection</b>			
<b>Decision making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop and oversee the implementation of DRR and civil protection policies</li> <li>Draft, approve, and update the national Civil Emergency Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inform the coordination body about DRR and civil protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Oversee the “agency” budget management, in accordance with the applicable financial legislation</li> </ul>
<b>National “agency” (unit, directorate, authority, inspectorate, etc.) for civil protection</b>			
<b>Decision implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implement council’s policies and minister’s decisions</li> <li>Develop and implement plans</li> <li>Draft, approve, and update the Civil Emergency Plan (depending on how roles are distributed between the “agency” and the “ministry”)</li> <li>Carry out inspections</li> <li>Data management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Coordinate efforts within the national DRR strategy</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan funding in specific areas of interest</li> <li>Receive funds request from local / lower levels</li> </ul>
Central level			
	Core roles	Coordination	Financing
<b>Other ministries (various)</b>			
<b>Decision making and implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Draft, approve, and update the Civil Emergency Plan in their area of responsibility and submit it to the “agency” (or Ministry)</li> <li>Data management in the area of responsibility</li> <li>Carry out assessment of disaster losses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inform the coordination body about DRR and civil protection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan annual budgets for DRR</li> </ul>

Source: author, based on desk review (see bibliography)

<sup>26</sup> A wide diversity of stakeholders may be considered, accordingly to [Regional Office for Europe & Central Asia | UNDRR](#)

## Subnational social protection systems

In specific emergency contexts, *ad hoc temporary* organisational approaches could be adopted, and they may consist of **organization of committees or commissions**, usually of inter-ministerial character, with focus on (i) coordinating civil protection institutions and structure activities, (ii) determine methods and procedures for employment of material and financial resources, (iii) decide on the allocation of funds aimed at recovery from natural disasters. These entities might be mirrored at subnational levels by emergency or civil protection committees in charge of implementing the policies on disaster risk reduction and civil protection.

Regarding the **subnational levels**, the administrative organization in each country context determines the configuration of responsibilities in the DRR area, and they are to be differentiated depending on the tier of decentralisation.

Particularly at subnational levels, the roles might not be fully common to every country context. In other words, one country might have adopted provisions regarding a limited group of roles whereas a second country adopted provisions regarding an extended number of roles, including the limited ones in the first country. The analysis considered the extended list of roles, in order to further support the formulation of recommendations.

Regarding the **SNG at tier 3**, the following configuration emerges:

**Table 2: DRR roles and responsibilities at subnational level tier 3:**

Subnational level – tier 3			
	Core roles	Coordination	Financing
<b>Regional department / Governmental de-concentrated body / Prefecture</b>			
<b>Decision making</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Draft and approve the regional DR assessment document.</li> <li>• Draft, adopt and update the Regional Civil Emergency Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate the activity of regional institutions, bodies, authorities, both decentralised and de-concentrated.</li> <li>• Cooperate with municipalities to carry out DR assessment in the region, as well as informing the public and the communities at risk of disaster.</li> <li>• Cooperate with neighbouring regions affected by disasters.</li> <li>• Coordinate the delivery of international aid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mediate budgeting process between lower and central level of administration, including checking provisions related to budget allocation for DRR in local budget planning.</li> </ul>

*Source: author, based on desk review (see bibliography)*

At this level, the general tendency is to focus on policy aspects and overall decision making processes. There are also exceptions, particularly in the case of Central Asia states such as Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan where the subnational governments at tier 3 level of decentralization have some responsibilities in the core categories: (i) Public order, safety, and defence – civil protection military mobilisation, etc., (ii) Environmental protection – protection of natural resources, or (iii) Housing and community amenities – spatial planning.

Regarding the **SNG at tier 2**, the responsibilities are more diluted without the possibility to identify a specific pattern, in a context where few countries in the region have this level of

## Subnational social protection systems

decentralised administration and the responsibilities at this level are echoing and complementing the ones at tier 3.

**Table 3: DRR roles and responsibilities at subnational level tier 2:**

Subnational level – tier 2			
	Core roles	Coordination	Financing
<b>District or city government</b>			
<b>Decision making and some<sup>27</sup> decision implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Articulate with and complement the roles assigned for the SNG at tier 3</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contribute to coordination effort within their geographical and administrative area of responsibility</li> </ul>	

*Source: author, based on desk review (see bibliography)*

High complexity is the main characteristic of responsibilities at **SNG at tier 1**, as they combine decision making and decision implementation roles, are the closest to the population in need and understand the best the specific needs within their environments. The following configuration of responsibilities at municipal level emerges:

**Table 4: DRR roles and responsibilities at subnational level tier 1:**

Subnational level – tier 1			
	Core roles	Coordination	Financing
<b>Local (self) government / Municipality / Mayoralty / City-hall</b>			
<b>Decision making and decision implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Develop DRR strategy and disaster risk assessment (DRA) document at municipal level</li> <li>Develop civil emergency plan</li> <li>Inform the population, carry out trainings for staff and population</li> <li>Ensure monitoring, early warning, alert and alarm systems</li> <li>Develop databases for the territory, including disaster losses, population affected, damages, needs assessment, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure DRR strategy and DRA document are articulated with regional/national strategies and documents</li> <li>Cooperate with all the upper levels of decentralisation and with the neighbouring municipalities</li> <li>Mobilise relevant public and private institutions and entities in their geographical area</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Invest in disaster prevention, protection and rehabilitation</li> <li>Budget planning with DRR component</li> </ul>

*Source: author, based on desk review (see bibliography)*

<sup>27</sup> E.g.: in case the fire department is at this level, then it will implement the decision taken at upper level.

### 2.3. Decentralised SP roles and responsibilities

Social protection systems, including floors, are traditionally well established<sup>28</sup> in the region and have achieved high levels of coverage compared to other regions. However, there is significant variation in levels of social protection expenditure, financing sources, adequacy of benefits and the role of the social partners. In some countries, however, fiscal consolidation measures may jeopardize the progress achieved. In other parts of the region, especially in Central Asia, social protection systems face challenges of limited coverage and inadequate benefit levels, alongside budget constraints and insufficient administrative capacity, thus failing to lift people out of poverty and informal employment.

While acknowledging the complexity and importance of the institutional configuration of SP, the following diagram (see table 5 below) selected the **core characteristics of the SP systems** relevant for the DRR and DRM. Moreover, focusing on the importance of **coordination**, it should also be acknowledged that “the push towards working across silos and with other stakeholders is not a social protection issue but a broader government trend and even an organizational trend”, according to ILO<sup>29</sup>.

According to the same source, coordination is required at three levels of public administration, namely:

- (i) **High-level: policy coordination** – internal rationale of the social protection system, overall fit and alignment between social protection system and other socio-economic policies;
- (ii) **Mid-level: operational coordination** (programme, organizational, plans, budget, IT) - tools used by the administrative system to coordinate different programmes. Also included mid-level institutions or bodies established to monitor coordination on a regular basis. Normally these bodies or committees do not deal with high-level definitions but rather with practical ways of implementing coordination, such as improving coordination procedures, setting common standards across provinces or regions and so on, and
- (iii) **Street-level: service-delivery coordination** – linkages at street-level with other programmes or services. The focus is at the point of delivery: how civil servants or local officials coordinate different programmes or services, coordination between units or service-delivery points. Based on this approach, the following configuration emerges as in the table 5 below.

Regarding the delivery system at subnational levels, a series of tasks and responsibilities have been identified, and they might not be fully common to every country context. Nonetheless, we opted in this analysis to have them all covered, even though some of them might be quite rare, such as the delivery of social benefits at local level.

---

<sup>28</sup> ILO, 2019. World Social Protection Report 2017–19, *Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*

<sup>29</sup> ILO, 2021. *Governance of social protection systems: a learning journey, Module #1: Coordination*.

Table 5: Core elements of a model of institutional configuration of SP at national level:

Overview of coordination of SP system (horizontal, vertical)			
Central level			
Coordination	Ministry of Labour / Social Protection / Family / Inclusion	Line ministries – mainly Education and Health	Ministry of Finance / Economy
High-level policy coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Legal and policy frameworks in social protection (and labour)</li> <li>• Strategy development</li> <li>• Financing</li> <li>• Establish definition, tools and structure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similarly with the Ministry of Labour (etc.) but in their own areas of interest</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Approve national budget</li> <li>• Coordinate PFM processes</li> </ul>

Subnational level tiers 3 and 2	
Mid-level operational coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Usually coordination between upper/central level and lower/street level.</li> <li>• Important dimensions: tools and structures used to translate high-level coordination guidelines into concrete steps: IT solutions (central registries, integration of different databases), joint budgeting, common planning, state or provincial coordination committees, definition of joint procedures, automatic information exchange.</li> <li>• Delivery: provision or approval of benefits and/or services</li> </ul>

Subnational level tier 1		
	Delivery system	Types of SP programmes
Street-level service delivery coordination	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underlying information systems and data management, with focus on beneficiary registries and social registries</li> <li>• Outreach and communication, sensitization and awareness raising</li> <li>• Identifying the vulnerable: needs assessment, targeting, registration, enrolment</li> <li>• Delivery: provision of benefits and/or services</li> <li>• Monitoring, evaluation and reporting</li> <li>• Managing grievance and redress mechanisms</li> <li>• Coordination (of services across sectors)</li> <li>• Case management</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social insurance (e.g. unemployment insurance, pensions)</li> <li>• Social care services</li> <li>• Livelihood support and economic inclusion programmes</li> <li>• Cash transfers</li> <li>• Public works</li> <li>• School feeding</li> </ul>

Source: author, based on desk review (see bibliography)

### 3. Subnational provision of multi-hazard disaster response and preparedness mechanisms, including through social protection

Despite the heterogeneity of both DRR and SP configurations in the region, the analytical approach adopted in this review allowed, as presented mainly under chapter 2, to identify some common traits or to emphasize those traits that, according to international thinking in the area, are deemed relevant and important, even if not necessarily common. With this caveat, and acknowledging that the final policy documents will benefit from further desk review, peer review and contextual data from the country case studies, this chapter synthesises and systematises the findings under three categories of interest: articulation of processes, roles and responsibilities at SNG level, coordination among stakeholders, and financing arrangements.

#### 3.1. Articulation of processes, roles and responsibilities

The institutional structures for the design and delivery of SP are diverse and often fragmented, while the decentralisation processes are uneven. Therefore, delivering SP at subnational levels depends on the characteristics of decentralization and the capacity at each layer<sup>30</sup>. At the same time, the delivery processes are quite similar, at least in principle, whereas a constant need for proper resources (human, financial) is quite characteristic, since each system is very well developed at central level and, often, much less developed at lower levels.

Similar findings were reached in other analyses<sup>31</sup>, confirming the need to carefully tackle the aspects related to ***adaptive social protection (ASP)***: not only the social protection systems need to be enhanced, but they would also require additional enhancements in order to be able to support the capacity of vulnerable households to prepare for, cope with and adapt to shocks.

As the DRM processes include ***prevention/mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery***, the articulation of roles and responsibilities at SNG level could consider the following:

---

<sup>30</sup> Magheru M., 2010. Decentralization of social protection system in Romania - An analysis focused on social assistance in the benefit of most vulnerable children and their families, UNICEF 2010.

<sup>31</sup> Wyatt, A., Barca, V. 2021. *Adaptive social protection and decentralisation: a conceptual framework*, Social Protection Approaches to COVID-19 Expert Advice Service (SPACE), DAI Global UK Ltd, United Kingdom.



Table 6: Articulating DRR mechanisms with SP provision systems

Articulation of DRR and SP processes		
Phase of DRM	DRM adaptation	SP adaptation
<b>Prevention / mitigation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Link public works with disaster proof infrastructure</li> <li>• Harmonise SP social registries with DRM processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expand coverage and adequacy of benefits</li> <li>• Improve targeting accuracy, focusing on reaching the most vulnerable children</li> </ul>
<b>Preparedness</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early warning systems to consider needs of vulnerable people benefiting from SP</li> <li>• Contingency plan to consider SP interventions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SP data management system to consider DRR related approaches</li> <li>• Linking early warning systems with SP programmes, such as triggering automatic payments in case of (levels of) shocks,</li> <li>• Consolidate procedures and human resources to act in emergency situations</li> <li>• Social protection systems to be supported by risk and vulnerability analysis, and enhance capacities for data management and reporting on risks and vulnerabilities</li> <li>• SP budgets to include a set percentage of reserve funds to be used flexibly to address shocks, and adopt a ‘crisis modifier’ that stipulates the circumstances under which the reserve funds are unblocked, or the system turns into an emergency mode</li> </ul>
<b>Response</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provision of emergency in-kind and cash support by considering the social registry</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transfer amounts adjustments and accept extraordinary payments</li> <li>• Short-term expansions to cover the new poor</li> <li>• Linkages to additional services,</li> <li>• Adjusting payment modalities</li> <li>• Introducing ad hoc/extraordinary payments (e.g. in winter months for clothing or heating).</li> <li>• Expanding the number of beneficiaries through ad hoc/extraordinary enrolment campaigns, or modifying/relaxing the criteria for enrolment (e.g. all children in a region affected by floods receive a child benefit - not only the poorest). Where benefits to children are linked to “conditions” and compliance has become untenable, temporarily relax conditions as appropriate.</li> <li>• Support children to access education, health and other services (e.g. via free transport, vouchers, fee waivers, deployment of social workers/mediators, etc.)</li> </ul>
<b>Recovery</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Post disaster needs assessment to support SP targeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Target the regions or vulnerable populations which were the most affected by an emergency to boost the recovery phase</li> <li>• In areas that are shock prone and impacts (e.g. on livelihoods) are known, the SP system could promote reskilling/retraining and livelihood diversification interventions for family members</li> </ul>

Source: author, inspired by [ECARO Social Protection Brief 2 - Resilience](#)

Regarding the **roles and responsibilities the subnational governments have in DRR and SP areas**, a series of similarities could support a better articulation and mutual support between the systems. In table 7 below these roles and responsibilities are summarised, bearing in mind that coordination and financing are also among the core roles and responsibilities but are treated apart in the specifically dedicated sections.

Table 7: Articulating DRR and SP related roles and responsibilities of SNG

Articulation of DRR and SP related roles and responsibilities of SNG		
DRM at SNG level	SP at SNG level	Actions for better articulation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop DRR strategy and disaster risk assessment (DRA) document at municipal level</li> <li>• Develop civil emergency plan</li> <li>• Inform the population, carry out trainings for staff and population</li> <li>• Ensure monitoring, early warning, alert and alarm systems</li> <li>• Develop databases for the territory, including disaster losses, population affected, damages, needs assessment, etc.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Underlying information systems and data management, with focus on beneficiary registries and social registries</li> <li>• Outreach and communication, sensitization and awareness raising</li> <li>• Identifying the vulnerable: needs assessment, targeting, registration, enrolment</li> <li>• Delivery: provision of benefits and/or services</li> <li>• Monitoring, evaluation and reporting</li> <li>• Managing grievance mechanisms</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRR related strategies and plans to be developed with consideration of SP available data</li> <li>• Information, outreach and sensitization to be mutually informed by SP and DRR</li> <li>• Monitoring, early warning, alert and alarm systems to include data about the most vulnerable (SP)</li> <li>• Databases for the territory (disaster losses, population affected, damages, needs assessment) to include SP M&amp;E related data</li> </ul>

Source: author, based on desk review (see bibliography)

### 3.2. Coordination among the stakeholders

The coordination among the stakeholders is primarily tackled from the DRR perspective, as the focus of the review is on how legal and policy frameworks support the subnational provision of multi-hazard disaster response and preparedness mechanisms. Moreover, the **coordination** among various stakeholders, both from a **horizontal perspective** (i.e. among the ministries, among the subnational stakeholders) and from a **vertical perspective** (i.e. among various categories of stakeholders at all levels of decentralisation) is intrinsic to DRR systems, whereas in the case of SP systems delivering cash and in-kind support<sup>32</sup>, the coordination is rather of a vertical nature<sup>33</sup>, focusing on how the central entity and its deconcentrated units coordinate with the decentralised bodies, also detailed under section 2.3.

From a **horizontal perspective**, the following **DRR coordination** related conclusions emerge:

- Strong legal and policy frameworks for coordination at central level, with at the core a formal institutionalisation of inter-ministerial coordination bodies.
- The SNGs, regardless the tier, have explicit coordination responsibilities among a broad variety of stakeholders, both de-concentrated and decentralised.
- Neighbouring (region, district, locality) cooperation at subnational level is essential.

From a **vertical perspective**, the following **DRR coordination** related conclusions emerge:

- Each ministry is in charge of the coordination among its respective subnational de-concentrated units.
- The National “agency” (unit, directorate, authority, inspectorate, etc.) for civil protection at central level has a strategic coordination role: national and subnational strategies and relevant documents and plans.

<sup>32</sup> While the focus of the mapping is on social protection responses that consist of cash transfers type measures, a broader approach to social protection by UNICEF should be acknowledged, covering a range of policies and programmes needed to reduce the lifelong consequences of poverty and exclusion. Programmes like cash transfers – including child grants, school meals, skills development and more – help connect families with health care, nutritious food and quality education to give all children, no matter what circumstances they are born into, a fair chance in life. More details on [Social protection | UNICEF](#)

<sup>33</sup> The horizontal coordination is rather characteristic to the service delivery component of the SP system, where at least the areas of education, health and social inclusion/protection need to be coordinated.

## Subnational social protection systems

- The SNG, regardless the tier, have explicit cooperation responsibilities between the upper and lower levels of decentralisation (e.g. a regional government will cooperate with all the municipalities in its coverage area).

***When a crisis strikes, the governments at the lowest level of decentralization have a critical role in mobilising all relevant public and private institutions and entities*** in their geographical area. This could be considered a horizontal coordination while it requires a strong vertical articulation too. Nonetheless, there is no explicit formal mechanism in place – except the potential provisions of local DRR strategies and plans – to ensure the effectiveness of such “mobilisation”, except that in the area of SP, because the same local government manages both the DRR and SP function, theoretically at least, the articulation should be implicit, creating the premises to effectively implement all the actions under section 3.1.

### 3.3. Financing arrangements

Ideally, ***DRM financing mechanisms, disaster and contingency funds, resource mobilisation systems and insurance mechanisms, would explicitly include the funding of SP interventions.*** Although this could easily work in theory, by establishing legal and policy provisions, nonetheless, the inner SP systems’ limitations<sup>34</sup> could not be overlooked: in most of the countries, the central government is the major source of funding for SP programmes, they can face major ***fiscal constraints***, and may not be willing or able to provide the local government with sufficient funding to cover the full costs of social protection programmes. Targeting processes, field visits for monitoring and evaluation purposes, communication and socialization campaigns, and cash delivery all create additional financial costs for local governments. Even when administrative budgets are made available, they are often not based on formula weighted for costs against, for example, the number of beneficiaries served and area of distribution/coverage. Further, additional budgets may be needed to recruit additional staff to manage and deliver social protection functions, and again the need may vary from area to area.

On another hand, emerging evidence<sup>35</sup> highlights three core lessons for ***applying a disaster risk financing approach to adaptive social protection***: (i) investment is needed to understand the potential cost of response, leveraging data sources to shed light on the anticipated contingent liability of using a safety net to respond to shocks, (ii) building from these costing models, appropriate funding should be pre-planned, and (iii) robust payment mechanisms that are capable of absorbing the funding made available after a shock and delivering it to households are critical to enable the disbursement of these risk financing instruments to households.

Finally, within the ***COVID-19 pandemic context***, a wealth of evidence<sup>36</sup> emerged globally requiring adjustment of social protection measures to better respond to large shares of population in need, with a focus on properly financing the SP systems: the impact of the crisis

---

<sup>34</sup> UNDP/UNCDF, 2013. *Strengthening the Governance of Social Protection: The Role of Local Government Regional Analysis*

<sup>35</sup> Thomas B., del Ninno C., Andrews C., Coll-Black S., Gentilini U., Johnson K, Kawasoe Y., Kryeziu A., Maher B., Williams A., 2020. *Adaptive Social Protection: Building Resilience to Shocks*. International Development in Focus. World Bank 2020

<sup>36</sup> UN Regional Coordination Mechanism – Europe and Central Asia, 2021. *COVID-19 and social protection in Europe and Central Asia – A moment of opportunity to expand and strengthen social protection mechanisms to safeguard health, well-being and livelihoods, leaving no one behind*.

## Subnational social protection systems

has highlighted the imperative of more effective financing of SP systems, including universal health care (UHC). While many governments are currently putting in place short-term measures to support informal workers<sup>37</sup>, it will be important that these extension policies are converted from a short-term measure to institutionalized policies based on sustainable and equitable financing. The current crisis, which prevents children and families from accessing many essential services, is a reminder of the key role social transfers play in shielding children and families from some of the worst effects of social and economic insecurities.

A proposal for a potential mechanism to finance disaster response, although not necessarily related to the COVID-19 context, emerged from the World Bank's and GFDRR series of Disaster Risk Finance Country Notes<sup>38</sup>, as follows:

**Table 8: Financing disaster response**

Disaster response potential financing	
Disaster risk	Financing source
High-risk layer (e.g., major floods, major earthquakes)	Donor assistance
	Emergency borrowing
	Sovereign risk transfer
Medium-risk layer (e.g., regional floods, minor earthquakes)	Contingent financing
	Budget relocation
Low-risk layer (e.g., localized floods, droughts, landslides)	Budget funds: Cabinet Contingency Fund
	Budget funds: Contingency funds of community budgets
	Catastrophe insurance

Source: author, based on World Bank's and GFDRR DRFCN

<sup>37</sup> In addition, other categories of support are envisioned. See Annex 4 with full details emerging from the World Bank, 2021. *Social Protection and Jobs Responses to COVID-19: A Real-Time Review of Country Measures* (May 14, 2021) COVID-19 Living Paper Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group.

<sup>38</sup> See full details in bibliography. DRF country notes were identified for Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan.

## 4. Annexes

### Annex 1: Details of SNG configuration at ECA regional level

#### sub national governments (SNG)

		Municipal level	Intermediate level	Regional or state level	total number of SNGs
1	Albania	61	0	12	73
2	Armenia	502	0	0	502
3	Azerbaijan	1607	0	1	1608
4	Belarus	1190	128	7	1325
5	Bosnia and Herzegovina	141	10	3	154
6	Bulgaria	265	0	0	265
7	Croatia	556	0	21	577
8	Georgia	72	0	2	74
9	Greece	325	0	13	338
10	Kazakhstan	6938	215	16	7169
11	Kosovo	38	0	0	38
12	Kyrgyz Republic	470	12	2	484
13	Moldova	925	0	35	960
14	Montenegro	23	0	0	23
15	North Macedonia	81	0	0	81
16	Romania	3181	0	42	3223
17	Serbia	174	0	2	176
18	Tajikistan	369	65	4	438
19	Turkey	1389	0	81	1470
20	Turkmenistan*	0	59	7	66
21	Ukraine	11030	676	27	11733
22	Uzbekistan	0	201	14	215

---

\* Wikipedia data

## Annex 2: Examples of institutions per group of stakeholders in decentralised contexts

Decentralization level	Stakeholders group	Examples of institutions
Central level	Parliament	Parliament of <b>Albania</b> (Kuvendi i Shqipërisë) or Kuvendi, unicameral representative body of the citizens of the Republic of Albania  Parliament of <b>Romania</b> (Parlamentul României) national bicameral legislature consisting of the Chamber of Deputies and Senate.
	National Government	President of <b>Azerbaijan</b> is head of state, and Prime Minister of Azerbaijan is head of Government. Executive power is exercised by the president and the government.  Government of <b>Georgia</b> (საქართველოს მთავრობა), supreme body of executive power consisting of Prime Minister (head) / ministers and is accountable and responsible to the Parliament of Georgia.
Subnational tier 3 Regional or state level	Regional/provincial Government	<b>Moldova</b> : 32 districts (raions), two municipalities (Municipii of Chisinau and Balti) and one autonomous territory (Gagauzia).  <b>Turkey</b> : 51 special provincial administrations (il Özelidareleri) and 30 provincial metropolitan municipalities
Subnational tier 2 Intermediate level	District/city Government	<b>Belarus</b> : 118 districts (rayon) and 10 cities of regional subordination  <b>Tajikistan</b> : 7 cities (shahr) and 45 rural districts (dehot) of regional subordination and 4 cities and 9 districts of national subordination
Subnational tier 1 Municipal level	Local government	<b>Croatia</b> : 428 municipalities (općina) and 128 towns (grad)  <b>Montenegro</b> : 21 municipalities (opština) and 2 urban municipalities

### Annex 3: Examples of responsibilities of SNG (COFOG)

**1. General public services /administration:** administrative services, civil services, public buildings and facilities, administration and operation of general services, basic research;

**2. Public order, safety, and defence:** police, firefighting, civil protection & emergency, road traffic control, defence;

**3. Economic affairs / transports:** road and railways networks and facilities, parking, airports, ports, public transport, special transport, employment services, support to local enterprises and entrepreneurship, agriculture, rural development, irrigation, telecommunications / IT, manufacturing and construction, mining, tourism, commerce, energy;

**4. Environmental protection:** parks & green areas, nature preservation, noise and vibration abatement, air pollution, soil and groundwater protection, climate protection, waste management (collection, treatment and disposal of waste), sewerage, street cleaning;

**5. Housing and community amenities:** drinking water distribution, public lighting, urban heating, housing (subsidies, construction/renovation, management), urban and land use planning, urbanism);

**6. Health:** pharmaceutical and medical products, general and specialised medical services and paramedical services, primary healthcare, hospital services, preventative healthcare, public health services;

**7. Recreation, culture, and religion:** sports and recreation, libraries, museums, cultural activities, cultural heritage/monuments, media/broadcasting and publishing services, religious affairs;

**8. Education:** pre-primary, primary, secondary, higher, vocational, special education, and research & development;

**9. Social protection:** social care for children and youth, support services for families, elderly, people with disability, social exclusion / poverty (benefits and policies), immigrants, integration of foreigners, social welfare centres, housing subsidies/benefits, unemployment subsidies/benefits.

## Subnational social protection systems

### Annex 4: COVID-19 SP-related measures throughout the region

		SOCIAL ASSISTANCE				SOCIAL INSURANCE				LABOUR MARKETS			
		Cash-based transfers	Public works	In-kind (in-kind/school feeding)	Utility & financial support	Paid leave / unemployment	Health insurance support	Pensions	Social security contributions (waiver/subsidy)	Wage subsidies	Training measures	Labour regulation	Shorter work time
1	Albania	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
2	Armenia	X	X	X	X			X		X		X	X
3	Azerbaijan	X	X	X	X	X			X	X		X	
4	Belarus	X		X	X	X				X			
5	Bosnia and Herzegovina	X			X	X	X		X	X	X		
6	Bulgaria	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
7	Croatia				X			X	X	X		X	X
8	Georgia	X		X	X			X		X		X	X
9	Greece	X			X	X			X	X	X	X	X
10	Kazakhstan	X	X	X	X		X						
11	Kosovo*	X			X			X	X	X			
12	Kyrgyz Republic	X		X	X	X			X		X	X	X
13	Moldova	X				X				X			
14	Montenegro	X			X	X		X	X	X			
15	North Macedonia	X		X	X	X	X		X	X		X	X
16	Romania	X				X				X	X	X	
17	Serbia	X		X		X		X	X	X	X	X	X
18	Tajikistan	X			X	X					X		
19	Turkey	X		X	X	X		X	X	X		X	X
20	Turkmenistan	X			X				X			X	
21	Ukraine	X			X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
22	Uzbekistan	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X

\* under UNSC resolution 1244



## Bibliography

Gentilini U., Almenfi M.B.A.; Blomquist J.D.; Dale P., De La Flor Giuffra L., Desai V., Tharmaratnam Fontenez M.B., Galicia Rabadan G.A., Lopez V., Marin Espinosa A.G., Natarajan H., Newhouse D.L., Palacios R.J., Quiroz A.P., Rodriguez Alas C.P., Sabharwal G., Weber M., *Social Protection and Jobs Responses to COVID-19 : A Real-Time Review of Country Measures (May 14, 2021)* COVID-19 Living Paper Washington, D.C. : World Bank Group.

Government of Georgia, 2017. *National Disaster Risk Reduction Strategy of Georgia 2017-2020*

ILO, 2019. World Social Protection Report 2017–19, *Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*

ILO, 2020. *Assessment of the Social Protection System in Georgia*

ILO, 2021. *Governance of social protection systems: a learning journey, Module #1: Coordination*

Longhurst D., Evans S., Connolly, D., Lung, F., McCord, A., Allan, S., Plichta M., 2021. *What are future financing options for shock responsive social protection? A technical primer Social Protection Approaches to COVID-19* Expert Advice Service (SPACE), DAI Global UK Ltd, United Kingdom

OECD/UCLG, 2016. *Subnational Governments around the world: Structure and finance*

OECD/UCLG, 2019. *2019 Report of the World Observatory on Subnational Government Finance and Investment – Country Profiles*. SNGWOFI.

Oxford Policy Management, 2015. *Shock-responsive social protection systems - A research programme for DFID* Working paper 1: Conceptualising Shock-Responsive Social Protection, compilation, OPM Oct. 2015

Oxford Policy Management and UNICEF, 2020. *Integrated Social Protection Systems in Europe and Central Asia Region - Policy Brief*.

Oxford Policy Management and UNICEF, 2020. *Integrated Social Protection Systems: A Review of Different Approaches in UNICEF Europe and Central Asia Region*.

Thomas B., del Ninno C., Andrews C., Coll-Black S., Gentilini U., Johnson K, Kawasoe Y., Kryeziu A., Maher B., Williams A., 2020. *Adaptive Social Protection: Building Resilience to Shocks*. International Development in Focus. World Bank 2020

UCLG, 2021. Analytical notes #3 series. *THE IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON SUBNATIONAL FINANCES* Emergency Governance for Cities and Regions.

UNDP/UNCDF, 2013. *Strengthening the Governance of Social Protection: The Role of Local Government* Regional Analysis. A Working Paper prepared for the Regional Dialogue for Social Protection and Local Governance, organized on 30 Sep.– 1 Oct. 2013, in Bangkok, Thailand

UNDRR, 2020. *COVID-19 Engagement Strategy Interim Report*, Geneva, Switzerland, United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR).

UNICEF, 2010. *Child protection systems mapping and assessment toolkit: Users' Guide*.

UNICEF, 2017. *Resilience, humanitarian assistance and social protection for children in Europe and Central Asia Social Protection*. Regional Issue Brief

## Subnational social protection systems

UNICEF, 2019. *UNICEF's Global Social Protection Programme Framework*

UNICEF, 2020. *Gender-Responsive Social Protection during COVID19: Technical note*

UNICEF, 2020. *UNICEF'S SOCIAL PROTECTION RESPONSE TO COVID-19 Strengthening social protection systems before, during and after crises*

UNICEF, 2021. *Preparing social protection systems for shock response - A case study of UNICEF's experiences in Armenia*

UNICEF, 2021. (not published) *Social Protection in BiH*

Western Balkans Regional Initiative 2017. *The Future of the Welfare State in Western Balkans*

WHO 2021 (UN ECA) 2021. *COVID-19 and social protection in Europe and Central Asia. A moment of opportunity to expand and strengthen social protection mechanisms to safeguard health, well-being and livelihoods, leaving no one behind*

World Bank 2014. *Disaster Risk Financing and Insurance Programme – Disaster Risk Finance country profile Serbia.*

World Bank, 2016. *Country risk profiles for floods and earthquakes, Europe and Central Asia*, World Bank Group and GFDRR, May 2016.

World Bank 2016. *Evaluating Sovereign Disaster Risk Finance Strategies: A Framework*

World Bank 2016. Programme Review. *SOVEREIGN DISASTER RISK FINANCE IN MIDDLE INCOME COUNTRIES* A partnership with the Swiss State Secretariat for Economic Affairs (SECO) World Bank Disaster Risk Financing and Insurance Program. Focus on Azerbaijan and Croatia.

World Bank, 2017. *Disaster Risk Finance: A Primer Core Principles and Operational Framework*, Disaster Risk Financing & Insurance Programme, World Bank Group.

World Bank, 2021. *Overlooked: Examining the impact of disasters and climate shocks on poverty in the Europe and Central Asia region*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

World Bank and GFDRR, 2016. *Europe and Central Asia, Country Risk Profiles for Floods and Earthquakes.*

World Bank and GFDRR 2017. *Disaster Risk Finance Country Note: Armenia*

World Bank and GFDRR 2017. *DISASTER RISK FINANCE DIAGNOSTIC Georgia*

World Bank and GFDRR 2019. *Forum on Financial Protection against Natural Disasters in Central Asia* (focus on Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan)

World Bank and GFDRR, 2019. *Disaster Recovery Guidance Series. Social Protection and Disaster Recovery* Transparency International, 2014. *Public financial management topic guide*

World Bank and GFDRR 2020. *DISASTER RISK FINANCE DIAGNOSTIC Albania*










Wyatt, A., Barca, V. 2021. *Adaptive social protection and decentralisation: a conceptual framework*, Social Protection Approaches to COVID-19 Expert Advice Service (SPACE), DAI Global UK Ltd, United Kingdom.

## Subnational social protection systems

When available, data from DRR main national stakeholders:

Country	Sendai Focal Point	National Platform	Country profile on Prevention Web
 Albania	General Directorate of Civil Emergencies, Ministry of Defence of the Republic of Albania		<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Armenia	Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Armenia	Armenia National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Azerbaijan	The Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Republic of Azerbaijan		<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Belarus	Ministry for Emergency Situations of the Republic of Belarus	Belarus National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ministry of Security of Bosnia and Herzegovina	Bosnia and Herzegovina National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Bulgaria	Ministry of Interior (Bulgaria), Chief Directorate Fire Safety and Civil Protection, Ministry of Interior	Bulgaria National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Croatia	National Protection and Rescue Directorate, Croatia - government	Croatia National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Georgia	Emergency Management Service of Georgia		<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Greece	General Secretariat for Civil Protection of Greece	Greece National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Kazakhstan	Committee for emergency situations of the Ministry of Internal Affairs		<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>
 Kyrgyzstan	Ministry of Emergency Situations of the Kyrgyz Republic	Kyrgyzstan National Platform	<a href="#">COUNTRY PROFILE</a>

## Subnational social protection systems

Country	Sendai Focal Point	National Platform	Country profile on Prevention Web
 Montenegro	Ministry of Interior - Directorate for Emergency Situations, Ministry of Interior and Public Administration	Montenegro National Platform	COUNTRY PROFILE
 North Macedonia	Republic of North Macedonia - government	North Macedonia National Platform	COUNTRY PROFILE
 Romania	General Inspectorate for Emergency Situations, Romania - government		COUNTRY PROFILE
 Serbia	Sector for Emergency Management, Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Serbia, International Cooperation Protection and Rescue Sector, Ministry of Interior	Serbia National Platform	COUNTRY PROFILE
 Tajikistan	Committee of Emergency situations and Civil defence under the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan		COUNTRY PROFILE
 Turkey	Ministry Of Interior Disaster And Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD)	Turkey National Platform	COUNTRY PROFILE
 Turkmenistan			COUNTRY PROFILE
 Ukraine	State Emergency Service of Ukraine		COUNTRY PROFILE
 Uzbekistan			COUNTRY PROFILE

**Online sources:**

An extended pool of national laws and strategies, both in SP and DRR areas, often in local language and translated with standard online translation tools allowing to identify core characteristics.

[2021 World Population by Country \(worldpopulationreview.com\)](http://worldpopulationreview.com)

[2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development web.pdf \(un.org\)](https://un.org)

[Addis Ababa Action Agenda .:. Sustainable Development Knowledge Platform \(un.org\)](https://un.org)

[Central Asia | European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations \(europa.eu\)](https://europa.eu)

[Disaster risk reduction and disaster risk management \(preventionweb.net\)](https://preventionweb.net)

[Disaster risk reduction | UNICEF Europe and Central Asia](https://unicef.org)

[Districts of Turkmenistan - Wikipedia](https://wikipedia.org)

[Europe | European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations \(europa.eu\)](https://europa.eu)

[Europe and Central Asia | UNDRR](https://undrr.org)

[Glossary of Terms | Cash Learning Partnership](https://cashlearningpartnership.org)

[Human Subjects Research Overview | National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research \(nih.gov\)](https://nih.gov)

[ILO Social Protection Monitor: announced measures \(September 2021\) throughout the world](https://ilo.org)

[IMF Policy tracker \(July 2021\)](https://imf.org)

[OECD.org](https://oecd.org)

[Quality assurance research \(unicef-irc.org\)](https://unicef-irc.org)

[SNG-WOFI](https://sng-wofi.org)

[Social Protection Inter-Agency Cooperation Board, SPIAC-B | socialprotection.org](https://socialprotection.org)

[The Paris Agreement | UNFCCC](https://unfccc.org)

[The New Urban Agenda: Key Commitments – United Nations Sustainable Development](https://un.org)

This study was conducted by Mihai Magheru. The work was carried out between November 2021 and May 2022 in close cooperation with UNICEF colleagues.

**Disclaimer**

Any views, opinions and recommendations presented in this review are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of the Governments or UNICEF

UNICEF Europe and Central Asia Regional Office  
Route des Morillons 4, 9th Floor, CH 1211 Geneva  
Switzerland  
[www.unicef.org](http://www.unicef.org)