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Activities, tools and resources to support implementation of UNICEF’s 10 action areas in Social Protection
The infographic on the inside front cover represents the life course infographic in UNICEF’s Global Social Protection Programme Framework.
Activities, tools and resources to support implementation of UNICEF’s 10 action areas in Social Protection
UNICEF’s Social Protection Programme Framework outlines UNICEF’s conceptual approach to social protection, examines the components of child-sensitive social protection systems, and highlights the 10 key action areas in which UNICEF and partners work in collaboration with governments to develop these systems. This companion guidance provides a range of examples of activities across each of the action areas, a repository of tools and resources, UNICEF’s monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework, and annexes containing additional material.

All our work in social protection, except in exceptional humanitarian contexts, is undertaken in partnership with national governments and is geared towards their priorities. We also work closely with UN sister agencies as part of our commitment to deliver results together, as well as non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and national partners. Accordingly, while this document may be most useful primarily for UNICEF colleagues, it may also serve as a useful resource for our partners.

Considerable experience already exists in a number of UNICEF’s 10 key action areas, including UNICEF and non-UNICEF tools and guidance. While UNICEF’s Social Protection Programme Framework aims to outline the direction of UNICEF’s work in social protection for the foreseeable future, this document is likely to evolve as experience grows and new tools and approaches are developed, not least in the action areas that are emerging. Accordingly, this document will change over time and be complemented by more detailed guidance in different areas.
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Chapter 1

UNICEF’s action areas in supporting child-sensitive social protection systems
UNICEF's Social Protection Programme Framework outlines 10 action areas of UNICEF intervention across the components of a child-sensitive social protection system (presented in detail in Table 1.1). This companion guidance provides a range of activities, examples, tools and resources to support our work in social protection.

**Four key caveats in understanding our action areas**

For an organization that is as diverse as the over 100 countries we work in, articulating the key action areas of our work and the activities we undertake is challenging. As such, some caveats in using this document are:

* **A suggestion not a prescription.** The independence of UNICEF country offices in working with national governments to determine areas of focus that would most benefit children – which is at the heart of UNICEF’s innovation, leadership and results – may lead to a focus on social protection by UNICEF country offices not included in these ‘core’ action areas. While this package hopefully provides useful direction for many contexts, it should not be adhered to at the expense of what is in the best interests of children.

* **It's not all or nothing.** In many contexts, UNICEF country offices may focus on one or two action areas rather than all elements. In some contexts, work may be sequential (working with government and other partners to build a national cash transfer may make sense before focusing on integrating programmes), in others political opportunities or available capacity may make focusing on a single element most effective.

* **Different areas of work are at different stages of maturity.** UNICEF’s work on social protection has grown dramatically in the past 15 years. In some key action areas, such as child poverty analysis and building evidence (Action Area 1) and expanding and improving cash transfers for children (Action Area 2), our work is at scale within and across countries. In others, such as shock-responsive social protection (Action Area 9), the work is relatively new, but growing fast. In others, such as health insurance (Action Area 5), the work, despite its importance, remains nascent for the organization.

* **Social protection, and who works on it, can have blurry edges.** Many of us working on social protection find ourselves in conversations about what’s included in our understanding and definition of social protection – including the role of UNICEF and our Social Policy teams specifically. While this guidance aims to articulate key areas where we often work in social protection, country approaches to structuring the work will vary depending on the needs of children and existing government and office structures. Globally, the package aims to outline key areas where we need to provide coordinated support – including working across sections and divisions.

The cross-sectoral nature of working on social protection

Child-sensitive social protection aims to prevent and protect children and families against poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion, transforming lives including through improved outcomes in health, education, nutrition, WASH and child protection (see Chapter 1). This goal, and the key action areas identified in the Social Protection Programme Framework, form a broad cross-cutting agenda that can support outcomes for vulnerable children across sectors. While in most offices social policy teams and social protection specialists will take the lead in our work and engagement on social protection, achieving results often requires engagement and leadership across the sectors in which UNICEF and governments are commonly organized.

In some specific activities, engagement and collaboration of sectoral colleagues will be essential: this ranges from measuring and understanding multidimensional poverty and the financial barriers families face, to work on ‘cash plus’ and connecting families to information, knowledge and services, to the rapidly-emerging area of social protection in humanitarian and fragile contexts where UNICEF’s work on development and emergencies comes together.

Finally, while not included in these action areas, much of UNICEF’s ongoing work across sectors supports social protection. For example, ensuring access to quality services for those living in poverty or vulnerable to it is at the heart of what social protection is trying to achieve, as well as UNICEF’s work across sectors, especially work towards achieving universal health care, which is embedded in the definition of social protection of organizations such as the International Labour Organization (ILO).

Despite the importance of this collaboration, experience at all levels of the organization suggests that working cross-sectorally on social protection goals is not always simple. This companion guidance to the Social Protection Programme Framework hopes to outline how organizational collaboration can achieve results for children.
UNICEF’s 10 key action areas in social protection systems and their child-sensitivity

**A FOUNDATION OF EVIDENCE**

**Action Area 1:**
Child poverty analysis, impact evaluations and systems assessments

- **Child poverty measurement and analysis:** Routine national measurement analysis of child poverty and implications for social protection.
- **Impact evaluations:** Assess programme impacts using evaluation designs including randomized controlled trials (RCTs) and quasi-experimental designs to inform national programmes.
- **Social protection systems assessment:** Generate evidence on the strengths and weaknesses of how the social protection system works for children, including identifying gaps and options.

**POLICY, LEGISLATION AND FINANCING FOR SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS**

**Action Area 2:**
Policy and strategy development, coordination and financing

- **Strategies and policy frameworks:** Supporting national dialogue on social protection laws/policies, supporting the drafting and development of social protection strategies.
- **Coordination:** Assessing and supporting development of national capacities and coordination mechanisms. Support strengthening of lead ministries, and coordination development partner coordination.
- **Domestic financing:** Sector expenditure reviews, costings of programmes, fiscal space analysis and working with governments to increase resource allocation for social protection.

**PROGRAMME AREAS OF CHILD-SENSITIVE SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS**

**Social transfers**

**Action Area 3:**
Expanding and improving cash transfers for children

- **Building political support:** Advocacy and stakeholder engagement to build understanding, support and financing for cash transfer programmes.
- **Supporting programme design:** Including targeting, addressing exclusion, transfer size, frequency and links to other programmes.
- **Implementation:** Beneficiary identification, communication, payments systems, linkages to other services, programme monitoring and evaluation (M&E), and management information systems (MIS).

**Action Area 4:**
Connecting cash transfers to information, knowledge and services

- **Providing recipients with information, knowledge and connections to services:** Understanding the non-financial needs of beneficiaries, connecting cash transfer programmes to information, knowledge and relevant services, and building the evidence base on best practices.

**Social insurance**

**Action Area 5:**
Expanding and improving health insurance

- **Increasing coverage to poor and marginalized populations:** Advocacy for health insurance expansion, linking cash transfer beneficiaries with health insurance, and improving identification of poorest for non-contributory health insurance.
- **Defining health services included in health insurance:** Analysis of gaps in health coverage and defining minimum package of health services for child and maternal health to be included under universal health coverage.
Labour and jobs

Action Area 6: Supporting childcare and adolescent employability

- **Childcare**: Development of policy and normative frameworks, increasing convenience, affordability and quality of childcare and supporting family-friendly workplaces.
- **Adolescent learning and skills**: Support systems-based approaches to adolescent learning and skills for employability, improving quality and relevance of programmes and flexible approaches to education.

Social service workforce

Action Area 7: Strengthening the social welfare workforce and direct outreach to families

- **Building and strengthening the social welfare workforce**: Including clarifying roles and responsibilities, and expanding the workforce and training.
- **Family outreach and case management**: Integrate family outreach and support into social protection programmes.

Administration and integrated service delivery

Action Area 8: Strengthening integrated administrative systems

- **Improving integrated management information systems (MIS)**: Needs assessments, developing MIS, building technical capacity and developing grievance and redress mechanisms.
- **Improving coordination and service delivery at sub-national level**: Improving overall capacity of sub-national social protection system to plan, coordinate and implement social protection programmes in an integrated way.

Social protection in humanitarian, fragile and risk-prone contexts

Action Area 9: Strengthening national shock-responsive social protection systems

- **Evidence and analysis**: Inclusion of an analysis of risks and shocks in child poverty analysis, impact evaluations/M&E/learning, social protection costing exercises and system assessments.
- **Policy, strategy, legislation, coordination and financing**: Reviewing and adapting relevant policies for scale up; making budgetary provisions; contingency planning; and strengthening horizontal and vertical coordination between social protection, emergency response and other relevant local authorities.
- **Programmes and design features**: Reviewing and adjusting the mix of programmes and their design features, such as eligibility criteria and transfer values, to enhance coverage and provide adequate levels of assistance in times of crisis; inter-linkages and complementary services.
- **Administration and delivery systems**: Adjusting the administrative and delivery systems of routine social protection programmes so they can be leveraged fully, partially or in combination to respond to the needs of children and families affected by crisis.

Action Area 10: Linking humanitarian cash transfers to social protection systems

- **Designing humanitarian cash transfers to achieve sectoral outcomes**: Context analysis including children's needs, transfer design and coordinating with stakeholders.
- **Determining the role of national systems in implementation of a humanitarian cash transfer programme**: Ascertaining the compatibility of the national system, assessing capacity and choosing the most appropriate delivery option.
- **Using the national social protection system to implement a humanitarian cash transfer**: Delivery of humanitarian cash transfers through national or mixed (national/parallel systems). Building linkages with national approaches when using parallel systems.
Chapter 2

UNICEF’s activities and examples by action area
**Action Area 1: Child poverty and vulnerability analysis, impact evaluations and systems assessments**

Having an evidence-based understanding of the situation of child poverty is a foundation in building effective social protection programmes. Poverty and vulnerability analysis provides the basic understanding about the situation of children. Impact evaluations and systems assessments of social protection programmes identify how social protection for children and families can be improved. UNICEF, in collaboration with partners, brings unique advantages and experiences in assessing child poverty and vulnerability, and adapting social protection responses accordingly to meet the needs of children and their families.

**A. Child poverty and vulnerability analysis**

Despite inclusion in the SDGs, child poverty is not measured either monetarily or multidimensionally in many countries. UNICEF analysis suggests that where measurement is undertaken, it is often not utilized to inform the design of social protection policies and programmes. As outlined in Table 2.1 below, establishing routine measurement can take different paths depending on the country and current approaches and available data. Routine child poverty measurement and analysis – including vulnerability analysis of certain groups such as women, persons living with disabilities and adolescents and youth – can build awareness and understanding of the specific vulnerabilities of children and their families living in poverty, and prompt high-level discussions on the importance of social protection in addressing child poverty and vulnerabilities. Child poverty and vulnerability analysis should be conducted together with governments with the clear advocacy objective of influencing national policies and programmes, including social protection programmes.

**Table 2.1 Child poverty and vulnerability analysis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Build national support and capacity for</td>
<td>Building knowledge and technical capacity of key stakeholders on the importance of routine child poverty measurement, in line with SDG Goal 1 indicators. This involves support and buy-in of national authorities on the importance of addressing child poverty, including National Statistical Offices and ministries of Planning and Finance.</td>
<td>When child poverty is not on the national agenda.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>child poverty measurement and analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine child poverty measurement</td>
<td>National poverty lines are the mainstream reference point for poverty reduction, so ensuring that children are routinely reflected in these poverty lines is key.</td>
<td>Initiating discussions around survey development with key partners to set up progress. The issue can also be raised during survey analysis and results discussions. Use during moments where policy and statistical priorities are established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child poverty advocacy</td>
<td>Building public and political support for child poverty through media and social media, events and campaigns.</td>
<td>Around important policy moments – to influence broad support to address child poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity-focused child poverty analysis</td>
<td>Child poverty analysis with an equity focus to shed light on areas which deserve specific social protection programming attention. This can include sub-national disaggregation (provinces/regions/districts), urban-rural, sex, life-cycle (age), and other sub-groups as appropriate.</td>
<td>Ahead of social protection programme design or reform. For re-targeting of existing programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Although child poverty analysis and impact evaluations are powerful approaches and tools for assessing attribution, alone they are insufficient to fully inform UNICEF and other organizations. For fuller information and understanding of the various aspects of social protection system, broader analysis is required, including policy analysis, contextual studies, exploring integration of approaches and exploring complementarities across sectors— as outlined in the section on systems assessment and policy analysis below (see also Table 2.3).
B. Impact evaluations of social protection programmes

There are various purposes for evaluating a social protection programme which require different types of evaluation methods, and sometimes a combination of methods is required. A formative evaluation is often undertaken early on, during the roll-out of a social protection programme, to allow for early modifications and improvements; a summative evaluation can provide information on the effectiveness of a social protection programme; and a process evaluation can determine whether specific activities within a programme were implemented as intended. A commonly-used evaluation method in social protection is the impact evaluation, which assesses the changes which can be attributed to a social protection programme. It can be useful to carry out an impact evaluation when there is interest in knowing the effectiveness of a programme, for example ahead of plans of further roll-out. Various impact evaluation methods to consider are outlined below, listed in order of what is generally considered most rigorous to least rigorous method. As part of the Transfer Project, UNICEF is currently working on impact evaluations with partners, including the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), the University of North Carolina and various national governments.

### Table 2.2 Impact evaluations of social protection programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Evaluation Method</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randomized controlled experiments (RCTs)</td>
<td>Participation in a treatment and control group is randomly assigned, providing a high-level of confidence that differences observed at end-line between treatment group (offered treatment i.e. social protection) and control group (not receiving treatment) are due to the treatment/intervention and not due to systematic differences (e.g., in age, disability status etc.) that existed prior to programme implementation.</td>
<td>There are numerous rigid requirements which need to be in place for an RCT, including the randomization of treatment and having sufficient numbers of clusters (e.g. villages, schools etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression discontinuity design (a quasi-experimental method)</td>
<td>Regression discontinuity design constructs a comparison from a group closest to the eligibility cut-off among those who did not qualify for treatment. The most common application in social protection is a proxy means test for eligibility.</td>
<td>The limitation of this method is that it might potentially underestimate treatment impacts, for example proxy means test estimates are valid for households just below and just above the cut-off and are therefore likely to be not representative of impacts expected on much poorer households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching (a quasi-experimental method)</td>
<td>A counterfactual (what would have happened had the treatment group not received the intervention) is constructed by selecting a comparison group that is as similar as possible to the treatment group through matching methods (a set of statistical techniques).</td>
<td>Matching methods can be used to construct a comparison group from existing national household surveys. A limitation is if the treatment and comparison groups are systematically different based on observable (education, age, etc.) or unobservable characteristics (access to markets, risk preferences, etc.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observational study</td>
<td>This method compares households or individuals receiving a programme to those not receiving, without attempts to construct a comparison group (such as matching) and assumes that differences are due to the intervention. The most commonly used method is multivariate regressions.</td>
<td>A limitation of this method is the likelihood that participants and non-participants differ with respect to both observable (disability, education etc.) and unobservable characteristics (risk preferences, cognitive abilities etc.), and differences may be attributable to both programme impacts and systematic differences that existed prior to programme implementation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Impact Evaluation Method

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre/post</td>
<td>Uses the status of programme participants before the programme is implemented to make assumptions about what would have happened, had the treatment not occurred. Household/participant well-being is compared before and after an intervention, and it is assumed that any changes are attributable to the intervention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>Monitoring tracks implementation progress of an intervention, providing information on whether the intervention is on track or on budget. Monitoring data, used in combination with impact evaluation, can provide some supporting evidence from the operation side on in cases lack of (or limited) impacts are due to poor or problematic implementation of the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Impact evaluation of social protection programmes can be a powerful tool to understand if the programme is meeting objectives, and improving well-being for households, adults and children—for whom, by how much, and through which pathways. It also helps programmes understand where impacts are less positive than expected, which is an essential component informing decisions of how to improve future programme design. Rigorous impact evaluation with a collaborative team not only produces rich data on programme functioning, but also allows governments and stakeholders to talk confidently about the benefits of their programmes and take informed decisions about design, scale-up and financing.

### C. Social protection systems assessments and policy analysis

Assessing social protection systems for the impacts on children and families can highlight strengths and weaknesses in how systems are addressing child poverty and highlight what needs to change. A major step forward has been the development of Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessments (ISPA), including the development of a Core Diagnostic Instrument (CODI) which provides steps for the overall assessment of social protection programmes as part of the ISPA tools. Such assessments can include analysis of specific social protection programmes, such as benefit incidence analysis, or broader systems and diagnostics exercises to understand the policy environment, coverage of important programmes, overall fiscal space environment and macro-economic situation of the country. The performance of a country’s social protection system is assessed in CODI using the 10 following performance criteria: inclusiveness (including gender and disability considerations), adequacy, appropriateness, respect for rights and dignity, governance and institutional capacity, financial and fiscal stability, coherence and integration, responsiveness, cost-effectiveness and incentive compatibility.
## Table 2.3 Social protection systems assessment and policy analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of social protection programmes</td>
<td>Often considered the first step in the assessment, mapping provides information on how many programmes exist and the objective of each programme.</td>
<td>As a first step of systems assessment, mapping of social protection programmes provides information about existing programmes and their objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of national social protection policy framework</td>
<td>Assessment of basic features of the national social protection policy framework, including the legal framework and national social protection strategy, to assess if it's in line with the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), ILO standards and other international commitments made by governments. It is important to explore the basic features of the policy framework, including how policies are aligned with the social protection needs of the population, social protection policymaking, social protection policy implementation, public spending and financing, information dissemination and awareness-raising, and monitoring and evaluation systems.</td>
<td>Ahead of social protection reform processes and/or when major adjustments need to be made to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of programme design</td>
<td>Diagnosis of key design features of social protection programmes in the country, assessing gaps in terms of coverage, financing and adequacy of benefits and opportunities to improve, and reinforcing complementarities inside and outside the social protection system.</td>
<td>Ahead of social protection reform processes and when major adjustments need to be made to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit incidence analysis of social protection programmes</td>
<td>Assessment to understand the distribution of social protection benefits by quintiles, often focusing on the poorest 20 per cent, relative to the total benefits going to the rest of the population. Of particular interest is understanding the proportion of poor children receiving benefits relative to non-poor.</td>
<td>This can only be used with social protection administrative data combined with household data on income and consumption (MICS, for example, include a module on social protection making it possible to estimate benefit incidence by wealth quintile).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of programme implementation</td>
<td>Assessment of programme implementation to gauge effectiveness of eligibility process, information-sharing methods, delivery systems, and complaint and appeal mechanisms.</td>
<td>Ahead of social protection reform processes and when major adjustments need to be made to the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty simulations of a social protection programme</td>
<td>As part of programme implementation assessment to understand/estimate the impact of a particular social protection reform initiative (scaling up an existing programme, starting a new programme or subsidy reforms to redirect resources to cash transfers, for example) on poverty and budget.</td>
<td>As part of social protection reform processes to assess the feasibility of expansion or the setting up of a new programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: a number of these tools are used directly as part of analysis of social protection programmes, such as cash transfers, and are cross-referenced below.*

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

Benefit incidence analysis of social protection by poverty status (personal consumption expenditure or wealth quintile) is a powerful tool to understand the share of poor and non-poor beneficiaries. Further analysis of benefit incidence by different age groups, gender, health status (disability) and other social characteristics could provide information on the overall breakdown of poverty status by different groups accessing social protection. Also, social protection benefit incidence/coverage combined with multidimensional poverty analysis can provide powerful insights about the share of multidimensionally poor children in social protection. While benefit incidence analysis is a powerful tool, it has its own limitation. It should be complemented by other types of analysis to understand the behavioural, administrative, political and economic effects of social protection programmes.
Georgia: Child poverty analysis and the national cash transfer programme

In Georgia, a UNICEF-supported household panel survey was used to analyse the trend of monetary poverty by age group, rural-urban differences in child poverty, and poverty rates by number of children in the household. Analysis of the poverty rate by age group showed that child poverty was higher than the population's poverty rate regardless of the poverty thresholds (i.e. extreme poverty, general poverty or relative poverty) and highlighted the particularly high extreme poverty rate for children aged 5–14.

The study further assessed the coverage and impact of the flagship cash transfer programme, the Targeted Social Assistance (TSA). The analysis revealed that the TSA had higher coverage of households without children than the households with children, and the difference was particularly high in lower consumption deciles. For example, households with children had only half of the coverage rate compared to those without children in the second to fourth consumption decile. With regards to the impact on the poverty rate, the impact of the TSA was limited and spread across different age groups.

Consequently, such analysis combined with policy advocacy and partnership building resulted in the introduction of a remarkable child benefit scheme in May 2015 to the social protection system, planned to reach approximately 260,000 children from the poorest households nationwide. This new social transfer was a much-awaited change for UNICEF, who had been advocating for a reform of the social security system to make it more focused on children. UNICEF has continued to perform a biennial survey (Welfare Monitoring Survey) since 2009 and in-depth assessments for improvement of performance of social protection schemes. Five survey rounds occurred between 2009-2017. More recently, one of the outcomes of continued discussions with the Government was the announcement in December 2018 of a five-fold increase of child benefits from January 2019, covering over 130,000 children.

Advocacy efforts were supported by an analysis of child poverty and simulation of various policy options, both based on a unique panel household survey. Here are some of the outstanding features of the analysis and the process that contributed to the change in the social security system:

1. A national panel survey enabled analysis of trends in income poverty by age group, highlighting higher poverty rates among children.
2. Analysis of the existing social security programmes identified low coverage rate among households with children.
3. The study modelled the impact on child poverty if a child benefit was introduced and existing policies reformed.
4. The process and analysis was undertaken in close consultation with the government and in collaboration with other development partners.
5. After the establishment of the grant, support to implementation continues to maximize the impact for the most disadvantaged children.

This evidence-based advocacy approach may be a successful strategy for replication elsewhere for engaging with government partners and generating policy reform.

Action Area 2: Policy and strategy development, coordination and financing

The overall social protection system determines both the direction of social protection in a country, and how effective it is in addressing the needs of children and their families, with particularly focus on vulnerable groups. UNICEF’s work with partners in this area has focused on a few key areas, including development of social protection policies and strategies, supporting coordination across parts of government that deliver social protection, and strengthening domestic financing for social protection. This work has revealed two important aspects of a robust overall national social protection policy: (1) a social protection legal framework that establishes the legal rights of citizens and responsibilities of the state, guaranteeing provision of those rights; and (2) a social protection strategy that outlines how those rights will be achieved by highlighting key priorities, assigning roles and responsibilities of institutions, and establishing mechanisms for effective coordination and accountability with appropriate financing. Ensuring social protection systems are shock responsive cuts across all actions areas, and may be particularly important in developing policies and strategies, coordination and financing. These aspects are considered in more detail in Action Area 9.

A. Social protection policies and strategies

One of the key contributions of UNICEF is to work with governments and partners to facilitate national dialogues and to build political support for a rights-based national law or policy that reflects citizens’ aspirations and needs in the area of social protection. UNICEF engagement has generally focused on engaging citizens in national dialogues, facilitating debates and discussions, and supporting relevant ministries technically in drafting and reviewing the law. UNICEF’s engagement on social protection strategies, in close collaboration with development partners, has been to provide close technical support to governments in drafting and development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Activity</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>When to use</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating a national dialogue on social protection to develop a social protection policy/law</td>
<td>Facilitating an inclusive national dialogue to develop a policy/legal framework law that guarantees the fundamental human right to social protection in line with principles mentioned in the CRC, SDGs and social protection floor (SPF) to which countries have subscribed. This is often undertaken as part of an inter-agency process including with ILO, and includes stakeholders such as workers, employers and organizations for people with disabilities.</td>
<td>In the absence of a legal framework or social protection law to discuss and develop an overall social protection legal framework so that the right to social protection is legally binding and is seen as a right. Or when the law is weak on human rights principles and needs revision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating with parliamentarians and legislators for a social protection law</td>
<td>Evidence-based advocacy with legislators and policy makers in order to support development of a social protection law.</td>
<td>When there is a need to develop political support for enacting a law on social protection and/or when the existing law is weak and doesn’t provide guarantees to protect the rights of citizens to social protections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting drafting of the social protection law/legal framework</td>
<td>Identifying key gaps in social protection law that needs to be strengthened in line with CRC, social protection floor and other international conventions and commitments made by governments.</td>
<td>When countries are developing social protection law/legal framework to support them with technical and financial resources to have right expertise in drafting the law.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Civil society organizations (CSOs) can play a key role in advocating and lobbying for a rights-based approach to social protection. Often CSOs aren’t engaged in the process of national dialogues or they lack capacity to meaningfully influence the discourse on social protection. Before and during the national dialogues on social protection to engage CSOs and to build their capacity in order to meaningfully influence the process.

Supporting governments to develop a well-articulated national strategy on social protection in line with national social protection law (if it exists) and other international and national commitments such as rights guaranteed in the constitution, CRC, SDGs and SPF. Ideally it should be developed to elaborate social protection law/legal framework. In countries where a law doesn’t exist, a strategy could be a starting point, although without legal foundation, strategies may be less sustainable.

Developing a road map for implementation including a planning tool for results monitoring and strengthening organizational capacity to implement, particularly at the sub-national level. During and after social protection strategy is developed, to support the roll-out of national social protection strategy.

Many developing countries don’t have a social protection policy that guarantees the right to social protection in law. Such a legal foundation provides institutions with the legal mandate to provide social protection services as well as providing a foundation of sustainability that can see social protection programmes survive political change. Even where laws are in place it can make sense to revisit them as they may be limited in coverage and ambition, particularly for vulnerable groups such as minorities, displaced persons and refugees.

B. Coordination: Supporting coordination of social protection inside and outside of government

Coordination plays an important role in making sure social protection programmes are efficient and integrated, particularly if a country has many contributory and non-contributory social protection programmes under various ministries and departments. Coordination can be understood in two important ways: horizontal coordination among different departments and ministries, and vertical coordination between a central department and their decentralized operations in provinces and districts. Often institutional mechanisms, human capacity, bureaucratic processes and systems and tools are not aligned to coordinate a complex net of social protection instruments. Therefore, an assessment of institutional and coordination mechanisms becomes important to understand the bottlenecks that could be addressed to improve programme implementation efficiency and effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conduct institutional and organizational assessment including capacity, mandate, tools and mechanisms</td>
<td>Reviewing capacity of institutions responsible for social protection instruments to fulfil their mandate, including the tools and mechanisms to implement efficiently and effectively.</td>
<td>When organizational mandates and roles and responsibilities are not clear and when evaluations and assessments points towards lack of efficient coordination among social protection programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Domestic financing: Costing assessments and supporting identification of domestic finance

Domestic financing for social protection is an important and integral area of social protection systems to ensure sustainability and to guarantee in law the right to social protection. It's also important for expanding coverage to those who aren't covered to achieve universal social protection through an integrated social protection system. There are two essential elements of financing for social protection: (1) costing social protection programmes to understand how much it’s needed for expansion; and (2) fiscal space analysis to identify sources of funding for specific programmes/expansion. The overall objective of UNICEF’s engagement in public financing for social protection is to bring efficiency, effectiveness, equity and sustainability to social protection financing.

### Table 2.6 Costing assessments and supporting identification of domestic finance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To help government conduct sector expenditure review</td>
<td>Help government conduct sector expenditure review of social protection to identify any issues related to effectiveness and efficiency and overall management of social protection funding.</td>
<td>To help understand efficiency and effectiveness of government expenditure to improve overall management of social protection financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake costing of a proposed social protection intervention</td>
<td>To understand how much it will cost to start a new social protection intervention or expand an existing programme. This could be done for an entire programme or any specific intervention such as a cash plus component.</td>
<td>When expanding an existing programme to include more beneficiaries, expanding the programme geographically or adding a specific intervention such as a cash plus component.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To conduct micro-simulations to understand cost and impact on poverty of a social protection programme</td>
<td>Microsimulations help understand the cost of a new programme and its impact on poverty, comparing that with an existing social protection intervention that needs to be reformed such as fuel and food subsidies.</td>
<td>During social protection reforms process or when starting a new programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity | Description | When to use
--- | --- | ---
**Equity analysis of social protection spending** | To understand to what extent social protection expenditure is equitably distributed among children living in the poorest governorates, districts and sub-districts or distributional impact on poor versus non-poor. | As part of social protection system assessments and evaluation. 

**Conducting fiscal space analysis for social protection** | Once costing is done to identify sources of funding and financing options for the social protection intervention. | When designing a new programme or scaling up an existing pilot programme nationally. 

**Fiscal incidence analysis of alternative forms of financing social protection** | To understand the combined distributional effect of proposed changes in social protection and taxation on children and households. | When changes to taxation are proposed to finance government expenditure, including social protection. 

**Translating fiscal space analysis to resource allocation to social protection** | Using fiscal space analysis to advocate and lobby with legislators and Ministry of Finance for increase or re-allocation of resources to social protection programmes. | After costing and fiscal space analysis to advocate for increase in resources to social protection. 

**Preparation of social protection budgets and financing plans** | Engaging with social protection line ministries to support the preparation of high-quality evidence-based budgets and medium-term expenditure submissions. | At budget preparation stage, as part of sector working groups. 

**Participatory preparation of sub-national social protection plans and budgets** | Developing local social service needs assessments and supporting costing and local budgeting for these services. | When local governments have responsibility for social services. 

**Implementing efficiency measures to support reallocation of resources** | Engaging with social protection implementation agencies to reduce costs of social protection administration processes such as targeting or payments. | When sector expenditure reviews identify inefficiencies and potential for reducing costs without impacting on quality of services. 

**Reviewing geographical allocation formula for social protection spending** | Reviewing and redesigning criteria for territorial allocation of social protection resources to improve the equity of social protection spending. | When geographical targeting is resulting in inequitable allocation of social protection resources. 

**Supporting parliamentary or citizens’ budget hearings on social protection** | Supporting sharing of social protection budgets and expenditure information with parliamentary committees and citizens groups to improve understanding of social protection spending and strengthen accountability. | During parliamentary budget hearings or established citizens budget processes. 

---

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

Fiscal space analysis is an important area of work and of great importance for social protection financing. One of the newer areas of interest among the social protection community is the net effect of taxation and transfers on poverty rates, particularly on the poor population. Fiscal space analysis is used to understand how tax and transfer interact to shape the income/wealth distribution. This will help practitioners understand how effective overall fiscal policies are in addressing poverty, what policy changes (direct taxation versus indirect) need to happen to address poverty, and why it matters – not just through transfers but also by introducing progressive taxation.
**Tunisia: Micro-simulation to demonstrate universal child benefit (UCB) cost-efficiency and impact on poverty**

Since Tunisia’s ‘Arab Spring’ revolution in 2011 established a democratic government after years of dictatorship, there has been strong pressure to improve social protection in the country. The Government currently spends about 1.1 per cent of GDP on social protection, considerably less than most middle-income countries. Equally, a serious economic crisis is eroding living standards and driving the Government to reduce public debt and the deficit in public finances, notably by phasing out energy and food subsidies, which cost 4 per cent of GDP (2018). Although these are poorly targeted, subsidy removal reduces household consumption.

Children are particularly vulnerable in this context, as child poverty (21.1 per cent in 2016) is almost twice as high as adult poverty (12.8 per cent). The current social protection system gives little attention to children, and child poverty is as high as 40 per cent in the more remote, deprived western regions.

Consequently, UNICEF has been working with the Ministry of Social Affairs and the Ministry of Finance to develop policy proposals for establishing a social protection floor (SPF) with special emphasis on protecting and advancing the well-being of children. After initial analysis by the International Poverty Centre (IPC), which found that a universal child benefit (UCB) would be both more progressive and more efficient than subsidies, UNICEF worked with Oxford Policy Management (OPM) and the Partnership for Economic Policy (PEP) to further analyse the cost, impacts, cost-effectiveness, benefit incidence and fiscal feasibility of a UCB. The study found that:

- A UCB would be highly progressive, with the poorest decile receiving about 15 per cent of the benefits, compared with 6 per cent for the richest decile. By contrast, energy subsidies tend to benefit richer households, while the benefit incidence of food subsidies is neutral.
- A grant of about 350 dinars a year (US$10 a month) per child would have substantial positive impacts and would be sufficient to compensate fully for the negative effects of the elimination of energy subsidies on child poverty.
- A UCB would be highly cost-effective. A full-scale implementation of a UCB for all children aged 0-17 would cost only 0.89 per cent of GDP in 2023, compared with the cost of 2.5 per cent of GDP for energy subsidies alone in 2018.
- The cost of achieving a 1 percentage point reduction of the child poverty headcount is less through the UCB than through the existing poverty-targeted social assistance programme, the National Support Programme for Needy Families (PNAFN). This is partly because the latter focuses on households that tend not to have children, but also due to serious inclusion and exclusion errors in its poverty targeting.
- A UCB is affordable, despite tight fiscal space. There will be a net gain of about 2.5 percentage points (of GDP) in fiscal space between 2018-2023, resulting mainly from the phasing out of energy subsidies, reductions in the public salary bill, and increased public revenue. The UCB would require 37 per cent of this additional fiscal space in 2023.

The aim is to launch the quasi-UCB in 2020/21 with an initial focus on younger children (aged 0-5), with a view to later scale up. UNICEF has argued that this would be money well spent, owing to cost-effectiveness and progressivity, but also because it would help to realize child rights, bolster investment in human capital development during the crucial childhood years, offset the negative effects of subsidy removal, and contribute to social cohesion during a period of instability.

UNICEF, with technical assistance from OPM, is now supporting the preparation of an orientation note for the Council of Ministers on the establishment of the SPF, including the launching of the UCB.

**Action Area 3: Expanding and improving cash transfers for children**

Cash transfers are becoming increasingly important among different types of social protection programme because of their proven impacts across dimensions of child poverty, particularly when appropriately designed. This is a crucial intervention for children, and UNICEF has built significant experience in both building nascent cash transfer systems and strengthening those already in place, focusing on the ‘upstream’ elements of building political support and national financing as well as key aspects of design such as targeting approaches, adequacy of transfers and insuring inclusion of the most disadvantaged children and their families, with particular focus on gender, disability and adolescence. In some circumstances, UNICEF also supports implementation including beneficiary identification, cash delivery, MIS and evaluation. Flagship cash transfer programmes that are appropriately designed are often at the core of shock-responsive social protection systems. Both building and, where possible, using these systems are considered in Action Areas 9 and 10.

**A. Building political support**

UNICEF works to build a common understanding of the value of cash transfer programmes in order to increase national support and mobilize resources to launch or build sustainable programmes at scale. Advocacy among decision makers and the public is at the heart of this area.

**Table 2.7 Building political support**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for new, expanded or improved cash transfers</td>
<td>To increase understanding of both policy makers and the public, UNICEF can play a crucial role in undertaking policy and/or public advocacy to increase awareness and build support for social protection.</td>
<td>Where there is room to increase information on benefits of cash transfers and support among policy makers and public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting development of institutional frameworks</td>
<td>Supporting the development of national strategies, policies or acts related to social protection and cash transfers to formalize mid-term and long-term commitments.</td>
<td>Where there is no legal or policy foundation to outline a sustainable approach for cash transfers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging in budgetary frameworks and processes</td>
<td>Mobilizing domestic resources to achieve sustainable funding mechanisms for cash transfers.</td>
<td>Where national funding for cash transfers is not included in existing budget frameworks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyzing fiscal space to finance cash transfers</td>
<td>Looking at the domestic budget profile or specific revenue sources to finance the introduction, expansion or improvement of cash transfers.</td>
<td>Where there are concerns about the available fiscal space for social protection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

There is growing evidence that cash transfers not only have protective effects but promote productivity. These can be very helpful considerations when working with governments that have a strong focus on addressing poverty through economic growth and increased productivity while making sure that a universal approach to social protection is adopted to expand coverage. However, while the evidence shows cash transfers should be considered a productive rather than a consumptive investment, there should be caution in setting cash transfers up in comparison to investments such as electrification or improving roads that have economic growth as their primary goal.
B. Supporting programme design of cash transfer programmes

Often based on understanding the status quo and the gaps or weaknesses of current programmes, UNICEF works with governments to help think through how a new programme could be designed or existing programmes adjusted to better address child poverty and vulnerability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Simulating the potential poverty impact of different cash transfer designs</td>
<td>Run microsimulations to understand the impact of introducing, expanding or improving cash transfers for children and their families.</td>
<td>When there is/could be government interest in how new approaches could address child poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimating the impacts of major policy reforms (micro-macro simulation)</td>
<td>Run micro-macro simulations to identify potential impacts of major policy reforms (such as fuel subsidy reform) on children and how cash transfers could be used to mitigate potential negative impacts or shocks.</td>
<td>Where there is a major policy reform planned or underway that the analysis could feed into.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costing different design options</td>
<td>Estimating the potential programme and operational cost of introduction/expansion or improvement of cash transfers.</td>
<td>Where costs of a new approach are unknown or could be a barrier to moving forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical assistance on programme design</td>
<td>Making recommendations about programme design elements – including targeting, eligibility, transfer size, frequency and grievance mechanisms – to maximize impacts on children and families.</td>
<td>When a programme is being designed or re-designed. This area involves a range of activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting development of MIS and beneficiary databases</td>
<td>Ensure inclusion or where necessary support the overall development of key child indicators for cash programmes.</td>
<td>As part of design of cash transfer programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

As a rights-based organization with a keen focus on reaching the most disadvantaged children and families living in poverty, vulnerable groups who are excluded from cash transfer programmes are a major concern. A growing body of evidence – including from the World Bank and ILO and Development Pathways – is showing that targeted programmes can miss upwards of 50 per cent of their intended beneficiaries. Targeted programmes may also be missing those who sit just above the poverty line, yet for whom financial barriers are still preventing the realization of their rights. This may be a key area of engagement for UNICEF.

C. Support to implementation

As well as supporting the analysis and design of cash transfers and the policy engagement and advocacy needed to achieve change, in many contexts UNICEF works directly with governments to support the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of cash transfer programmes. This includes a range of work such as beneficiary identification, programme communication, payments systems, linkages to other services, M&E and MIS, grievance and redressal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providing technical support to implementation</td>
<td>Assisting the programme roll-out at various stages, such as communication with beneficiaries, registration, using tools such as MIS or payment mechanisms.</td>
<td>When national partners need additional support for effective implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building central and local capacity for implementation</td>
<td>Providing training, operational manuals or equipment to operationalize cash transfer programmes.</td>
<td>Ideally before roll-out of implementation, but if capacity remains a challenge may have to happen after.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modelling implementation through a pilot project</td>
<td>Directly financing and managing small-scale programmes to build evidence of scalability and impact of cash transfers where no national programmes exist.</td>
<td>Where there is a realistic pathway for a demonstration pilot to lead to scale up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening monitoring and accountability mechanisms</td>
<td>Setting up monitoring systems and building accountability mechanisms, such as grievance mechanisms or audits, to ensure vulnerable children and families are receiving their entitlements.</td>
<td>Starting with implementation design, but may need to be done retroactively where gaps remain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracking the flow of money</td>
<td>Using Public Expenditure Tracking Survey (PETS) to track the flow of money from central level to household level to identify any bottlenecks in delivery or concerns of leakages.</td>
<td>After programme implementation, where there are concerns that financial flows may not be efficiently moving through the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating the implementation and impact on children</td>
<td>Conducting impact evaluations to rigorously identify the impact of cash transfers on children and families and/or evaluation of the implementation to identify areas for improvement.</td>
<td>During programme design and where there has not been a recent evaluation of programme impacts or effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zambia: Engaging in budget frameworks to expand cash transfers

The Social Cash Transfer (SCT) programme in Zambia started as a pilot project in 2003, targeting 159 households. After its inception, it followed a cautious expansion process, until in 2013 the government, elected on a pro-poor agenda, increased the funding by 700 per cent (Michelo 2015). In 2016, the SCT programme covered about 8 per cent of the population, representing 18 per cent of Zambia’s extreme poor. The programme continued its rapid expansion, and between 2015 and 2016 alone, coverage increased from 185,000 households to 239,000 households.

Driven by stubbornly-high levels of poverty and the deteriorating economic situation in 2015 and 2016, Zambia’s new government, which came into power after the August 2016 elections, formulated an economic reform programme, with social protection recognized as one of the five pillars of this programme. Government priorities had already realized a reduction of fuel subsidies and an increase in the budget for social protection.

In this important time period, UNICEF Zambia and partners engaged in advocacy – led by DFID and UNICEF – for an increased budget allocation to the SCT in the medium-term expenditure framework. UNICEF’s role during this process included the development of caseload and budget projections, contracting a high-level consultant for government engagement and dialogue, and consultations with relevant stakeholders (such as the Ministry of Finance, CSOs and development partners).

Additionally, UNICEF Zambia released the first edition of a series of annual social sector budget briefs. The briefs were widely circulated and provided the analytical underpinning for development partnership and intra-government advocacy for more efficient social protection spending. The sectoral analysis on social protection provided a snapshot of the trend over recent years and comparison of allocation for various transfers and subsidies.

Finally, it is important to mention the role of the programme’s impact evaluation, which contributed to policy-makers deciding to increase the programme’s budget for 2017. All of the accumulated work and processes contributed to a budget increase for the programme from US$30.2 million per year in 2016 to US$55.2 million in 2017.

However, significant challenges remain, including reported irregularities in the programme that led to suspension of support from DFID. The programme is responding through improved accountability processes including establishing grievance and redressal mechanisms to help highlight payment irregularities.

Sources: UNICEF Zambia; Michelo, Stanfield, ‘Social Cash Transfer Scale-up for Zambia’, International Policy Centre for Inclusive Growth One Pager, no. 287, IPC-IG, Brasilia, Brazil, April 2015.
Action Area 4: Connecting cash transfers to information, knowledge and services

While cash transfers can have huge impacts on children’s lives, not all barriers faced by families are financial, and cash transfers can be more effective when combined with appropriate information and knowledge for recipients, as well as connecting recipients to other services and programmes. Many practitioners use the term ‘cash plus’ to define linking social protection interventions with other sectors and outcomes (although it’s important to note in some contexts cash may not be the additional element added to comprehensive social protection programmes for children). UNICEF is well placed to support governments and partners in this area given both our engagement with cash transfer programmes and our expertise in communication for development and work across sectors, and work on connecting cash to information, knowledge and services requires close engagement between social protection and sectoral experts.

A. Providing information and knowledge to recipients and connections to services

The term ‘cash plus’ encompasses a wide range of complimentary activities and linkages, with the aim of integrating programmes across sectors to address different dimensions of poverty and more effectively support poor and vulnerable families, resulting in synergistic impacts. Key aspects of cash plus programming include providing information and knowledge at the point of cash delivery, information sharing to support behavioural change, and connections to other services.

### Table 2.10 Providing information and knowledge to recipients and connections to services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding the context and challenges facing beneficiaries</td>
<td>For cash plus approaches to work best, it is important to understand the evidence on financial and non-financial barriers to accessing services, vulnerability assessments, cultural barriers and other important aspects.</td>
<td>At the beginning of setting up a cash plus component or designing a cash transfer programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of beneficiaries on key aspects of non-financial barriers to services such as cultural practices, childcare, nutritional practices etc.</td>
<td>Depending on what types of cash plus approach is needed, recipients should be provided with training sessions and information on each aspect to address non-financial barriers to services and ensure the meaningful impact of cash transfers.</td>
<td>As part of social protection programme implementation in close coordination with other sectors and programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and linkages to other sectoral programmes and services</td>
<td>Often cash transfer beneficiaries lack information about what kind of sectoral services and programmes are available. Providing information and developing mechanisms to link beneficiaries with information can improve results and outcomes for children and families. Some critical programmes may not be widely communicated due to sensitivities (such as sexual reproductive health and rights, HIV, legal rights and protection services, birth registration, vaccination information) but access to these areas are essential for beneficiaries due to their poverty and marginalization.</td>
<td>As part of social protection programme implementation at the point of cash delivery, beneficiaries could be provided information about their rights and where and how they can access other critical programmes and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and linkages to other social protection programmes</td>
<td>Utilizing mapping of social protection to develop a cross-referral mechanism to assign beneficiaries to the appropriate programmes with fee waivers where appropriate through either single window operation or other mechanisms.</td>
<td>During implementation of cash transfer programmes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While significant evidence shows the impacts of cash transfers on a range of deprivations – including access to health and education, impact on food consumption and diversity of consumed food – there are less clear results on nutritional outcomes for children. In some areas the key barrier may not be a lack of financial resources, and therefore linking cash to information, knowledge and services might prove a more effective way to improve outcomes. However, evidence of what works in what areas is much more sparse that the wealth of evaluations on cash transfers. Building evaluations and operational research into emerging ‘cash plus’ programmes could not only help guide national programmes but build a global knowledge base to encourage effective programming for poor and vulnerable families.

Tanzania: ‘Cash plus’ (integrated social protection) model on adolescent transitions

In 2015, it was estimated that 17.5 million Tanzanians were aged between 15 and 34 years; a number expected to double by 2035. Therefore, investments made today will largely determine whether Tanzania is able to translate its demographic dividend into accelerated economic growth, peace and stability, or whether the dividend will result in irreversible loss of opportunity. Youth development is prominent in Tanzania’s National Five-Year Development Plan (2016/17–2020/21). According to a recent study, investment in the capabilities of adolescents related to health and education in resource-poor settings could generate large economic and social returns.

However, the dividend is not automatic, and, despite this incredible potential, adolescents in Tanzania face many risks related to poverty, early pregnancy and marriage, violence, HIV, and lack of livelihood opportunities. It is also during adolescence that gendered norms within socio-cultural environments play an increasingly important role in adolescents’ lives, shaping their current and future opportunities. The evidence described above, taken together with Tanzania’s recent widespread expansion of social protection programming, highlights the current opportunity to examine the potential for social protection and complementary programming to facilitate safe transitions and maximize youth future productivity and well-being.

The Productive Social Safety Net programme (PSSN - TASAF III) was officially launched in August 2012, with components including: a national safety net incorporating transfers linked to participation in public works and adherence to co-responsibilities; enhancement of livelihoods and increase in beneficiaries’ incomes; targeted development of infrastructure (education, health, water); and capacity-building to ensure adequate programme implementation.

The cash plus model complements the PSSN with a package of adolescent-focused interventions to strengthen productive, human and health capital. The skills training is a ten-week course, including the following components:

- Livelihood skills: opportunity and obstacles to livelihood activities for adolescents;
- Business concepts: developing business ideas, self-evaluation and success factors in personal economic development;
- Generating business ideas: learning from role models in the community;
- Using SWOT (‘strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats’) analysis: analyzing business ideas with SWOT analysis;
- Developing a simple business plan: filling out simple business plan forms;
- Record keeping: understanding simple business record keeping;
- Saving for business: how to establish micro-savings and loan groups;
- Responsibilities of an entrepreneur: legal aspects of business, insurance and licenses;
- Long-term life/business plans: setting career goals and long-term business plans.

Following the training, adolescents will have access to mentoring and coaching, vocational training and opportunities to apply for a productive grant.
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**Action Area 5: Expanding and improving health insurance**

Social insurance includes contributory programmes which cover risks associated with sickness, old age and unemployment, all of which can have very significant implications for children. For UNICEF, the main area of contribution to social insurance programmes is around health insurance. While UNICEF’s work in the area is relatively limited, a review revealed significant examples, including work in the Philippines on insurance packages for children including premature newborns and children with disabilities. Further, there has been a growing interest from partner governments on the potential of health insurance to support universal health coverage. This is an emerging area for UNICEF, with work growing with partners across the following activities:

A. **Increasing insurance coverage of poor and marginalized populations**

Globally, healthcare costs push 100 million people into extreme poverty due to out of pocket costs and lack of non-contributory health insurance or universal health coverage, according to the WHO. This has significant implications for child health and growth, and the future economic development of a country. Over recent years UNICEF has expanded its engagement in this area of work, focusing particularly on increasing health insurance coverage for the poor and marginalized. Below are some of the activities that reflects UNICEF’s work in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of financial barriers to accessing health services</td>
<td>Understanding and gathering evidence on out-of-pocket expenditure to access health services can be used to advocate for provision of non-contributory health insurance for poor households.</td>
<td>As part of child poverty and deprivation analysis in order to understand how financial barriers play a role in accessing health services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for extension of health insurance to poor households</td>
<td>Using analysis of financial barriers to health services and impact of poor health on poverty and household well-being to advocate for provision of non-contributory health insurance to poor children and households.</td>
<td>Working with Ministry of Health, Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and CSOs under the auspices of the Social Protection Coordination Body to advocate for extension of non-contributory health insurance to poor families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking cash transfer beneficiaries to non-contributory health insurance</td>
<td>Supporting poor families who are benefiting from cash transfers programmes to access non-contributory health insurance programmes if available.</td>
<td>During the design of cash transfer programmes and across referral mechanisms to link cash transfer beneficiaries to non-contributory health insurance for poor households.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting government in identification of beneficiaries for health insurance</td>
<td>Supporting government in defining selection criteria and developing assessment tools for identification of beneficiaries for non-contributory health insurance.</td>
<td>During implementation of health insurance schemes to identify beneficiaries for the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Supporting governments to define the package of health services under universal health coverage

SDG 3.8 calls for universal health coverage, including financial risk protection, access to quality essential healthcare services and access to safe, effective, quality and affordable essential medicines and vaccines for all. Universal health coverage is about providing a minimum set of good quality health services that address the most significant causes of disease and death and expand coverage to all those who need it throughout the life course. While the role of UNICEF is evolving depending on each country context, UNICEF can significantly contribute to help countries define the minimum package of services included in health insurance provision and that have significant impact for children and their well-being.

**Table 2.12** Supporting governments to define the package of health services under universal health coverage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of gaps in health coverage for poor children and households</td>
<td>Analyzing gaps in health insurance coverage and free health services available particularly for poor families or those who don’t have health insurance.</td>
<td>When countries face challenges in terms of health coverage, particularly for the poor and marginalized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help governments define basic health services for children and families</td>
<td>Supporting governments in defining a minimum package of free health services that should be available, including for children, particularly for those who don’t have health insurance.</td>
<td>When governments need help in defining and articulating what health services should be made available free of cost for all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocating for universal provision of basic health services for children and families</td>
<td>Using evidence to advocate for free universal health coverage to health services that have an impact on child health.</td>
<td>Using evidence to influence key policy makers in government and parliament while working with key partners such as WHO, CSOs and others.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

**Supporting public financing of non-contributory health insurance:** Contributory and non-contributory health insurance draw from the same fiscal space and therefore a health insurance model that takes into consideration both contributory and non-contributory insurance programmes to include the poor and marginalized is central to extending coverage. Leveraging UNICEF’s work on public financing for children and extending support to governments on financing for non-contributory health insurance builds on UNICEF’s strength in public financing as well as extending coverage for poor and vulnerable people.
Mali: Expansion of non-contributory health insurance for poor households

While Mali has made significant economic progress in recent years, poverty remains high and child-related indicators are below the averages of sub-Saharan Africa. The social protection system is far from reaching the coverage necessary to meet the needs of children. One of the human development and social protection challenges in Mali is lack of access to essential healthcare for poor families and their children. Only 23 per cent of children under 5 years of age with suspected pneumonia were taken to a health provider in 2015.

To address this deficiency, UNICEF became the first partner to support the Government to implement the programme *Régime d'Assistance Médicale* (RAMED) in 2015. The programme implementation started in Mopti and Sikasso regions. RAMED is a national programme funded by the Government. It is a non-contributory health insurance programme that provides access to free health care to the most disadvantaged and vulnerable segments of the society. The services include a full healthcare package including consultations, outpatient care (e.g. laboratory testing, medical analysis), hospitalizations, medicines and other medical expenses, and maternal health. Eligibility for the programme is granted not only to Malians from the poorest households without healthcare coverage, but also to the homeless population, residents of charitable institutions, orphanages, institutions for rehabilitation and certain categories of prisoners.

In 2018, the number of beneficiaries in Mopti and Sikasso who received medical services through RAMED increased sharply to 49,217 compared to only 5,287 in 2015. This included 15,289 children in the two regions in the last year. This result has been made possible through intensification of interventions in Mopti and Sikasso regions, as well as activities such as the setting up of village committees and social surveys to identify beneficiaries. In 2018, UNICEF also supported expansion of RAMED programme to Kayes region. UNICEF’s support to the programme includes building a real data collection system for the identification of beneficiaries (e.g. supply of tablets and smartphones, vehicles), and capacity-building of government at national and sub-regional levels to provide technical, logistical and financial support to sub-regional and local government divisions in charge of social protection. UNICEF ensured an effective coordination between health facilities and the National Health Assistance Agency to deliver free healthcare to the selected beneficiaries, through providing information on eligibility criteria and the process for accessing free healthcare.

In 2018, UNICEF also worked towards developing a single registry to foster better integration of social protection programmes (particularly the non-contributive ones such as *Jigisemejiri*, RAMED etc) and avoid duplication among the different actors and government departments providing social protection services. The pilot phase of the single registry was launched with the initial data of 2,000 beneficiaries. The latest revision of the registry contains around 400,000 registered beneficiaries of various non-contributive social protection programmes. UNICEF support was critical in facilitating registration of over 220,000 beneficiaries into the ANAM database (RAMED). UNICEF continues to provide technical assistance to deliver data management systems, train relevant personnel (not only in health facilities, but also the executive management of government structures, such as ANAM) and is actively engaged in technical and steering committees.
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While labour market interventions are a core aspect of social protection for many organizations, they have not typically been part of the set of UNICEF’s core social protection work. However, UNICEF’s new Strategic Plan stresses the importance of supporting children and adolescents to develop skills to improve young people’s employability and to address gender inequalities in the workforce, including the stigma and impact of teenage pregnancy on adolescent girls. Additionally, in early childhood UNICEF has an important role to play in supporting quality childcare, not only for child development but to facilitate parental employment. Community-based childcare in particular offers a platform not only for improving child outcomes but also for increasing women’s empowerment. These areas are emerging as a crucial global challenge to which UNICEF can meaningfully contribute.

A. Expanding the quality and affordability of childcare for young children

Quality childcare plays a fundamental role in freeing parents and caregivers to enter employment and improving child outcomes. As most caregivers are mothers, inclusive, affordable, quality childcare has the double effects of: 1) releasing mothers from the burden of child care responsibility; and 2) promoting women’s economic empowerment by allowing them to work and by creating employment opportunities in childcare centres. There is a triple effect, when we take into consideration the benefits for the developing child. Despite social protection’s focus on reducing poverty and vulnerability, it has been largely ‘care-blind’. UNICEF’s vision for childcare focuses on convenience, affordability and quality enhancement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support the development of national policy and normative frameworks that include child care</td>
<td>National policy, normative and financial frameworks on childcare, including key considerations of availability, affordability and quality, form the foundation of a national childcare system. Policies and normative and financial framework and costed implementation plans can be linked to the development of curriculum and standards of childcare centres. (Important areas to include in policies, frameworks and standards are outlined in more detail in activities below).</td>
<td>During policy development, when no such policy for framework is in place, or does not sufficiently include relevant areas. Working towards developing such a policy or framework can be an effective ‘way in’ in discussing the important of child care with policy makers and find the financial space for implementing such policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing the convenience of childcare centres</td>
<td>Convenience of childcare includes considerations of availability, location and opening hours that support working families in both private and public sectors. Work can include national regulations and oversight, developing community-based approaches to childcare with government, as well as support and advocacy within the private sector.</td>
<td>When there are a lack of convenient childcare options for families, either in terms of sufficient availability, location of centres or opening hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the affordability of childcare centres</td>
<td>There are a range of options for addressing the affordability of childcare centres, including ensuring benefits (such as cash transfers) consider childcare costs, childcare vouchers and fee waivers for low-income families (where targeting can be effectively undertaken) and subsidised employer provision in the private sector.</td>
<td>When financial barriers are an impediment to accessing child care. Comparing costs of childcare with the potential earnings of a working mother, father or caregiver is a useful indicator of affordability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>When to use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the quality of childcare centres</td>
<td>Support standards and oversight of key quality considerations, including staff-to-child ratios; qualifications and training of providers with decent pay and conditions; comfortable, attractive physical premises; adequate space; safety and security; a curriculum that features rich content, diverse learning activities and pedagogic methods; and a stimulating environment.</td>
<td>Where there are issues of quality in key areas in either public or private childcare provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support family-friendly workplaces</td>
<td>Support the development and implementation of national policy development and implementation to ease work-family conflicts, and to facilitate both mothers’ continued engagement in work and children's holistic development. This includes areas such as maternity leave and breastfeeding provisions, paternity and parental leave and social security entitlements.</td>
<td>Where policies are either not in place or not being implemented to support family-friendly workplaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocate for greater sharing of childcare responsibilities between mothers and fathers</td>
<td>Promote greater sharing of childcare responsibilities between mothers and fathers. Paid parental leave is a bedrock in these efforts, which can also include public advocacy and partnering with CSOs and educational institutions.</td>
<td>When care responsibilities are delineated along gender lines, creating an environment where ability of mothers to work outside the home is curtailed and children do not fully benefit from paternal care.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

UNICEF is undertaking a major effort to engage with the private sector in supporting the development of family-friendly workplaces. This extends beyond child labour, to also focus on issues such as the impacts on children caused by the working and living conditions of parents, and as members of the community and environment in which businesses operate. Key programmatic concerns relate to breastfeeding and early childhood development (ECD) in the workplace, WASH4Work, child protection concerns, maternal health and nutrition, living conditions and access to basic services for working families. It also touches on the themes of urbanization, migration, climate and adolescence. Given global workforces, there is potential to reach an estimated one billion children by simply changing business action for workers and their families around the world – especially marginalized families who are often on the margins of poverty and frequently discriminated against. There is therefore a huge opportunity for business action, influence and leverage to deliver dramatic results for children and contribute to the achievement of UNICEF programmatic results and the SDGs.
B. Supporting adolescent employability

Skills development and preparing young people for life and work is emerging as a core area of UNICEF’s work in supporting and strengthening social protection. UNICEF has a long history in supporting children’s right to education, and this support is now being expanded to focus on the second decade of life and adolescent development. Key areas of work include increasing and sustaining access to quality education for adolescents; improving learning outcomes; increasing access to skills development; and facilitating employability and entrepreneurship, particularly for the most disadvantaged. Across these areas, UNICEF has a strong focus on improving gender equality, reaching girls and boys to address their particular needs and recognizing the significant challenges adolescent girls often face in terms of empowerment and accessing economic opportunities. UNICEF’s work in support of adolescent employability will always ensure that programmes do not violate provisions of international conventions aimed at protecting children’s rights, including hours of work, hazardous work and any form of child labour.

### Table 2.14  Supporting adolescent employability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supporting systems-based approaches to skills development</td>
<td>Strengthen the development, budgeting and implementation of skills-development interventions embedded in gender-responsive education sector plans and budgets.</td>
<td>In preparation and during development of sector plans in education, and relevant moments of the budget cycle. Any project should be sustainable and align to government plans and policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen data systems to track adolescent learning</td>
<td>Strengthen Education Management Information Systems (EMIS), providing disaggregated data and ensuring transparency, including providing information to beneficiaries.</td>
<td>During review of EMIS systems or indicators, during joint sector reviews, in design of programmes to improve student learning and/or school accountability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve quality and relevance of skill development programmes</td>
<td>Engage the private sector in curriculum design, materials and accreditation of skills training programmes. Ensure technical and vocational skills training includes a mix of foundational, transferable and job-specific skills and that teaching is both classroom-based and on the job.</td>
<td>If there is existing engagement with the private sector, this can be built on, or new relationships or opportunities with the private sector may need to be built.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support alternate provision of learning and skills through flexible models of education and training</td>
<td>Support government to pilot, cost and scale-up alternate models of flexible and accredited education and training for adolescents, including in humanitarian response. May include cash incentives and subsidies to improve gender equitable access, including working and young mothers.</td>
<td>In contexts where conventional education and training is not reaching disadvantaged adolescents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support transition from school to work</td>
<td>Improve quality of informal sector apprenticeships, including supporting internships and provision of career guidance.</td>
<td>When designing programmes, consider how to connect young people to work opportunities, as well as the skills that will be demanded by the labour market. Assess by partnering with other agencies, such as World Bank and ILO.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support gender equitable skills development</td>
<td>Tackle gender socialization from early grades in learning and teaching materials, pedagogy and teacher development. Promote STEM (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) subject and career opportunities where gender imbalance occurs.</td>
<td>During gender-responsive sector planning and reviews, teacher development, pre-service training, design of teaching and learning materials.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bangladesh: Quality informal apprenticeships for vulnerable out-of-school adolescents

While the Bangladeshi economy has flourished over the last 10 years, many young people still face significant risks. The country’s increasing prosperity has meant that big improvements have been made in providing access to health, education, child protection and other services. But at the same time many young people do not have enough access to information and services specific to their needs. Additionally, many do not even begin secondary education and many more fail to complete it. In short, systems are not fully in place which prepare young people for the workplace.

While figures suggest that there will be a decline in youth unemployment in the next few years, the fact remains that there are far too many adolescents and young people who are not acquiring the skills they need to secure decent-quality jobs. UNICEF data shows that youths aged 15-24 years old made up 19 per cent of the total population in 2018, representing around 31 million individuals. Of those, 57 per cent are employed in vulnerable jobs. More than one million youths are unemployed — while every year two million young people enter the workforce, mostly as unskilled workers involved in hazardous and low-paid jobs.

Consequently, UNICEF have partnered with BRAC to help adolescents make this difficult transition to work and improve their life prospects. For example, over four years, 18,900 out-of-school adolescent boys and girls in Bangladesh have accessed informal apprenticeships resulting in improvements in their immediate work outcomes. Through the programme, traditional informal apprenticeships were provided to include supervised training under selected master craft persons using a competency-based training and assessment model. The main interventions were to upgrade the technical skills of master crafts persons and to create a decent work place, to provide on-the-job trade training, and off-the-job trade theory and soft skills classes. Adolescents were placed in trades that challenged gender stereotypes and those completing were supported with job placements.

More than 95 per cent of learners (50 per cent girls) graduated and became wage-earners. Employment and monthly incomes increased by six times compared to that of non-participants, impacting significantly on participants’ savings, household food consumption and non-food consumption. The impact was particularly high for females and early marriage decreased by 62 per cent. The Government is now incorporating the programme into the national apprenticeship strategy for larger-scale implementation.

Clearly, with the right support and provision, adolescent skills development and future employability can be enabled by such efforts and this contributes to overall economic and social prosperity.

Action Area 7: Strengthening the social welfare workforce and direct outreach to families

Poor and vulnerable children and families often have a complex range of needs and face significant barriers to access services that can support them. Direct outreach is essential for these families to understand the challenges they face and provide support and connections to appropriate services. Case management and referral services are often linked to the social welfare workforce but may also be implemented by or in collaboration with community-based volunteers and paraprofessionals. Given UNICEF’s experience in both social protection and child protection needs, we are uniquely placed to work with governments and other partners in strengthening systems to provide this outreach.

A. Building and strengthening the social welfare workforce

A strong social welfare workforce is the backbone of a strong social protection system. While the role of social workers in a traditional cash transfer programme involves conducting assessment and follow-up visits to households related to the cash transfer programme, there is growing recognition that this role needs to be strengthened to include cross referrals to other social protection programmes and expanded to include identification of cases that need special attention such as psychosocial support, child labour, sexual abuse and other child protection concerns. The former role is an area of great interest for UNICEF given our work on child protection and social protection. Many country offices are already exploring a variety of approaches to strengthen and expand the role of social workers to address multidimensional poverty as well as leveraging the social protection system for child protection work.

Table 2.15 Building and strengthening the social welfare workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of roles and responsibilities of the social welfare workforce</td>
<td>An in-depth functional review of the roles and responsibilities of the social welfare workforce as prescribed in by-laws of the social welfare department to identify gaps in their performance and duties, their qualification requirements, and number of social workers required to perform the tasks.</td>
<td>As part of social protection systems assessments or review of social protection law and bylaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing accountability and incentive mechanisms for the workforce</td>
<td>After the functional review of social welfare workers, support the establishment of clear accountability mechanism and incentive structures.</td>
<td>As part of institutional reform processes focusing on the Ministry of Social Welfare or equivalent department responsible for the social welfare workforce to identify organizational support to social workers to perform their duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training of social welfare workforce to increase performance</td>
<td>Capacity building of social welfare workforce to undertake case identification, referral pathways and management of cases. Including training plan/module jointly developed with stakeholders.</td>
<td>As part of institutional reforms/change process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing systems and mechanisms for social welfare workforce to identify, register, follow and refer cases</td>
<td>A development of business process that can help social workforce to identify cases that need additional attention, develop cross-referral mechanisms that are easy to follow and provide support to the social welfare workforce to perform their functions.</td>
<td>Once agreement is reached to expand and strengthen the role of social welfare workforce to perform duties that are agreed upon.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
One of the recurrent challenges is that expanding the role of social workers depends on the ratio of beneficiaries per social workers and the capacity of social workers in terms of skills and trainings to identify beneficiaries for case management referral. There is no set rule or formula for this and it depends on the tasks and capacity of social workers to perform these tasks in a constructive way. The first step would be to map out social workers’ roles and responsibilities including a review of the terms of reference of social workers (if possible) coupled with a systematic review of the organizational arrangements, time and capacity needed to perform tasks.

B. Case identification and management

With the expansion of cash transfer programmes, beneficiary case identification and referrals have caught the attention of programme implementers and policy makers. While case management is highly technical and requires proper training, case identification and preliminary assessment of households to identify cases is within the mandate of social workers assigned to ministries of Social Welfare or their equivalents. In many developing countries the duties are performed by formal social workers or in some cases volunteers, but case identification and preliminary assessment for case referrals could be performed by both types of social workforce.

Table 2.16  Case identification and management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion of child-specific indicators in beneficiary registries/social registry systems.</td>
<td>To remove the non-financial barriers impeding access to services and to help address child-specific deprivations meaningfully through social protection mechanisms. Child-specific data and information should be included in the social and beneficiary registry systems. This will provide data and information on status of children receiving and not receiving assistance and what other services and programmes should be linked up to address multidimensional poverty faced by children and their families.</td>
<td>During the development of beneficiary and social registry system as part of integrated MIS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping of child-specific services</td>
<td>Conduct a national and subnational level mapping of social assistance and child protection services as part of social and beneficiary registry systems.</td>
<td>In parallel with social and beneficiary registry system development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop monitoring and referral mechanisms</td>
<td>MIS should be able to regularly identify, record and monitor child-specific indicators so that social workers and other departments can follow-up as needed. A referral mechanism for child protection and other services should be agreed upon and rolled out.</td>
<td>During the institutional and functional review of social protection department and ministry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case identification and referrals</td>
<td>Child-specific cases (such as child labour, out-of-school children etc) should be identified and referred to the appropriate departments and agencies for follow-up.</td>
<td>During the implementation of social assistance/protection programmes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic distress can increase children’s vulnerability to violence, abuse and exploitation which underlines the importance of ensuring that the child protection case management system is linked to the social protection/cash assistance information system/s. This can be an effective way of identifying beneficiary families for the cash assistance system. Likewise, the case management system can monitor key child protection concerns that children may face, including ensuring that families are not unnecessarily separated due to economic stress.
The State of Palestine: a case-management approach to address multidimensional poverty

Protracted conflict, stagnant growth and high unemployment are some of the main challenges facing the State of Palestine (SOP). GDP growth over recent years has been unable to improve the living standards of a growing population, resulting in a stagnant per capita income growth and current growth projections of around 2.5 per cent according to the IMF. Geopolitical tensions have recently increased, with no agreement on a way forward in the peace process. According to 2017 statistics, poverty affects around 29 per cent of the population and has significantly increased since 2011, particularly in Gaza. The geographical disparity in poverty rates is very marked: while 13.9 per cent of the West Bank population is considered poor, this number reaches 53 per cent in Gaza.

This background illustrates the challenging conditions UN agencies have had to operate in, which have impacted upon effective delivery of social protection and how best to address multidimensional poverty. Thus, the SOP’s national framework on poverty incorporates both the economic and social dimensions of vulnerabilities. In 2016–2017, UNICEF and WFP supported the Ministry of Social Development (MoSD) to design a new six-year Social Development Sector Strategy that incorporates the national guidelines. Consequently, the central focus of ministry reform was the introduction of a case management system – an approach advocated by UNICEF. UNICEF has provided the MoSD with materials to develop their information management platform, with plans to build an integrated National Social Registry. Under this system, families classified as extremely poor are assigned a social worker who then conducts home visits to assess each client family’s needs and establish a customized plan of care and support services. The MoSD relies on a civil servant staff of around 300 social workers spread across 17 governorates (12 in the West Bank and 5 in Gaza). UNICEF has also worked to build the capacity of the ministry’s M&E and case management system to better use existing databases across different departments in the ministry. Support for this reform process will continue in partnership with the EU and the World Bank.

Under the World Bank-supported Social Protection Enhancement Project, an online case management system is being developed in selected areas of the West Bank, accompanied by a communications campaign targeting poor and vulnerable people (especially women and youth), training on the system’s methodology, protocols and psychosocial support services, as well as support to the infrastructure, which should ultimately improve linkages and referral mechanisms. The system is centred on a unified portal that links various databases within the MoSD as well as with the Ministry of Health, Ministry of Education and Higher Education, and other entities. The Government of Palestine reached a consensus with development partners, including the EU, UNICEF, WFP and the World Bank, to adopt case management as a part of the reform process. UNICEF is providing technical support to the MoSD, with a focus on enhancing the unified portal and monitoring and evaluation capacity, especially as it relates to data analysis and evidence-based decision-making. Ultimately, UNICEF aims to improve the coverage and quality of social assistance and services provided to children and families living in poverty and deprivation.

A strong administrative system is the backbone of an integrated social protection system. It enables integration among different programmes and improves efficiency by simplifying processes, effort, time and resources. Different countries are at various stages of putting in place integrated administrative systems, but generally there is significant room for growth in this area. For UNICEF this is an established area of work, although UNICEF typically focuses on administration of particular programmes. UNICEF’s strong comparative advantage is providing support so that child-sensitive information is sufficiently and adequately collected, analyzed and reported and that systems are disability-sensitive, gender-sensitive and shock-responsive.

A. Improving integrated information systems

Integrated information systems are at the heart of effective social protection systems. Table 2.17 below shows what is included in UNICEF’s activities with partners in this area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment of information systems</td>
<td>Understanding the gaps in information systems (and underlying registries) that provide information for planning, design, implementation and results monitoring for children – with a clear focus on required functions. The assessment could be part of CODI (see Action Area 2) or a stand-alone exercise to analyze gaps and weaknesses in the current system and put forward recommendations.</td>
<td>During a systems assessment or a standalone exercise before starting reform process or setting up a new programme/s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing information systems that cater for children's needs</td>
<td>The scarcity of child-related data in social protection information systems is always a challenge for planning, design, implementation and monitoring purposes. A foundational activity is to review information collection through the system and include data that is relevant to strengthen outcomes for children.</td>
<td>During the programme design phase, e.g. as part of the monitoring framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical capacity of IT department and monitoring teams developed at national and sub-national level</td>
<td>Building of capacity (e.g. skills) and enabling environment (e.g. hardware, software) to manage, run and adapt the information system at national and sub-national levels, with clear roles and responsibilities.</td>
<td>During the development of information system, and when piloting to test applicability and functionality of the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring framework for results</td>
<td>Identifying what kind of information is needed for what purpose is fundamental to a good monitoring system. Depending on the programme objective, developing a monitoring framework for results would help generate reports and timely data on programme implementation and results.</td>
<td>As part of programme design and inception, clearly articulating programme objective and indicators to be generated by the information system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grievance and redress mechanism</td>
<td>Grievance and redress mechanisms allows practitioners to understand the challenges in the delivery of social protection programme. Often grievance and redress mechanisms have separate reporting mechanisms from routine social protection information systems.</td>
<td>During programme development and design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Improving coordination and service delivery at sub-national level

Coordination within and between ministries at national level is a crucial part of building an integrated system. This coordination also needs to be replicated at a local level to ensure integrated delivery. UNICEF’s activities with partners in this area are shown in Table 2.18 below.

![Table 2.18](image)

**Table 2.18** Improving coordination and service delivery at sub-national level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of sub-national social protection coordination and delivery mechanisms</td>
<td>Understanding of key gaps in the implementation of social protection programmes at sub-national level is key to improving the effectiveness of the social protection system. Numerous challenges remain in many countries in terms of coordination, implementation capacity and level and extent of decentralization.</td>
<td>Before or during the implementation of the social protection programme to understand the key gaps in programme implementation at sub-national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting establishment of sub-national inclusive coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>Supporting government in establishing effective and inclusive (representing civil society and community) coordination to strengthen implementation of social protection programme at the sub-national level.</td>
<td>Before and during the implementation of the programme, in accordance with the social protection framework, to establish sub-national structures for coordination and implementation of social protection programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening capacity of sub-national social protection delivery systems</td>
<td>This is based on the needs assessment strengthening capacity of social protection sub-national social coordination body to plan, manage and implement social protection programmes.</td>
<td>During implementation of social protection programme and on an ongoing basis, identifying and addressing gaps and lessons learnt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting fiscal and administrative decentralization to strengthen delivery mechanisms</td>
<td>The extent of decentralization in a country has an impact on implementation of social protection programme at the sub-national level, therefore government may require support to enact laws and reforms to decentralize appropriate fiscal and administrative functions for better implementation.</td>
<td>During processes around decentralization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

One of the emerging areas of work at the administrative level of social protection is the development of social registries that serve the function of identifying and registering people to be potential beneficiaries of one or more social protection programmes, and complementary integrated beneficiary registries that link data across existing programme Management Information Systems (MIS) to give an overview of who is receiving what. Making sure that these registries and their broader information systems are child-sensitive and provide relevant information to enable social protection systems to respond to children is emerging as a crucial area of work for UNICEF.
Iraq: Developing a Management Information System (MIS) to identify, monitor and follow-up beneficiaries as part of a government cash transfer programme

Iraq has faced a number of conflicts since 1980, and its dependency on oil revenues has left its economy highly vulnerable to price fluctuations. The recent twin crises of 2014 – a sharp decline in oil prices and war in Iraq and Syria – are estimated to have drastically eroded welfare gains from the past, with a 20 per cent increase in poverty rates meaning a return to 2007 levels. At the onset of the armed conflict in 2014, more than 3 million Iraqis were displaced in 18 months, a level of displacement that persisted until the end of 2017, according to the International Organization for Migration. Approximately 22.5 per cent of the population were living in poverty in 2014, while recent estimates suggest that 11 million Iraqis are in need of humanitarian assistance. All of this serves to illustrate the very challenging conditions UN agencies have had to operate in. This has had implications for delivering effective social protection for families and children and underscores the need for effective MIS and case management to overcome such constraints.

Thus, in order to reach prospective social protection beneficiaries, UNICEF in collaboration with the World Bank and the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (MOLSA) are piloting a case identification and referral approach as part of a pilot cash transfer programme. The goal is to improve school enrolment and retention, increase vaccination of children under 5, and improve health outcomes through prenatal and postnatal visits. The pilot programme was launched by MOLSA in March 2018 in Sadr-2 in Baghdad Governorate of Iraq. The MIS is the central piece that brings together beneficiaries, social workers, school management staff and health centre officials through a user-friendly platform to follow up and identify cases that need additional support.

The process that led to the Government’s decision to launch the programme included:

- Advocacy to adopt a case-management approach to increase demand for services and to empower families by providing information and knowledge about other programmes and services.
- Technical support from UNICEF and the World Bank on a comprehensive beneficiary baseline that captures information on multidimensional poverty for better programme monitoring.
- Financial and technical support from UNICEF to develop an MIS that includes three modules: a health module, an education module, and a social worker module for case identification and follow-up that could capture barriers to services including child protection concerns.
- Training of responsible social workers for Sadr-2 on how to use the MIS for case identification and referrals. This includes new tablets for the social workers and computerization of health and education facilities.
- Mapping of social services including social protection, child protection and women’s empowerment in the pilot areas to be included in the MIS for cross referral.
- Behavioural change component integrated into the MIS by generating automated messages for compliance to the programme and information and knowledge on importance of education and healthy behaviour.

Strengthening the case management capacities of government can help ensure that families and children enjoy access to social protection and help link these groups to wider social services and support.

Action Area 9: Strengthening national shock-responsive social protection systems

Children and families need social protection systems not only to respond to shocks that affect individuals or households, but also to respond to broader shocks such as humanitarian crises that affect a group of households or communities simultaneously. Strengthening national shock-responsive social protection systems is integral to UNICEF’s work on social protection, and as such should be mainstreamed in other social protection action areas. It is dealt with as a separate action area in this guidance to help ensure visibility and focus as this area of work emerges and becomes normalized within UNICEF’s social protection work.

Figure 2.1 Components of a child-sensitive social protection system

- **Admin**: Integrated administrative tools such as registries, payment mechanisms, grievance and redress etc.
- **Programmes**: Coordination and harmonization among programmes at all levels
- **Policies**: Overall policy coherence, including common and shared vision, coordination and financing mechanisms
- **Evidence base**: Poverty and vulnerability analysis, systems assessment and evaluations
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Our work includes supporting national governments to prepare routine systems in advance of a crisis along the four components of the Social Protection Programme Framework: evidence, policy, programmes and administrative systems (see Figure 2.1). Shock-responsive social protection is ultimately about making better use of available resources – alongside other sectoral support – to address the needs of individuals, households and communities within fragile and shock-affected areas, before, during and after a shock/acute crisis. Responding to these increased needs may require: extending coverage to support more people; increasing the level of financial protection for affected populations (e.g. transfer values); and increasing the range of services offered to fully cover complex and multidimensional risks. The extent to which this can be achieved via, or in coordination with, the social protection sector will depend on the country context and the characteristics of the shock.

A. Evidence and analysis
Routine areas of action – such as conducting child poverty analysis, impact evaluations, monitoring and evaluation (M&E), learning, costing exercises and systems assessments – can better encompass a focus on risks and shocks.

### Table 2.19  Evidence and analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Familiarising with the risk profile of the country</td>
<td>Building on available information and expertise from humanitarian and disaster risk management (DRM) colleagues, both at national and sub-national levels, to develop a comprehensive risk profile. Incorporating practices from UNICEF’s Guidance on Risk-Informed Programming (2018).</td>
<td>As a part of the SitAn (Situation Analysis) for country programme document (CPD) and Strategy Notes development. In crisis-prone countries, at the time of updating the Emergency Preparedness Platform (EPP), specially MPS9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further incorporating evidence on risk and vulnerability into child poverty analysis, impact evaluations/M&amp;E/learning and costing exercises</td>
<td>Incorporating a focus on vulnerability to covariate risks and prolonged exposure to them when analysing child poverty (not just the most deprived, chronically poor, etc); building an evidence base on the use of social protection in emergency contexts via impact evaluation, M&amp;E and learning; and incorporating a focus on shocks into routine costing exercises, to understand and pre-empt the potential cost of response before a shock.</td>
<td>At the time of conducting an MICS or general child poverty analysis in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the readiness of social protection systems</td>
<td>In collaboration with other stakeholders, assessing the ability of the social protection system, its programmes, delivery systems and capacity, to play a role in response to shocks and identify specific areas that may require strengthening and further investment by the government.</td>
<td>Usually conducted as a part of a preparedness exercise linked to the CPD and/or EPP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Policy, strategy, legislation, coordination and financing
The existing policy, strategy and legal framework determine the extent to which social protection systems have the scope to play a role in responding to shocks and meeting the needs of children and their families. Based on an assessment of a country’s capacities and needs, modifications of the policy, strategy and legislation therefore form an important component of shock-responsive social protection. However, for the policy to be implemented effectively, it requires adequate resourcing and coordination with multiple stakeholders. Together, policy, financing and coordination components provide a strong foundation to design and operationalize shock-responsive social protection.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapting social protection and other relevant policies/strategies/legislation to enable shock-responsiveness social protection (SRSP) systems</strong>&lt;br&gt;In collaboration with relevant ministries, map common risks and review existing social protection and DRM policies, strategies and legislation to identify provisions/procedures that enable or restrict the use of routine social protection programmes and their systems to support shock response. Use review findings to adapt these features to facilitate the use of social protection system for emergency purposes: better linking of routine programming and planning to covariate shocks; institutionalizing coordination with DRM and humanitarian actors who have the mandate to respond to covariate shocks; increasing flexibility in the system and enabling swift response during shocks (contingency planning, etc); increasing accessibility of assistance during shocks (waiving/relaxing of conditionalities, documentation requirements, qualifying conditions, KYC (‘know your customer’) requirements, etc).</td>
<td>As a part of social protection policy review and development or as an independent effort in countries that are prone to crisis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Broader review of national policy and legislation from a shock-responsive perspective</strong>&lt;br&gt;Review of further policies, laws and regulations that may support or hinder a response via the social protection sector: public financial management; data protection; minimum wage; civil registration and ID systems, etc.</td>
<td>As above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting horizontal coordination between social protection and other stakeholders responsible for humanitarian action</strong>&lt;br&gt;Facilitating dialogue between government ministries/stakeholders responsible for DRM and social protection, as well as international humanitarian actors, to develop a common agenda and response strategy that leverages the strengths of each sector (with the objective of enhancing the efficiency and effectiveness of the overall response). Development of guidance, standard operating procedures and action plans on the use of social protection systems for emergency response. Supporting the existing social protection working/coordination group in countries to include coordination of HCTs as well as discussions on making transfers inclusive and empowering for the socially excluded.</td>
<td>Usually as part of disaster preparedness planning and/or annual planning exercise of the social protection ministry/department. Coordination with the working group on HCTs can be initiated as a part of interagency preparedness efforts or during humanitarian response. In protracted crises, this is likely to be an ongoing process.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting vertical coordination and capacity building within the social protection sector (sub-national levels)</strong>&lt;br&gt;Supporting the relevant government authorities to develop clear delegation of shock-response related roles and responsibilities to local levels of administration, via job descriptions, operational manuals, standard operating procedures, contingency plans and lines of accountability. In addition, supporting the creation of local-level coordinating structures for actors across social protection, DRM and beyond, as well as ongoing training and capacity building of frontline staff.</td>
<td>As part of preparedness efforts and during crisis response, especially in protracted crises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collaborating with other stakeholders to influence development of SRSP systems</strong>&lt;br&gt;Depending on the context, in close collaboration with WFP, UNHCR, FAO, ILO, World Bank and/or NGOs, develop an investment case for donors to engage and fund governments efforts on SRSP. In addition, create awareness and understanding among government stakeholders on the value of SRSP. This may include commissioning research, and conducting workshops and trainings at national and sub-national level.</td>
<td>Depending on opportunities and linked to disaster preparedness efforts in the country.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting the creation of a financing strategy to support potential scale-ups</strong>&lt;br&gt;Based on an understanding of fiscal space for the social protection sector and of costing simulations tailored to different response scenarios, support the development of a risk layering strategy building on learning from Disaster Risk Financing: a combination of budgetary instruments (e.g. contingency/reserve funds), contingent credit and market-based risk transfer instruments. Planning for timely disbursements, including processes for the triggering, release, delivery and reconciliation of funds.</td>
<td>As a part of the annual planning and budgeting processes in the country and linked to disaster preparedness planning. Work with donors can also be undertaken as a part of humanitarian action, especially in protracted crises.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Programmes and design features

Broadly, countries with an effective mix of programmes across social insurance and social assistance that offer high and equitable coverage of population and needs are better positioned to respond to shocks, as they possess a broader toolbox to draw from and build on.

Table 2.21  Programmes and design features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review mix of programmes, their objectives and linkages, with a focus on shocks</td>
<td>Different social protection programmes fulfil different functions and objectives. Conducting an analysis of the range of programmes, their existing and potential inter linkages and scope for modifications in objectives/function to include addressing humanitarian needs (before and after a shock).</td>
<td>As a part of preparedness exercise at national level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review eligibility criteria, qualifying conditions, targeting design and subsequent coverage, with a focus on shocks</td>
<td>In close collaboration with other stakeholders, support modifications to routine criteria and qualifying conditions to better encompass vulnerability to shocks (especially for children). Can be incorporated into routine programming and/or pre-designed for temporary scale-ups.</td>
<td>As a part of preparedness exercise at national or local government level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review level/value, frequency and duration of transfers</td>
<td>Facilitating coordination with humanitarian stakeholders to agree on common methodology to determine emergency transfer values, frequency and duration to enhance the effectiveness of the response.</td>
<td>As a part of preparedness exercise at national or local government level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linking to other complementary systems</td>
<td>Depending on the country context, this will include linkages to early warning systems, health insurance, education programmes, etc.</td>
<td>As a part of preparedness exercise at national level.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Administration and delivery systems

The administrative and delivery systems of routine social protection programmes can be leveraged in full (via programme expansions), in part (via a new programme ‘piggybacking’ onto selected components for shock response), or in combination depending on the context to support populations in different locations. For an existing system to play a role in times of crisis, the nuts and bolts of that system require minor adjustments in anticipation of potential crises so that they can respond to different objectives and timelines, aligned with changes in social protection policy and strategy.

Table 2.22  Administration and delivery systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and strengthening of delivery systems to enable: a) continuity of service delivery and b) flexing/scaling</td>
<td>Reviewing routine delivery systems to determine overall strength and adaptations required to ensure continuity of service delivery and the potential to rapidly flex and scale in response to typical shocks: communications, registration and enrolment, payments, case management. Subsequently, determining a strategy for: a) leveraging delivery systems that are deemed useful for shock response (via contingency plans, surge capacity, adaptations, procedural simplifications, etc); and b) aligning with humanitarian partners to fill in any gaps and ensure fulfilment of humanitarian principles.</td>
<td>As a part of ongoing efforts to consolidate social protection in the country and enhance preparedness for shocks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Activity Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review and strengthening of back-office administrative functions (information systems, M&amp;E) for shock response</td>
<td>Social protection information systems (and the registries that underpin them) vary widely across countries and require assessing in terms of their completeness, relevance, currency, accessibility, accuracy and levels of data protection to understand whether they can play a role for shock response and how that role could be strengthened via preparedness actions. Similarly, routine M&amp;E systems will require assessing and adapting against revised objectives and processes.</td>
<td>As a part of ongoing efforts to consolidate social protection in the country and enhance preparedness for shocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening accountability mechanisms</td>
<td>Accountability mechanisms and grievance redressal are fundamental to emergency response. Yet often government social protection systems do not have robust systems in place. System strengthening will involve: a) supporting the set-up of multi layered accountability mechanisms to ensure that people have access to fair and transparent grievance redress before, during and after the crisis; b) aligning humanitarian grievance mechanisms to national responses, where necessary.</td>
<td>As a part of preparedness exercise as well as ongoing social protection system strengthening efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT

Developing shock-responsive social protection systems is a dynamic process that entails navigating technical, political and economic challenges. Acknowledging the comparative advantage of others, especially humanitarian stakeholders, and working closely with them, can help to address technical bottlenecks. While efforts on shock-responsive social protection are needed in all risk-prone countries, it is important to note that: (a) Existing government systems may not be appropriate or able to scale up in all humanitarian contexts, especially conflict contexts where the risk of humanitarian principles being compromised are high; and (b) Humanitarian assistance will continue to be needed to fill gaps in coverage and assistance in times of crisis.
Malawi: Establishing a shock-responsive social protection system

Malawi is an agriculture-based economy exposed to climate and weather-related risks. More than 50 per cent of Malawi’s population lives below the national poverty line. The country faces seasonal dry spells that have eroded the livelihood systems of poor households and their ability to maintain investments in children. The trends in climate change (i.e., extended dry spells and erratic rainfall) have further exacerbated the problem.

Humanitarian agencies have provided assistance to support households affected by the shocks. Over the past decade, Malawi has been supporting on average about 1.7 million people each year with emergency food assistance. Malawi’s social protection system provides support to chronically poor households. The system has benefited from technical support from UNICEF and other development partners over the past 10 years. The flagship Social Cash Transfer Programme (SCTP), now in all 28 districts, provides regular and predictable cash transfers to the poorest and most vulnerable 10 per cent of the population. A social registry is also in the process of national scale-up and will record household-level information for the entire population.

In the new Malawi National Social Support Programme (2018-2023), a commitment was made to strengthen the design and implementation of social protection to improve shock-responsiveness and ability to respond to both the chronic and acute needs of the poor. UNICEF is working closely with the Ministry of Gender, Child, Disability and Social Welfare (MoGCDSW) and other stakeholders to invest in shock-responsive social protection (SRSP). One area of focus has been the incremental piloting of the expansion of the SCTP in response to a crisis. In 2017-18, for example, the SCTP was expanded in response to drought. A total of 3,092 SCTP beneficiary households (over 16,000 individuals and nearly 9,000 children) living in drought-affected areas received emergency cash top-ups. Following the success of the piloted expansion of the SCTP, the programme has further been leveraged to provide lean season cash top-ups to over 13,000 households in two drought-affected districts and 31,601 households affected by floods in 2019. UNICEF in close collaboration with WFP provided technical guidance and support to the MoGCDSW. Consequently, UNICEF is placing a strong emphasis on building the capacity of the MoGCDSW to support scale-up. Furthermore, during the lean season of 2018-2019, UNICEF supported the government to provide unconditional cash transfers to households, with vulnerable children (aged 6-59 months), pregnant/lactating women, and people living with HIV and AIDS benefiting from life-saving nutritional services.

UNICEF is also helping to increase the efficiency of the cash delivery system. The timeliness and regularity of cash transfers have been improved through the roll-out of electronic payments (e-payments) in two districts. This initiative was supported by UNICEF, which is now the leading agency supporting the Government in developing a national e-payment solution.

Lastly, the successful implementation of SRSP requires a shared vision and strong coordination between the social protection and humanitarian sectors. Given that this is still lacking in Malawi, UNICEF is using its convening power and technical leadership in SRSP to support the government with the goal to design and facilitate the necessary modifications to current approaches and develop complementarities and synergies within the social protection sector.

Source: UNICEF Malawi Country Office.
Action Area 10: Linking humanitarian cash transfers to social protection systems\textsuperscript{13}

Social protection is a human right and it is the responsibility of the state to ensure that this right is upheld at all times – including in times of crisis. As well as supporting governments to strengthen their social protection systems in anticipation of crisis, UNICEF also supports the use of national social protection systems during a crisis. Where government systems are not strong enough to be used in their entirety, UNICEF will support governments to use some aspects of the system (such as beneficiary lists or payment mechanisms), and will work to ensure any parallel mechanisms are as closely aligned with government systems as possible. In some contexts, government systems may not be in place or appropriate to use and alternative parallel delivery mechanisms may be needed.\textsuperscript{14} This is the one exceptional circumstance where our work may not be in direct partnership with national governments. Where such non-government mechanisms are used and government systems are weak or nascent, UNICEF will support building national social protection systems for longer-term use and strengthening the humanitarian-development continuum.

A. Designing humanitarian cash transfers (HCTs) for children to achieve sectoral outcomes

Shocks affect the ability of households to maintain levels of investment in the human capital development of children. Evidence suggests that HCTs can support households meet a range of basic child needs and support a speedy recovery from the impact of the shock. When complemented with accompanying services and designed accordingly, HCTs can also support sectoral outcomes for children. The first step in ensuring HCTs achieve these goals and determining the role of national systems is assessing the needs of children and families and designing the appropriate HCT response. With this foundation, the role of the national system can play a part in the response to be determined.

Table 2.23 Designing HCTs for children to achieve sectoral outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Context analysis and assessment of children-specific needs</td>
<td>In collaboration with other stakeholders, assess the needs of children. In many contexts, this entails adaptation of common tools for data collection to ensure that information on children's needs is collected and analyzed at different stages of the crisis.</td>
<td>At the onset of the crisis as well as at different stages of the crisis (especially in protracted crises) as a part of multi-agency rapid assessments (MIRA) or Post Disaster Needs Assessments (PDNA).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designing HCTs</td>
<td>In collaboration with other stakeholders, design HCTs to meet the unmet needs of children and families and support their recovery. This includes utilizing the results of context and needs analysis; setting objectives; identifying selection criteria; determining transfer value, frequency and timing; determining complementary services and agreeing on an M&amp;E framework etc.</td>
<td>At the time of determining UNICEF's overall humanitarian response and requesting resources. In a protracted crisis this would be undertaken in line with the change in the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinating with other stakeholders</td>
<td>In humanitarian contexts, many agencies implement HCTs to support the needs of the affected population. It is important that such responses are coordinated to ensure that the calculations of transfer values factor in the needs of children and also be informed by government plans on expansion of social protection.</td>
<td>At all stages of the crisis response, as part of the humanitarian coordination system and closely aligned with the social protection working group.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Determining the role of the national system in HCT programme implementation

Designing a HCT programme and selecting the system with which to implement it are closely linked, hence they are often conducted concurrently. Where social protection systems exist, an analysis of their ability and suitability to deliver HCTs must be assessed. In most contexts, this information is collected as a part of preparedness. If these assessments and mapping are not available, a rapid analysis can be undertaken at the beginning of the response.

Table 2.24 Determining the role of the national system in HCT programme implementation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ascertaining the compatibility of the system</td>
<td>The humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence take precedence in humanitarian response. Ascertaining the compatibility of the system with these principles is critical. At the same time it is important to check for computability with systems to manage risks, especially fiduciary risks.</td>
<td>At the time of determining UNICEF’s overall humanitarian response and requesting for resources. In a protracted crisis this would be undertaken depending on the change in the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing the capacity of the system</td>
<td>Ascertaining whether the existing or potential national system has the capacity to support the delivery of the programme effectively is another crucial factor for choosing the system. This assessment may include assessing whether the system: can assist a large proportion of the affected population; cope with higher volumes and frequency of cash transactions; manage security risks; has a grievance mechanism etc.</td>
<td>At the time of determining UNICEF’s overall humanitarian response and requesting for resources. In a protracted crisis, this would be undertaken depending on the change in the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choosing the most appropriate option</td>
<td>Guided by the capacity and compatibility assessments as well as need at different stages of the crisis, a decision on whether to utilize the existing social protection system fully or partially can be taken. In contexts where the existing social protection may not be the most suitable option, parallel or mixed systems may be set up to deliver HCTs.</td>
<td>At the time of determining UNICEF’s overall humanitarian response. In a protracted crisis, this would be undertaken in line with the change in the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using humanitarian cash transfers (HCTs) to contribute to efforts on shock-responsive social protection (SRSP)</td>
<td>Humanitarian contexts where HCTs are underway (including using parallel systems) offer opportunities to strengthen existing efforts or to initiate efforts at building SRSP systems. Depending on the context this may entail strengthening the national database (either by introducing MIS, creating a database or adding beneficiaries to an existing MIS), piloting cost-effective mechanisms for targeting, cash delivery, communication and grievance redress mechanism etc., and consolidating learning from the HCT to feed into SRSP.</td>
<td>Using HCTs to contribute to efforts on SRSP.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C. Using the national social protection system to implement an HCT programme

When it is determined that a national system, including subnational components, is an appropriate implementation option, then the extent to which the system can be used must be determined. There can be many implementation options/models and ways for UNICEF to support national systems delivery.
Table 2.25 Using the national social protection system to implement an HCT programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>When to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Delivering HCTs entirely through the social protection system</td>
<td>Where the assessments indicate that it is possible to leverage the social protection system fully, UNICEF works with relevant ministry and sub-national governments to deliver HCTs. This entails working closely with government counterparts to design the programme, support its operationalization, build capacity at different levels, and establish independent third party monitoring etc.</td>
<td>Depending on the capacity of the social protection system, this option can be used either in the first phase of the humanitarian response or as a part of ongoing humanitarian assistance, especially in protracted crisis contexts. Efforts can be made as a part of preparedness to strengthen the system for leveraging in times of crisis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Using the social protection system partially</td>
<td>Fully leveraging the social protection system may not be possible in all humanitarian contexts. In such contexts, UNICEF borrows some components of the system to deliver and manage the humanitarian cash transfers through a parallel system. This may include using the beneficiary list to assist those vulnerable before the crisis, or using the delivery mechanism, communication system, grievance redress mechanisms and/or the social service workforce.</td>
<td>As a part of the process to design programme operations. In most contexts, this can be initiated as a part of the preparedness actions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building linkages with national approaches if delivering HCTs through a parallel system</td>
<td>Where it is not possible to use any aspects of the existing social protection system, UNICEF delivers HCTs through a parallel system (these approaches are discussed in detail in the Humanitarian Cash Transfer guidance). Wherever possible, due consideration should be given to links with national capacities and processes towards building and strengthening a nascent national social protection system. This may include mirroring the operational system or designing complementary components that could be transitioned to the social protection system when appropriate.</td>
<td>As a part of the process to design programme operations. It may be possible to initiate some of this work as a part of emergency preparedness work undertaken by country offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence collection and knowledge management</td>
<td>All programme implementation options present future learning opportunities and to test hypotheses. Where possible, UNICEF invests in robust and systematic evidence collection and in sharing it through documentation, webinars etc. to support learning.</td>
<td>Designing the research at the time of designing the HCT and ongoing evidence collection for the duration of the programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SOMETHING TO THINK ABOUT**

There is an increased impetus to align HCTs as much as possible with existing social protection programmes and systems. There have been recent examples of working closely with the governments to deliver HCTs. While using existing government systems may not be appropriate in some contexts, perceptions about the ability of social protection systems to respond adequately and in a timely manner to humanitarian crisis play a big role in leveraging them. A change in discourse that is backed by evidence is needed to encourage use of social protection systems for humanitarian action.
Dominica: Delivering a multi-purpose child grant through the Public Assistance Programme

Hurricane Maria, one of the worst recorded storms in the last decade, struck Dominica in September 2017. Following widespread destruction, UNICEF partnered with the Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica and WFP to design a humanitarian cash transfer (HCT) programme to respond to the needs of hurricane-affected households with children, working closely with the Ministry of Social Services, Family and Gender Affairs (MSSFGA) to leverage the existing social protection system – the national Public Assistance Programme (PAP) – for the HCT.

With an administrative system already in place, the delivery of emergency cash transfers through the existing PAP platform was envisaged as the most appropriate solution to respond to the needs of the most vulnerable. The Joint Emergency Cash Transfer (JECT) programme—launched by the MSSFGA, WFP and UNICEF in early December 2017—provided unconditional cash transfers to almost 25,000 people (including 6,000 children) most affected by Hurricane Maria, to meet their essential needs. The programme provided emergency food and child grants by scaling up the programme to provide a top-up to existing PAP beneficiaries and horizontally to assist vulnerable households not included on the PAP beneficiary list.

The transfer comprised different components. The WFP contributed to the food grant component of the JECT, while UNICEF contributed to the child grant component. The government, through the MSSFGA, continued providing cash assistance to PAP beneficiaries. Therefore, the partnership allowed for a multi-purpose cash grant for the most vulnerable families and their children.

The following specific support was provided to the Ministry by UNICEF:

- Transfer of funds for three HCT instalments;
- Technical support to identify and register new beneficiaries;
- Development of programmatic communication material to clarify the distinction between HCTs and regular cash transfers;
- Payment monitoring.

Analysis indicates that the JECT demonstrated satisfactory results in terms of food security outcomes. It contributed to keeping food consumption stable during the intervention. Coping strategy indexes remained stable indicating that families continued to adopt coping strategies in order to meet household needs. Furthermore, 92 per cent of beneficiaries mentioned that they had used part of their entitlement to buy food and over 70 per cent of the beneficiaries reported food as their main expenditure. Household repairs, debt repayment and ordinary bills were among the most frequent expenditure. For families with children, education was the second-highest expenditure and most families confirmed that they spent their child grant mostly on education-related expenditure.

The experience in Dominica has been instrumental in initiating discussions with governments in the wider Eastern Caribbean region – including the British Virgin Islands, Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent and the Grenadines and Antigua and Barbuda – on strengthening the shock-responsiveness of social protection systems. It shows how HCTs can leverage resources from existing social protection programmes and underscores the importance of building shock-responsive systems.

Annex 1: Tools and resources by key action area

**ACTION AREA 1: CHILD POVERTY ANALYSIS, IMPACT EVALUATIONS AND SYSTEMS ASSESSMENTS**

**A. Child poverty and vulnerability analysis and building evidence**

**i) GENERAL**
UNICEF and the Global Coalition to End Child Poverty (2017) *A world free from child poverty: A guide to the tasks to achieve the vision* outlines practical steps for establishing routine national child poverty measurement and analysis.

The World Bank [Measuring Poverty](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator) website provides useful overview and links to resources for measuring and monitoring poverty.

The World Bank [Poverty and Equity Data Portal](https://databank.worldbank.org/data/source) provides interactive tools to track and analyse monetary poverty using the extreme poverty line.

The World Bank Poverty and Equity Global Practice Group (2016) *New Estimates of Extreme Poverty for Children* is a background paper which calculates the rate of extreme poverty among children in developing countries.

**ii) MULTIDIMENSIONAL POVERTY MEASURES**
Gordon and Nandy *Measuring Child Poverty and Deprivation* is a technical guide, focusing on the Bristol estimate to measure multidimensional child poverty.


OPHI's [Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) online training portal](https://ophi.org.uk/multidim) provides an overview of techniques used to measure multidimensional poverty.

UNICEF Office of Research (2016) *Comparing Approaches to the Measurement of Multidimensional Child Poverty* uses two multidimensional approaches – MODA and MPI – on the same dataset to compare the differences in estimates when different methods are used.


[Introduction to vulnerability analysis (2016)](https://www.unicef.org/dpa) is a UNICEF internal working paper that gives an overview of existing approaches to measure vulnerability from a child perspective.

[Reducing child poverty in Georgia (2015)](https://www.unicef.org/dpa) uses monetary child poverty analysis to advocate for reform of the country’s social assistance schemes.

**B. Evaluating effectiveness of social protection programmes**

Davis et al. (2016) *From Evidence to Action: The Story of Cash Transfers and Impact Evaluation in Sub-Saharan Africa* contains two chapters that describe the methods used by the Transfer Project in several countries. Chapter 3 focuses on quantitative methods, while Chapter 4 introduces qualitative design and methods.
The Transfer Project’s impact evaluation survey and instrument examples are available at: https://transfer.cpc.unc.edu/instruments/

The UNICEF Office of Research Overview of Impact Evaluation provides a series of methodological briefs and short videos covering a wide range of topics, ranging from theory of change, participatory approaches, data collection and analysis methods.

Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL) is a global network of researchers who use randomized evaluations to answer critical policy questions in the fight against poverty. On their website, you can find a methodological overview of RCTs as well as results and policy lessons from different approaches.

The International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie) provides evidence of what works or not. Their website outlines their mission and expertise: http://www.3ieimpact.org/our-expertise/impact-evaluation

More information and resources are also available at the PEP Policy Impact Evaluation Research Initiative (PIERI).

Chirchir and Kidd (2011) Good practice in the development of management information systems for social protection provides an introduction on what MIS can do, the requirements of setting up a functional MIS, and discusses how the MIS of different programmes are linked to each other within a country.


C. Programme and systems assessments

I) ASSESSMENTS OF SOCIAL PROTECTION PROGRAMMES

ISPA’s CODI tool (https://ispatoools.org/core-diagnostic-instrument/) is unique in providing a unified framework to carry out a comprehensive assessment of social protection system performance, allowing governments to identify duplication, fragmentation and inefficiencies across schemes and programmes. CODI increases coordination among national stakeholders as well as development partners across different sectors.

UNICEF-ROSA (2014) Assessing child sensitive social protection is a toolkit to support country-level analysis of the extent to which a social protection system is child sensitive.


ISPA social protection public works tool generates stylized information on the potential impact of public works programmes in a social protection context in a given country, helping to interpret the assessment from a systems perspective. While the emphasis is on programmes pursuing social protection objectives, the tool could be expanded to assess other types of public works programmes.

ISPA social protection payments tool provides guidance on how to assess a payment mechanism for the delivery of cash or near-cash social protection transfers primarily targeted at poor and vulnerable populations.

ISPA social protection identification tool provides guidance on information collection and performance assessment of identification systems for social protection.
II) BENEFIT INCIDENCE ANALYSIS
Bastagli (2015) Bringing Taxation into Social Protection Analysis and Planning. This paper from ODI contributes to efforts to include tax considerations in social protection analysis and design by discussing the key methodological issues in carrying out joint distributional analysis, reviewing the evidence on the incidence and distributional impact of taxes and transfers and discussing alternative tax revenue sources and their implications for social protection financing and sustainability.

UNICEF Office of Research (2018) Commitment to Equity for Children (CEQ4C): Fiscal Policy, Multidimensional Poverty, and Equity in Uganda. This working paper provides a child-dedicated focus on fiscal incidence analysis by tracking child-relevant benefits, turning children the unit of analysis, and using multidimensional child poverty metrics.

III) INSTITUTIONAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL

ACTION AREA 2: POLICY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT, COORDINATION AND FINANCING

A. Strategies and policy frameworks

B. Coordination mechanisms
ILO (2016) Social Protection Coordination: Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals on Universal Social Protection through South-South and Triangular Cooperation is a coordination brief which is also applicable more broadly to social protection systems.


ILO (2014) Institutional Coordination and Social Protection Floors includes experiences of Argentina, Brazil, Chile, Mexico and Uruguay, online summary and comparative tables, and is available in French and Spanish.

World Bank Safety Nets How To – Institutional Aspects.

FAO Coordinating Social Protection and Agriculture: Initial Thoughts on Key Ideas focuses on agriculture, but usefully explores a number of issues in relation to coordination in general.


C. Domestic financing


Bastagli (2015) Bringing Taxation into Social Protection Analysis and Planning looks at taxation and transfer together to understand a complete picture of fiscal policy and its impact on poverty and inequality.

A. General
UNICEF and the Global Coalition to End Child Poverty (2017) A World Free from Child Poverty: A Guide to the Tasks to Achieve the Vision is a comprehensive guide on child poverty work to achieve the SDG target on child poverty from measurement to detailed policy analysis.

UNICEF (2017) Making cash transfers work for children and families provides a review of UNICEF’s work and key activities in cash transfers. The guidance includes a review of the organization’s work, a framework of UNICEF’s approach, and detailed activities including further resources and country examples.

B. Building political support
UNICEF (2010) Advocacy Toolkit: A guide to influencing decisions that improve children’s lives is a comprehensive guide that explains how to develop advocacy messages, monitor and evaluate advocacy, and build relationships and secure partnerships.


Fiscal space for social protection: knowledge sharing initiative is a webinar series hosted by socialprotection.org on topics including inequality and taxation; social compacts for sustainable financing; and constituency building and fiscal space.

ILO, WFP and UNICEF (2015) Capitalising on UN Experience: The Development of a Social Protection Floor in Mozambique documents the process among UN agencies to build a social protection floor.

C. Supporting programme design of cash transfer programmes
The UNICEF-ILO Social Protection Floor Costing Tool is a user-friendly tool for users to estimate costs and create graphs of certain scenarios without knowledge of modelling.

Devereux et al. (2015) Evaluating the Targeting Effectiveness of Social Transfers: A Literature Review reviews empirical evidence of popular targeting mechanisms and discusses various costs and trade-offs.

ODI (2010) Social Protection Toolsheet: Targeting Social Transfers provides detailed steps to identify a targeting mechanism that is appropriate (fit for purpose), achievable (adequately resourced) and acceptable (has popular and government support).
Kidd, Gelders and Bailey-Athias (2017) *Exclusion by design: an assessment of the effectiveness of the proxy means test poverty targeting mechanism* uses evidence to argue that the PMT method is inaccurate and arbitrary based on multiple country analysis.

**D. Support to implementation**

World Bank *Safety Nets How To* is a comprehensive e-course on social protection design and implementation.

Barca and Chirchir (2014) *Single registries and integrated MISs: De-mystifying data and information management* clarifies the often-confusing use of terminologies around information management, and discusses success factors of integrated MIS (iMIS) with numerous country examples.

ISPA (2015) *Social Protection Payment Delivery Mechanisms* presents the main methods and different components for cash payments delivery and offers questions and matrices to conduct an in-country assessment.

*Communicating Cash: A Quick Guide to Field Communications in Cash Transfer Programming* by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) is a practical resource to support communication activities with beneficiaries. It covers what beneficiaries need to know, what the channels are, and best practice for sensitization.

ODI and UK Aid (2013) *Holding Cash Transfers to Account: Beneficiary and community perspectives* is a synthesis report of five cash transfers programmes based on perceptions and experiences of beneficiaries with policy recommendations on how programme accountability and M&E can be improved.

Davis et al. (2016) *From Evidence to Action: The Story of Cash Transfers and Impact Evaluation in Sub-Saharan Africa* provides detailed accounts of how some countries have expanded their pilot projects, with a focus on the role of impact evaluation.

UNICEF Office of Research *Impact Evaluation Series* contains methodological briefs and short videos covering a wide range of topics, ranging from theory of change, participatory approaches, data collection and analysis methods.

**ACTION AREA 4: CONNECTING CASH TRANSFERS TO INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE AND SERVICES**

**A. General**

Palermo, Veras and Yablonski (2017) *Cash Plus and Systems Linkages Overview* is a Transfer Project workshop presentation which looks at the strengths and weaknesses of cash transfers and how to link cash transfers with other sectors.

Sedlmayr, Shah and Sulaiman (2017) *Cash-Plus: Variants and Components of Transfer-Based Anti-Poverty Programming* examines whether extensions such as coaching and training augment the poverty-relief effects of cash transfers, or whether they unnecessarily constrain the agency of recipients in the allocation of programme resources.
Tanzania’s cash plus and adolescents: https://www.unicef.org/tanzania/reaching-adolescents-rural-areas. This resource describes current cash plus approaches adopted as part of the Tanzania’s PSSN programme.

B. How to develop cash plus components

C. Integrated services – single window approach
Single Window Services: Models, International Experiences and the Country Case of Brazil’s Cadastro único: https://socialprotection.org/discover/blog/single-window-services-models-international-experiences-and-country-case-brazil%E2%80%99s This resource provides information about the definition of single window approach in social protection, and explains some of its benefits and challenges.

ILO, How to build single window approach: https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowTheme.do?tid=3885 This resource describes ways of developing single window approach as part of social protection programme:


ACTION AREA 5: EXPANDING AND IMPROVING HEALTH INSURANCE

A. Increasing coverage of poor and marginalized population


B. Defining health services included in health insurance


Hatt et al. (2016) Looking at Universal Health Coverage through the Lens of Essential Packages of Health Services.
A. Expanding the quality and affordability of childcare for young children


Government of Viet nam presentation: Maternity Protection of Viet Nam: The Investment Case.


Britto, Hirokazu and Boller (2011) Quality of Early Childhood Development Programs in Global Contexts: Rationale for Investment, Conceptual Framework and Implications for Equity.


UNICEF (forthcoming) Studies of business impact on global supply chains: Viet Nam; Bangladesh; Indonesia and Cote d’Ivoire.

WASH4Work: Mobilizing greater business action to address WASH challenges in the workplace, in communities, and across supply chains

UNICEF (forthcoming) Guidance for Brands on Integrating Child Rights into their Global Supply Chains and Sourcing.


B. Supporting adolescent employability

I) SECONDARY EDUCATION
Guidance on Secondary Education (forthcoming in 2019) and Briefing Note on Alternate Pathways to Secondary Education both provide an overview of the characteristics of high-quality alternate secondary-level education programmes.


The GPE and UNICEF-led Data Must Speak (DMS) initiative is aimed at using data through user-friendly school profile cards to empower communities to take action and drive change, and hold policy makers and schools accountable for resources and performance of schools. Launched in 2014 and implemented in 12 countries to date, the initiative has the potential to expand to secondary level (e.g. in Mali).

The UNICEF, UNESCO Institute for Statistics and GPE Global initiative on Out-of-School Children has supported governments in 87 countries to better use data to identify and reduce the number of primary and lower secondary aged children who are out of school. Future Out-of-School Children Initiative (OOSCI) studies will include older adolescents and non-formal learning, based on forthcoming global evaluation.

II) SKILLS DEVELOPMENT
Global Framework on Transferable Skills (forthcoming 2019): Intended as country guidance and global public good to provide conceptual and programmatic guidance on embedding transferable skills within education and training systems to improve children’s learning and skills development outcomes.

Technical Note on Transitions to Work (forthcoming 2019): Note being developed to guide the design of UNICEF programming on skills for work and the transition to employment.

Unpacking School to Work Transition (forthcoming 2019): Background note analyzing data and recent trends in school to work transition.

Measurement and Monitoring of Foundational Learning Skills through MICS. The UNICEF MICS household survey includes a module to assess reading and numeracy skills of children and adolescents ages 7 to 14 in their homes, including adolescents who are not in school. This module will be applied in approximately 50 developing countries over the next three years.

Solutions for Youth Employment S4YE Impact Portfolio. UNICEF is one of 19 partners within this World Bank initiative which aims provide leadership and resources for catalytic action to increase the number of young people engaged in productive work. UNCEF Kosovo’s UPSHIFT project is profiled.

III) ADOLESCENT GIRLS AND GENDER EQUALITY
UNICEF and ILO (2018) GirlForce: Skills, Education and Training for Girls Now. This advocacy brief analyses recent ILO school-to-work transition data in 34 countries, identifying challenges faced by girls in accessing learning and training and the biases that prevent girls from gaining necessary skills for future employability. Recommendations on these aspects are provided in the note.


**ACTION AREA 7: STRENGTHENING THE SOCIAL WELFARE WORKFORCE AND DIRECT OUTREACH TO FAMILIES**


International Federation of Social Workers (2016) The role of social work in social protection systems: The universal right to social protection aims to advance that the understanding of social work locates social welfare in a broader context of a social developmental model making social protection transformative, leading to positive economic outcomes, to more sustainable, stable, resilient and harmonious societies.

International Federation of Social Workers (2012) Effective and ethical working environments for social services work: The responsibilities of employers of social workers. This policy provides guidelines regarding the working environment required for effective and ethical social work practice; alignment of organizational and social work practice objectives; protection of the interests of service users; and promotion of good standards of practice and quality services.

Roelen (2016) Cash for Care: Making Social Protection Work for Children’s Care and Well-being highlights the need for linking social protection programmes with child protection services.

**ACTION AREA 8: STRENGTHENING INTEGRATED ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS**

Chirchir and Kidd (2011) Good Practice in the Development of Management Information Systems for Social Protection. Strong operational systems are also essential if social exclusion is to be effectively tackled in the implementation of social protection schemes. This publication describes Development Pathways’ experience and expertise in the development of MIS for social protection, which is led by our Senior MIS Specialist, Richard Chirchir.

This ISPA tool provides guidance on information collection and performance assessment of identification systems for social protection: https://ispatools.org/id/

This ISPA tool provides guidance on how to assess a payment mechanism for the delivery of cash or near-cash social protection (SP) transfers primarily targeted at poor and vulnerable populations. https://ispatools.org/payments/

This ISPA tool generates stylized information on the potential impact of public works programmes in a social protection context in a given country, helping to interpret the assessment from a systems perspective. While the emphasis is on
programmes pursuing social protection objectives, the tool could be expanded to assess other types of public works programmes. https://ispatoools.org/public-works/

Development Pathways – Upgrading a social assistance MIS and linking social protection programmes with a single registry.

The National Social Protection Secretariat Single registry for social protection – online tool.


World Bank (2019) Beneficiary Registry: Case Study – Columbia Families in Action. This case study draws from the experience of establishing beneficiary registry under the Columbian ‘Family in Action’ programme.

**ACTION AREA 9: STRENGTHENING NATIONAL SHOCK-RESPONSIVE SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS**


SPIAC-B (2016) Leaving no one behind: How linking social protection and humanitarian action can bridge the development-humanitarian divide

**ACTION AREA 10: LINKING HUMANITARIAN CASH TRANSFERS TO SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS**


UNICEF (2018) Tool to assess the readiness of social protection systems (forthcoming)
Annex 2: Social protection and the sectors

2a. Social protection, monetary poverty and productivity

One of the most fundamental impacts of social protection programmes is to directly address child monetary poverty and the financial barriers families face. This is mainly achieved through direct social transfers, which is also the most studied area. In many cases transfers are sufficient to change poverty rates, and in one meta-analysis 6 out of 9 countries studies showed a decrease in aggregate poverty. However, it is also important to note in many cases that a direct impact on poverty may be limited due to the small sample size or transfer size measures. In OECD countries, with mature social protection systems, generally larger transfer sizes and high-quality data collection, the overall impacts in poverty are extremely clear.

Even where transfer amounts are not sufficient to effect aggregate poverty, there is overwhelming evidence that they increase household expenditure, with 26 out of 35 studies with evaluation on household expenditure demonstrating at least one significant positive impact, and 22 showing increases in household food expenditure, underlining their constructive use.

As well as supporting households directly, social protection also has a positive effect on household productivity. The fundamental purpose of social protection is not only protecting families from the impacts of poverty, but to support them when they experience life shocks, preventing the need for depleting productive assets in an emergency. Evidence from evaluations generally show no negative impacts on labour market participation, and indeed positive impacts in some cases, such as improvement in employment conditions and an increase in investment in productive assets boosting family incomes. Further, social transfers are shown to create broader multiplier effects as cash is used locally, with evidence from countries in sub-Saharan Africa showing income multipliers implying that every US$1 transferred to households adds US$1.3–US$2.5 to the total income in the local economy.

Other areas of child-sensitive social protection can facilitate employment, particularly of mothers. While cash transfers can have an immediate impact on poverty, child-sensitive social protection systems seek to facilitate quality employment of vulnerable populations, including through extending access to childcare, family-friendly workplaces, and employability of adolescents. While these programmes are more nascent in many countries, they form an essential part of social protection systems that address poverty and vulnerability.

Conclusions:

- Social protection, including cash transfers, can address child monetary poverty directly – although small transfer amounts can limit the impacts.
- Transfer size matters: even if transfers are not sufficient to move children and families above the poverty line, they can increase household expenditure and address financial barriers across sectors.
- Social protection also increases household productivity and has positive multiplier effects in the local economy.
Direct interventions to address undernutrition, even when scaled up to 90 per cent coverage rates, have been estimated to address only 20 per cent of the stunting burden. Tackling the underlying drivers of nutrition, particularly in sectors such as social protection, education, health, and water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) is key to addressing the other 80 per cent.\textsuperscript{18}

There are strong links between social protection interventions and pathways for improved nutrition, such as food security. Food consumption and diet diversification is a major focus of expenditure when families living in poverty start receiving cash transfers, and a large body of evidence demonstrates significant increases in food security of families receiving cash transfers. For example, a systemic review of cash transfers shows significant increases in dietary diversity (7 out of 12 studies).

The relationship between social transfers and anthropometric outcomes such as stunting among children is more limited. Multiple reviews have examined the evidence of cash transfers and nutritional outcomes, concluding that impacts on stunting is generally small. One review and meta-analysis of 17 cash transfer programmes found that impacts on height-for-age were small and not statistically significant. Of 12 studies examining stunting or height-for-age, 7 found improvements, and 5 found no impacts. Among nine studies examining wasting or BMI, four found improvements. The results reflect the complex drivers of undernutrition, which include factors other than just income and food security. Importantly, it’s worth noting that no study shows a negative impact.\textsuperscript{19}

Integrated social protection and nutrition responses (including ‘cash plus’ approaches) is an emerging way forward. Increasing work is underway on nutrition-sensitive social protection that can more effectively address the complex drivers of nutrition. This work includes complementary support such as behaviour-change interventions and linkages to nutritional services. These interventions are in their early stages, including in Bangladesh, Ethiopia, Nigeria and Peru,\textsuperscript{20} and more evidence is needed to fully understand impacts and best practices.

\textbf{Conclusions:}

- Social protection programmes including cash transfers support food security, but alone do not always impact nutritional outcomes for children.
- In countries with a high undernutrition burden, integrated social protection interventions with nutrition support (cash plus) could provide the breakthrough, but more evidence is needed on the best combination of packages.
By addressing economic security at the household level, social protection can improve child and maternal health. Financial barriers contribute to food insecurity and insufficient diets, reduced access to health services, compromised hygiene environments, and inadequate care practices, all of which contribute to poor health outcomes. Multiple reviews of the evidence have examined the impacts of cash transfers on health. One review found that 9 out of 15 studies found a positive impact on use of health facilities, while the remaining 6 found no impacts. A second review focusing on six conditional cash transfers or CCTs (five in Latin America and one in Africa) found increases in vaccination, mixed evidence on use of health facilities (care seeking), and mixed evidence on health outcomes such as anaemia and diarrhoea. A third review of 13 studies (mostly CCTs) found positive impacts on health care utilization, skilled attendance at birth, and health related behavior change. As health is a priority area for family expenditure, reasons for a lack of impact may include insufficient transfer size, short duration of exposure, lack of available quality health care services, and the complex nature of determinants of health.

Cash transfers do not need to be conditional to benefit child health. The evidence on the benefits of conditionality on health outcomes is not conclusive: most evidence on conditional transfers comes from Latin America and most evidence on unconditional transfers comes from Africa, and contextual differences in burden of disease and quality of healthcare services make comparisons difficult. An additional reason for not finding positive impacts on usage of health services may relate to the presence or absence of conditions mandating preventive care visits. Few studies have tested the effectiveness of conditions directly. Given the multisectoral benefits of cash and the limited evidence UNICEF does not actively promote conditions in cash transfers (see Annex 3).

By many definitions, access to health is a fundamental aspect of social protection. Health shocks at household level play a crucial role in a family's economic security, and as such ensuring free access to quality healthcare is a fundamental aspect of social protection and a core component of the ILO's social protection floor. Accordingly, UNICEF’s work towards universal health coverage can be understood as part of our work on social protection.

Opportunities should be found to connect social protection and health programmes. Promising areas are emerging connecting social protection and health programmes to improve health outcomes for children and families. One important approach is directly providing beneficiaries of social protection programming with fee waivers for health insurance programmes, as has been done in Ghana. There may be further opportunities in linking social protection programmes with health information and links to services, as is emerging in nutrition.

Conclusions:
- Social protection, including cash transfers, have fundamental and significant impacts on usage of health services, while the evidence on health outcomes is mixed.
- By many definitions access to health is a fundamental aspect of social protection.
- In many contexts, there may be opportunities to combine health and social protection programming, such as enrolment into health insurance schemes or supply-side strengthening to enhance the quality of services.
2d. Social protection and education

Social protection interventions have major impacts on key educational indicators. Direct and opportunity costs to education are a significant impediment to educational enrolment and completion. A systematic review of 35 studies examining the impacts of cash transfers on education found that both conditional and unconditional cash transfers have positive impacts on enrolment, with stronger evidence for positive impacts on secondary enrolment. Five studies looked at test scores, and the review concludes that effects on student achievement measured by test scores is limited, which may be due to limited available evidence, as well as the complex dynamics, including supply-side factors, behind learning outcomes.

Cash transfers have clear, positive impacts for girls’ education. There has been extensive study on the impact of cash transfers on gender and education, with results showing increases in school attendance for girls and some improvements in test scores and cognitive development.

The evidence on conditionality is nuanced. Reviews find positive evidence of both unconditional and conditional transfers on attendance with no significant difference overall, but there is some evidence that the degree of monitoring and enforcement may increase impacts on enrolment. Some countries are innovating with design and targeting transfers to enhance impacts among adolescent girls to encourage enrolment and completion, as well as moving beyond simple conditionality to provide support to families where children are not attending school (see Annex 3 for more on conditionality).

Education has been a sectoral leader in social protection through fee abolition and school meals. Extensive work to abolish school fees has proved to be a hugely impactful social protection intervention, addressing financial barriers with transformational impacts. With a number of informal fees remaining, as well as growth in private schools across contexts, financial barriers to education still remain a significant challenge. While the evidence on free school meals compared direct transfers is mixed, free school meals remain a significant intervention in 131 studies, with at least 368 million children being fed daily at school.

A new area of work is emerging in connecting cash transfers with support to help adolescents achieve a healthy and productive transition to adulthood. In Tanzania, for example, adolescents in households receiving a cash transfer are being linked to livelihood skills training and education on topics related to sexual and reproductive health and HIV treatment and prevention, through mentoring and coaching.

Conclusions:

- Social protection, including cash transfers, have a significant impact on enrolment. Evidence on educational outcomes is less clear, perhaps due to the complex dynamics behind learning outcomes.
- Both conditional and unconditional transfers show impacts on enrolment, with some evidence that monitoring and enforcement can increase results, particularly for girls.
- Combining cash transfers with support to adolescents in the form of additional training and linkages to information and services is an emerging area that may improve adolescent transitions to adulthood.
2e. Social protection and WASH

WASH has generally received very limited focus in terms of social protection programming and impact evaluations, despite being integral to child health and development. There may be two factors driving this. First, programme evaluations are limited in the number of areas they can consider and focus may be drawn by health, nutrition and education outcomes.

Second, and relatedly, cash transfers may be expected to have a limited impact on some WASH outcomes. Water is often free at the point of delivery, and is such a vital priority that increased income may not effect common indicators. For sanitation practices, behaviour change may be expected to be more influential on outcomes than income change. Income changes may be expected to have more of an impact on the adequacy of sanitation facilities, but little data is available to assess this.

Behaviour change through ‘cash plus’ approaches may be the most important entry point, but there are limited examples. Given the vital role of knowledge and behaviour patterns in WASH practices, linking cash transfers with information and behaviour change may be effective. One example showing possibilities in this area is in Ethiopia, where handwashing practices formed an important part of behaviour change communication as part of a cash transfer, and lack of water was considered a crucial barrier to putting some of the knowledge about sanitation and nutrition in practice.

Given the strong links between nutrition and WASH outcomes and the growing work on linking nutrition interventions to social protection programming, integrating WASH with nutrition behaviour change communication could be an efficient and effective combination.

Conclusions:

- There is significant scope to increase consideration of WASH outcomes in social protection programming.
- Including relevant indicators in cash transfer evaluations could clarify the role of changing family income and WASH outcomes.
- Including WASH components in ‘cash plus’ behaviour change communication may be the most effective engagement, particularly in linking WASH to nutrition where there is extensive ongoing work.
The relationship between poverty and child protection issues is complex. Poverty can exacerbate children's vulnerability to violence, exploitation and neglect, and child maltreatment can result into poverty in adulthood. Further, financial stress in families can push children into hazardous working conditions or child marriage, violating their rights. Gender is an important moderator of the relationship between poverty, economic distress and adverse child protection outcomes. For example, girls are at a much higher risk of early marriage and sexual exploitation driven by poverty compared to boys.

A recent review of social safety nets and childhood violence, including cash transfers, found only 11 studies examining these linkages, analyzing 57 unique impacts on diverse violence indicators. Among the 57 indicators examined, approximately one in five found significant social protection impacts on childhood violence, with the most promising evidence originating from impacts on sexual violence among female adolescents in Africa. The evidence on the ability of social protection programmes to delay marriage is more limited, but there are examples of cash transfer programmes which have possibly delayed marriage, sexual debut and pregnancy in Eastern and Southern Africa. However, these findings are not replicated in all contexts.

Social service workers and family outreach play a vital role. Social outreach services can offer families direct support as well as provide a link between families and existing social protection and child protection services. As outlined in Chapter 2 (Action Area 7), building these systems and connections is a crucial comparative advantage of UNICEF.

Child protection and social protection are different but complementary, and often work with similar partners. The core goal of social protection is addressing economic vulnerability of families, while child protection focuses on protecting children from vulnerabilities such as violence, abuse, exploitation and harmful practices. While these vulnerabilities are conceptually different, they often intertwine at the family level. Also, it is often the same ministries and local structures that we engage with and that ultimately engage with families.

Coordination is crucial. Given the unique complementarities between social protection and child protection, effective coordination between child protection and social protection work is essential.

Conclusions:

- The relationship between social protection and child protection can be complex, but the work of social protection to strengthen families economically may have direct impacts on child protection results.
- The role of social service workers and family outreach is a crucial connection between social protection and child protection and a core value added of UNICEF.
- Social protection and child protection must work closely together to ensure effective and efficient services for families and children.
Poverty is one of the structural drivers of risk-seeking behaviour associated with HIV. Poverty also disproportionately impacts people living with HIV due to lost income and the increasing cost of accessing treatment and care and support services. Research has shown that HIV-sensitive social protection, particularly cash transfer programmes, have a positive impact on mitigating the risky behaviours associated with HIV, adherence to HIV treatment, providing income support to households living with HIV, and improving access to care and support services.

Recent studies show the positive impacts of integrated HIV-sensitive social protection programmes on HIV prevention. Evidence reviews show that a combination of different social protection programmes are more effective in reducing new HIV infections and mitigating risky behaviours, which calls for a cash plus approach to address HIV prevention outcomes.

Randomized trials in Malawi, Kenya and South Africa have shown that national cash transfer programmes coupled with educational conditionality reduced HIV prevalence and reduce the risk of HIV infection among adolescents, particularly girls. A recent study from South Africa shows that an integrated social protection services (with a cash plus component of parental monitoring and access to HIV support groups) improved adherence and retention to antiretroviral therapy and retention in care.

The role of social protection for care and support is better documented. Social protection not only prevents deprivation among people living with HIV, but home-based care for people living with HIV or AIDS and their caregivers can play a crucial role. Home-based care has documented benefits, positively impacting on provision of healthcare for those marginalized due to poverty, HIV or other stigmatized status. Home-based care also helps to promote treatment adherence; provide food and economic support to members of affected households; and link clients and caregivers with legal support and livelihood opportunities.

**Conclusions:**

- HIV-sensitive social protection, particularly cash transfer programmes, have a positive impact on mitigating the risky behaviours associated with HIV, and supporting treatment and income support of households with HIV-positive members.
- Moving forward, integration of HIV sensitivity in social protection programming particularly in high burden countries is needed.
- ‘Cash plus’ approaches (a combination of cash and linkages to existing services services) may be more effective to address HIV outcomes than cash alone.
Annex 3: Conditionality in cash transfers: UNICEF’s approach

Conditional cash transfers are transfers given to beneficiaries conditional on specific actions such as sending children to school or making regular health visits, and unconditional transfers are those that are given to beneficiaries without any specific requirements beyond eligibility.

The arguments for and against
Arguments that support conditionality are both conceptual and political. On the one hand, it is argued that conditionality can help overcome situations where households don’t have a full understanding of the benefits of services or actions, such as the returns to education. Further, from a practical political-economy perspective, it may be easier to gain political support from policy makers, taxpayers and sometimes communities themselves if transfers are linked with specific responsibilities.

On the other side, it is argued from a human rights perspective, individuals have a right to social protection that is not conditional on particular actions and that conditionality undermines the principles of human dignity. A related concern is that conditionalities may further marginalize those least likely to be able to comply with conditions due to the barriers they face. Conditionalities can also decrease poor households’ ability to choose the most appropriate investments by assuming that they are not capable of wise choices, and as such sector-specific conditionalities can run the risk of undermining the multi-sectoral and mutually reinforcing impacts of cash transfers. Finally, from an operational standpoint, conditionalities carry a higher financial and administrative burden due to the monitoring of compliance, and their effective implementation depends on the existence of human capacity and supply of quality services at national and sub-national level.

The evidence: impacts of unconditional and conditional transfers
Evidence from rigorous impact evaluations shows that both conditional and unconditional transfers have positive impacts on a range of outcomes of similar magnitude. Some systematic reviews have found no statistically significant differences between approaches in nutrition, health and education outcomes, while others have found some limited differences in some areas such as education.

UNICEF’s approach
UNICEF’s approach to conditionality is based on a number of considerations, including UNICEF’s human rights-based approach, an examination of the available evidence, and on-the-ground experience working with both conditional and unconditional transfers.

UNICEF does not actively promote the use of conditionality in its technical assistance, in light of human rights and operational concerns and insufficient evidence of the added value of conditionalities. UNICEF’s application of this approach is context-specific, taking into consideration national priorities and political economy, and the social and economic vulnerabilities of children and their families.

To address non-income related barriers and constraints to realizing children’s rights, UNICEF promotes and supports:

- Clear, accessible communication of programme objectives, operations and participants’ rights, to participants, communities and the general public.
- Design and implementation of accompanying training and information, for example on nutritional information or early childhood development.
• Strengthening linkages between cash transfers and social services, and the required supply response.
• Strengthening provision of social support services, including referrals to other social services and programmes.

Where UNICEF is working with governments considering or implementing conditional cash transfers, UNICEF works with partners to:

• Consider the option of 'soft conditions', with an emphasis on messaging related to the objective of the transfer programme and removal of punitive action if a beneficiary is not able to comply.
• Ensure that sector-specific conditions do not undermine the cash transfers’ potential broad-based benefits.
• Assess the administrative, financial and social feasibility of implementation.

Source: This annex is a summary of [Conditionality in cash transfers: UNICEF’s approach](February 2016).
Annex 4: Integrating gender into social protection programming: an emerging approach

Social protection has significant potential to contribute to tackling gender inequality – a prerequisite for sustainable and equitable poverty reduction for all, including children. For example, social protection measures can help to reduce physical abuse and increase decision-making power. However, social protection is not automatically supportive of gender equality and can even reinforce harmful gender norms and practices if not designed and implemented in a gender-sensitive way.

Integrating gender in social protection: a diagnostic tool

UNICEF is working in partnership with international partners including DFID and the World Bank on new work to support global efforts to better integrate gender into social protection interventions and systems, and to be more ambitious about the transformational potential that social protection has for tackling gender inequality. This includes a new research programme on gender and social protection.

As part of the conceptual framework for this research programme, UNICEF’s Office of Research – Innocenti has applied the ‘gender integration continuum’ diagnostic tool to social protection programmes, as outlined below, to support efforts to integrate gender appropriately into different phrases of social protection programming.

Where a programme falls along this continuum depends on how gender is considered (or not) across the different phases of the programming cycle – one programme could theoretically have gender-responsive design features but gender-neutral M&E systems. Programmes can be categorised as gender-discriminatory, gender-blind or neutral, gender-sensitive, gender-responsive and gender-transformative.

- **Gender-discriminatory** interventions (systems) are those that intentionally or unintentionally take advantage of gender stereotypes in pursuit of programme outcomes and may reinforce gender inequalities. An example is a programme that makes women only responsible for fulfilling conditions related to children in order to be eligible for and to receive the social protection benefit.

- **Gender-neutral (sometimes referred to as gender-blind)** interventions (systems) are those that ignore gender roles, norms and relations and how these might affect women's and men's specific needs. Gender-blind interventions are not aimed specifically at either women or men, and they often assume that the programme or intervention will affect them equally. An example is a contributory (only) social protection system, which does not account for the lower likelihood of women to work in the formal sector.

- **Gender-sensitive** interventions (systems) acknowledge and address gender insofar as it is needed to reach programme objectives. This type of intervention may benefit women specifically but without tackling the root causes that contribute to gender inequalities. An example is the provision of childcare support to mothers in public works.

- **Gender-responsive** interventions (systems) are those that acknowledge gender dynamics and deliberately respond to women's and men's specific needs. Such interventions may target specific groups of women/men to achieve certain gender equality goals. An example is the provision of individual cash benefits to men and women rather than combining them in one household transfer.

- **Gender-transformative** interventions (systems) are those that address the causes of gender-based inequalities and work to transform harmful gender roles, norms and relations. They seek to transform unequal gender relations to promote shared power, control of resources, decision-making, and support for women’s empowerment. They adopt gender equality and women’s empowerment as a deliberate and primary objective. Such interventions might for example aim to tackle income poverty and increase women’s decision-making...
power over financial decisions and contraceptive use as equal primary aims, and be designed to actively change gender norms. Another example is the inclusion of behaviour change components targeting men and boys to promote shared responsibility in care work.

**Minimum standards and beyond**

Efforts to integrate gender equality and women’s empowerment objectives into any given policy or programme can be carried out along a ‘gender integration continuum’. Specifically, where a programme falls along this continuum depends on how gender is considered (or not) across its design (intent and features), implementation (fidelity to design), financing and M&E systems, and associated outcomes and impacts. Much of this should be guided by the local context, evidence and context-specific reality of women’s and girls’ rights, and associated challenges and opportunities in that country or territory. At a minimum, all social protection interventions and systems must uphold the principle to ‘do no harm’ and employ a basic level of gender sensitivity (even where gender equality is not a primary objective). Gender-sensitive programmes may opt to conform to existing gender norms in order to enhance specific programme outcomes, but the ultimate goal of the social protection system should be to gradually move towards more gender-responsive and transformative programming (if the objectives of poverty reduction, risk pooling and income security against risks and contingencies are to be met). This means that interventions should not only aim to deliberately respond to specific gender needs but also strive to transform harmful gender norms and practices that affect women’s and girls’ capabilities - and empower them to exercise their agency and live to their full potential.

Sources:


Annex 5: Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework for UNICEF’s work on social protection and organizational leads

Social protection features prominently in UNICEF’s latest Strategic Plan. Many results are clustered under Goal Area 5 ‘Every Child has an Equitable Chance in Life’, which includes a social protection results area featuring two outcome and two output level indicators on social protection. While the overall lead for social protection is the Social Policy section in Programme Division, as a multifaceted area of work other sections and divisions also support organizational social protection objectives, and social protection indicators can also be found across other results areas and indicators. All the organizational indicators and targets can be found in The Strategic Plan Results Framework.

Progress against these indicators is measured annually by collecting country office responses to the Strategic Monitoring Questions (SMQs), and reported in the Executive Director’s Annual Report (EDAR), the Data Companion as well as the Goal Area 5 Annual Reports. Results Assessment Module (RAM) standard indicators on social protection were developed to facilitate the global tracking of progress in various areas of work under social protection, and can be selected by country offices for their country programme documents (CPDs) to measure progress on social protection outcomes. Social protection expenditure should be coded to the corresponding Specific Intervention Codes (SIC) under the Social Protection Result Area.

UNICEF’s result areas, indicators and expenditure codes are summarized in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1 Organizational indicators and reporting on social protection

<p>| ACTION AREA 1: CHILD POVERTY ANALYSIS, IMPACT EVALUATIONS AND SYSTEMS ASSESSMENTS |
| Understanding child protection and social protection systems |
| Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area | Strategic Plan indicators | SMQs (Strategic Monitoring Questions) | RAM (Results Assessment Module) indicators | Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC) |
| Goal Area 5 Result Area: Child Poverty | 5.1. Percentage of children living in extreme poverty (SDG 1.1.1) (outcome indicator) | n/a | Outcome indicator: Number of children living in poverty according to (a) International extreme poverty line; (b) National monetary poverty lines; or (c) National multidimensional poverty lines. | n/a |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs (Strategic Monitoring Questions)</th>
<th>RAM (Results Assessment Module) indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25-01-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result Area: Child Poverty</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Child poverty measurement: support to routine national measurement of monetary and multidimensional child poverty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a.1. Number of countries with nationally-owned measurement and reporting on child poverty</td>
<td>SMQ-25-01-5.a.1-1 When was the most recent monetary child poverty rate reported? If monetary child poverty is not reported, select ‘not reported’. Please indicate the age group for the monetary child poverty rate in the ‘Remarks’ section.</td>
<td>Output indicators: 1.1 National government measurement of child poverty using multidimensional measures. 1.2 National government measurement of child poverty using monetary measures.</td>
<td>25-01-01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.a.3. Number of countries where measurement, analysis or advocacy has led to policies and programmes to reduce child poverty</td>
<td>SMQ-25-01-5.a.3-9 Is the country explicitly responding to child poverty with a set of policies and programmes embedded in national plans? Choose one option that best describes the current situation:  • Option 1 - There is no child poverty measurement (either monetary or multidimensional);  • Option 2 - There are child poverty measures but they are not used or receive little traction in discussions involving government nor in advocacy (please provide a brief explanation in ‘Comments’);  • Option 3 - Child poverty measures are being used in ongoing policy discussions and/or advocacy but have not yet lead to changes in policies and programmes for children;  • Option 4 - Child poverty measures have informed guiding documents, e.g. national development plans;  • Option 5 - Child poverty measures have had specific impacts and/or informed policies and strategies;  • Option 6 – Policies/strategies have been translated into programmes to address child poverty.</td>
<td>Output indicators: 1.3 Advocacy is shaped by child poverty analysis (media and social media campaigns). 1.4 Policies and programmes are influenced by analysis and advocacy to reduce child poverty.</td>
<td>25-01-02</td>
<td>Child poverty analysis towards policy change (profiling, mapping and identifying drivers of multidimensional and monetary poverty of children, modelling and simulation of policy options). 25-01-03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</td>
<td>Strategic Plan indicators</td>
<td>SMQs (Strategic Monitoring Questions)</td>
<td>RAM (Results Assessment Module) indicators</td>
<td>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Child Poverty</strong></td>
<td>5.b.1. Number of countries with moderately strong or strong social protection systems</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.b.1-2 Was child poverty and deprivation analysis used by the Government to inform social protection reforms and/or social protection strategy formulation? SMQ-25-02-5.b.1-6. How often are the social assistance programmes evaluated or assessed?</td>
<td>2.1 Evidence: Existence of data and evidence on how social protection systems are responding to child poverty and deprivations (such as health, education, nutrition etc). 2.8 M&amp;E: Monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are used to follow up on social protection delivery/system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACTION AREA 2: POLICY AND STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT, COORDINATION AND FINANCING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection</strong></td>
<td>5.b.1. Number of countries with moderately strong or strong social protection systems</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.b.1-1. Does the government have a legal social protection policy or legal framework? SMQ-25-02-5.b.1-3. Are there national and sub-national coordination mechanisms in place to coordinate national social protection programming? (NOTE: Refers to government coordination, rather than development partners.) SMQ-25-02-5.b.1-4. What percentage of GDP is dedicated to social assistance programmes (cash transfers, in kind, social pensions, school feeding, public works, fee waivers)?</td>
<td>2.2 Policy/strategy: Existence of valid national social protection strategy and/or policy. 2.3 Cash transfers: Existence of legislation on cash transfer programmes and/or family benefits. 2.4 Coordination: Coordination mechanisms for social protection systems established countrywide. 2.5 Public spending on social protection from domestic resources as a proportion of national budget. 2.6 Social protection financing: Proportion of public social protection expenditure that goes to children (% GDP). 2.7 Data management: Social protection data management system developed (management information systems, social and beneficiary registries).</td>
<td>25-02-04 National social protection strategies: policies, strategies, legislation and coordination (inter-ministerial, donor). 25-02-12 Public finance management in social protection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</td>
<td>Strategic Plan indicators</td>
<td>SMQs</td>
<td>RAM indicators</td>
<td>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection</strong></td>
<td>5.4. Number of girls and boys reached by cash transfer programmes through UNICEF-supported programmes (outcome indicator)</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.4-15. What is the total number of children covered by UNICEF-supported cash transfer programmes in your country? (UNICEF-supported means technical assistance, direct programme implementation and funding of cash transfers to either government or through parallel systems e.g. UN agencies/INGO/private sector etc., in both development and humanitarian contexts).</td>
<td><strong>Outcome indicator:</strong> Number of children covered by social protection systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.b.1. Number of countries with moderately strong or strong social protection systems</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-6.b.1-5. What are the existing elements of the integrated social and beneficiary registry system?</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-6.b.1-7. What is the proportion of total children in the country covered by the social assistance programme(s)?</td>
<td><strong>Output indicators:</strong> 2.7 Data management: Social protection data management system developed (MIS, social and beneficiary registries, M&amp;E systems). 2.9 Cash transfers: Cash transfer system DESIGNED including expanding coverage and improving inclusion of children (e.g. design, targeting, beneficiary selection, cash delivery and overall financing). 2.10 Cash transfers: Cash transfer system is being effectively IMPLEMENTED including the expanding coverage and improving inclusion of children (e.g. beneficiary identification, grievance mechanisms, cash delivery mechanisms).</td>
<td>25-02-01 Cash transfers: Technical support to government cash transfer system development and expansion (design, targeting, beneficiary selection, grievance mechanism, cash delivery mechanisms like banking, mobiles, community distribution). 25-02-02 Cash transfers: Social protection data management (MIS, social and beneficiary registries, M&amp;E systems). 25-02-03 Cash transfers: Delivery of cash transfers through government system (beneficiary identification, grievance mechanisms, cash delivery mechanisms like banking, mobiles, community distribution).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTION AREA 4: CONNECTING CASH TRANSFERS TO INFORMATION, KNOWLEDGE AND SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection</strong></td>
<td>5.b.1. Number of countries with moderately strong or strong social protection systems</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.b.1-8. Are social assistance programmes in the country linking beneficiaries to information and knowledge and/or other services?</td>
<td>2.13 Beneficiaries of cash transfers are linked with other programmes, information and services. 2.12 Social welfare workforce strengthened and connected to social protection system (case management, referral capacity development).</td>
<td>25-02-05 Linking cash to other programmes, information and services (information on essential family practices, livelihoods, psychosocial support, etc).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACTION AREA 5: EXPANDING AND IMPROVING HEALTH INSURANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 1 Result Areas: maternal and newborn health; immunisation; child health.</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.9 Other social protection programmes ARE adapted to address child poverty and deprivation (such as access to affordable child care, health insurance etc).</td>
<td>25-02-08 Support to other social protection programmes - universal health coverage/health insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACTION AREA 6: SUPPORTING CHILD CARE AND ADOLESCENT EMPLOYABILITY

### Childcare

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 1</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Result Area</strong>: Early childhood development (ECD)</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>2.9 Other social protection programmes ARE adapted to address child poverty and deprivation (such as access to affordable childcare, health insurance etc).</td>
<td>25-02-07 Support to other social protection programmes: Childcare and early childhood development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Result Area</strong>: Social Protection</td>
<td>1.20. Percentage of children receiving early stimulation and responsive care from their parents or caregivers (outcome indicator).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percentage of caregivers with knowledge of children's cognitive and psychosocial development by being responsive to the child's needs for care, and stimulating the child through talking, reading and other appropriate interactions. Percentage of children aged 36-59 months with whom adult household members engaged in early childhood stimulation and learning activities. Percentage of children receiving early stimulation and responsive care from their parents or caregivers. Percentage of children under 5 years of age experiencing harsh discipline at home.</td>
<td>21-08-01 21-08-03 21-08-06 21-08-99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</td>
<td>Strategic Plan indicators</td>
<td>SMQs</td>
<td>RAM indicators</td>
<td>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Goal Area 1 Result Area: Early childhood development (ECD)** | 1.h.1. Number of countries that have adopted ECD packages for children at scale. | SMQ-21-08-1.h.1-2. Are two or more ECD interventions combined and delivered as a package through at least one existing platform to address the holistic early childhood development of children 0-59 months through UNICEF supported programmes during the year of reporting in the country? Please indicate which interventions (e.g. nutrition, health, early stimulation and learning, parenting, social and child protection, etc) in the ‘Remarks’ section. | Existence of integrated early stimulation, protection and nutrition intervention packages targeting children aged 0–35 months. National training mechanism established for ECD frontline workers. Country Programme incorporates early stimulation, protection and nutrition packages targeting children aged 0-3 (Including Care for Child Development). | 21-08-02  
21-08-09  
21-08-99 |
|  |  | SMQ-21-08-1.h.1-3. Are any of these packages adopted at scale? SMQ-21-08-1.h.1-4. Do any of these early stimulation interventions target children aged 0-59 months in humanitarian situations? (Please note: we are not currently calculating this). | | |
| **Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection** | 1.h.2. Number of countries with national ECD policy or implementation plans for scale-up | SMQ-21-08-1.h.2-5. Does the country have a national multisectoral ECD policy? SMQ-21-08-1.h.2-6. Does the country have a national multisectoral ECD action/implementation plan? SMQ-21-08-1.h.2-7 (we are not calculating this, was a Data, Research and Policy (DRP) question). If the plan was supported by UNICEF in previous years, please provide details in the ‘Remarks’ section. | National monitoring and reporting system on budget allocation and implementation status on ECD across sectors established and operationalized. | 21-08-04  
21-08-05  
21-08-99 |
|  |  | | | |
|  | 1.h.3. Percentage of UNICEF-targeted girls and boys in humanitarian situations who participate in organized programmes with ECD kits through UNICEF-supported programmes. | SMQ-21-08-1.h.3-8. What is the number of children under the age of 5 targeted to participate in organized programmes with ECD kit (either UNICEF ECD kit or locally procured set of materials) or an equivalent concept in humanitarian situations through UNICEF-supported programmes? SMQ-21-08-1.h.3-9. How many of those targeted children actually participated in organized programmes with ECD kit or an equivalent concept in humanitarian situations through UNICEF-supported programmes? SMQ-21-08-1.h.3-9a. How many of the children who participated in organized programmes with ECD kit or equivalent were children with disabilities? | ECD is integrated in UNICEF’s emergency preparedness and response plan and implementation. ECD partnerships, including ECD Action Network (ECDAN), established at national level to coordinate the programme interventions and provide advocacy. | 21-08-07  
21-08-08  
21-08-99 |
## Adolescent employability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result Area:</strong> Social Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HQ Lead:</strong> Social Policy section</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.9 Other social protection programmes ARE adapted to address child poverty and deprivation (such as access to affordable child care, health insurance etc.).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result Area:</strong> Adolescent empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of adolescent girls and boys who participate in or lead civic engagement initiatives through UNICEF-supported programmes (outcome indicator)</td>
<td>SMQ-25-03-5.5-1</td>
<td>If the country office supports adolescent civic engagement, what was the number of adolescent girls and boys who participate in or led civic engagement initiatives through UNICEF-supported programmes in development contexts during the year of reporting?</td>
<td>Number of adolescent girls and boys who participate in or lead civic engagement initiatives</td>
<td>25-03-01 System strengthening for adolescent participation and civic engagement (including in humanitarian settings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-03-5.5-2</td>
<td>If the country office supports adolescent civic engagement, what was the number of adolescent girls and boys who participated in or led civic engagement initiatives through UNICEF-supported programmes in humanitarian contexts during the year of reporting?</td>
<td>Number of adolescent girls and boys who participate in or lead civic engagement initiatives through UNICEF-supported programmes</td>
<td>25-03-02 Adolescents participating in or leading civic engagement initiatives (including in humanitarian settings).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.c.1 Number of countries with appropriate national policies and legislation supporting development of adolescent girls and boys</td>
<td>SMQ 25-03-5.c.1-3: Does the country have policies/legislation on adolescent development?</td>
<td>Number of adolescent girls and boys completed a skills development programme.</td>
<td>Existence of a multisectoral, adolescent policy/action plan (reflecting sectoral commitments for adolescents).</td>
<td>25-03-04 Development of multi-sectoral legislation/policies/strategies/action plans supporting development and participation of adolescents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ 25-03-5.c.1-4 Select all criteria that apply to the national multisectoral policies/legislation on adolescent development.</td>
<td>Number of countries with appropriate national policies and legislation supporting development of adolescent boys and girls.</td>
<td>Existence of a strengthened system for adolescent participation.</td>
<td>25-03-05 Adolescent participation data/research/evaluation evidence generation, synthesis, and use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ 25-03-5.c.1-5: Select all criteria that apply for the first national single sector policy on adolescent development.</td>
<td>Number of girls and boys who have participated in skills development programmes for learning, personal empowerment, active citizenship and/or employability through UNICEF-supported programmes.</td>
<td>Number of adolescent girls and boys who completed a skills development programme.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ 25-03-5.c.1-6: Select all criteria that apply for the second national single sector policy on adolescent development.</td>
<td>Percentage of country offices routinely engaging children in the planning, implementation and M&amp;E of UNICEF country programmes.</td>
<td>Number of countries with appropriate national policies and legislation supporting development of adolescent boys and girls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Area 2 Result Area: Skills Development</td>
<td>Strategic Plan indicators</td>
<td>SMQs</td>
<td>RAM indicators</td>
<td>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of 15-24 years old not in employment, education or training (NEET) (Outcome indicator) 2.c.1 Number of girls and boys who have participated in skills development programmes for learning, personal empowerment, active citizenship and/or employability through UNICEF-supported programmes</td>
<td>All SMQs under Result Area 3: Skills development. SMQ-22-03-2.c.1-1</td>
<td>Percentage of youth not in employment, education or training (NEET). Service Delivery - Skills - Number of children who have participated in skills development programmes for learning, personal empowerment, active citizenship and/or employability through UNICEF-supported programmes.</td>
<td>All SICs under Result Area 3: Skills development. 22-03-02 Provision of skills development for adolescents (10-19 year-olds) (including in temporary learning spaces). 22-03-03 Provision of skills development for multiple age groups (including in temporary learning spaces).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.c.2. Percentage of UNICEF-supported countries with systems that institutionalize gender-equitable skills for learning, personal empowerment, active citizenship and/or employability (available with disaggregation across 3 dimensions: i) Mainstreaming of skills development within the national education/training system; ii) Responsiveness to the demands of the labour market; and iii) gender-equitable skills development)</td>
<td>SMQ-22-03-2.c.2-3 to SMQ-22-03-2.c.2-7</td>
<td>See SP/SMQ guidance for corresponding RAM indicators.</td>
<td>22-03-04 to 22-03-14 22-03-99 Should be prorated across all 22-03 SICs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACTION AREA 7: STRENGTHENING THE SOCIAL WELFARE WORKFORCE AND DIRECT OUTREACH TO FAMILIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5</strong> Result Area: Social Protection</td>
<td>5.b.1. Number of countries with moderately strong or strong social protection systems</td>
<td>SMO-25-02-5.b.1-9. Is there direct outreach and case management linked to the social assistance programming?</td>
<td>2.12 Social welfare workforce strengthened and connected to social protection system (case management, referral capacity development). 2.13 Beneficiaries of cash transfers are linked with other programmes, information and services.</td>
<td>25-02-06 Social welfare workforce strengthening - case management, referral, capacity development. 25-02-07 Support to other social protection programmes: childcare and early childhood development. 25-02-08 Support to other social protection programmes - universal health coverage/health insurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 3</strong> Result Area: Prevention and Response to Violence</td>
<td>3.3. Core prevention and response interventions addressing violence against children through UNICEF-supported programmes (a) number of mothers, fathers and caregivers reached through parenting programmes; and (b) number of girls and boys who have experienced violence who are reached by health, social work or justice/law enforcement services (outcome indicator).</td>
<td>SMO-23-01-3.3.b-1 Has the country office supported programmes contributing to achieving the result on children receiving prevention and response services for violence against children? SMO-23-01-3.3.b-2 How many children who experienced violence were reached by UNICEF-supported health, social work/social services or justice/law enforcement services? SMO-23-01-3.3.b-2a What is the age breakdown of the children who were reached by UNICEF-supported health, social work/social services or justice/law enforcement services? SMO-23-01-3.3.b-2b a) How many of the children were reached by UNICEF-supported health services? SMO-23-01-3.3.b-2c b) How many of the children were reached by UNICEF-supported social work/social services? SMO-23-01-3.3.b-2d c) How many of the children were reached by UNICEF-supported justice/law enforcement services? SMO-23-01-3.3.b-2e How many of the children reached by UNICEF-supported health, social work/social services or justice/law enforcement services were children with disabilities? SMO-23-01-3.3.a-5 If the country office supported parenting programmes this year with the aim of contributing to achieving the result on children receiving prevention and response services for violence against children, how many mothers, fathers and caregivers were reached through those UNICEF-supported parenting programmes?</td>
<td>Number of mothers, fathers and caregivers reached through parenting programmes. Number of girls and boys who have experienced violence reached by health, social work or justice/law enforcement services.</td>
<td>23-01-14 Parent/caregiver education and programmes on violence, exploitation and abuse - across the life cycle. 23-01-15 Parent/caregiver education and programmes on violence, exploitation and abuse - 0 to 7 years. 23-01-16 Parent/caregiver education and programmes on violence, exploitation and abuse - 8 to 18 years. For the SICs relevant to SP indicator 3.3.b, following are the primary SICs, but other SICs can also be relevant. 23-01-02 Services to prevent or respond to violence, exploitation and abuse. 23-01-03 Services to prevent or respond to gender-based violence in emergencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTION AREA 8: STRENGTHENING INTEGRATED ADMINISTRATIVE SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection</strong></td>
<td>5.b.1. Number of countries with moderately strong or strong social protection systems</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-6.b.1-5. What are the existing elements of the integrated social and beneficiary registry system?</td>
<td>2.7 Data management: Social protection data management system developed (MIS, social and beneficiary registries, M&amp;E systems). 2.9 Cash transfers: Cash transfer system DESIGNED including expanding coverage and improving inclusion of children (e.g. design, targeting, beneficiary selection, cash delivery and overall financing). 2.10 Cash transfers: Cash transfer system is being effectively IMPLEMENTED including the expanding coverage and improving inclusion of children (e.g. beneficiary identification, grievance mechanisms, cash delivery mechanisms).</td>
<td>25-02-01 Cash transfers: Technical support to government cash transfer system development and expansion (design, targeting, beneficiary selection, grievance mechanism, cash delivery mechanisms like banking, mobiles, community distribution). 25-02-02 Cash transfers: Social protection data management (MIS, social and beneficiary registries, M&amp;E systems).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ACTION AREA 9: STRENGTHENING NATIONAL SHOCK-RESPONSIVE SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

#### Cash delivery and linkages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal Area 5 Result Area: Social Protection</th>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.b.2 Number of countries with national cash transfer programmes that are ready to respond to a crisis</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.b.2-11. Do the social protection and disaster risk management (DRM) policy, strategy or legal framework support scaling up of cash transfer programmes (i.e expansion and adjustment) of social protection in emergencies?</td>
<td>Outcome indicator: National social protection system is ready to respond to a crisis (see the scale for options).</td>
<td>25-02-09 Shock-responsive social protection - Strengthening social protection system for humanitarian response (preparedness).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.b.2-12. What is the level of coordination between the stakeholders relevant for shock responsive social protection to enable the scale up of cash transfer programmes?</td>
<td>Output indicators: 2.14 Shock-responsive social protection (SRSP): Policy/strategy is adapted to support appropriate and timely vertical and/or horizontal expansion of the existing social protection systems during crisis by government and/or humanitarian agencies (linking with early warning systems, climate change and resilience building policies, contingency budgeting and financing etc).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-5.b.2-13. Which elements of the flagship cash transfer programme can scale up (i.e expansion and adjustment) to respond to emergency needs of children and their families?</td>
<td>2.15 SRSP: Operational mechanisms are strengthened to adapt and/or expand in a timely manner during crisis (targeting and registration, MIS, coordination, monitoring, cash delivery system, complaints, communication, linking with complementary services, HR capacity).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.16 SRSP: Stand-alone/parallel humanitarian cash transfers are designed and facilitated to strengthen and/or transition into existing social protection systems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.17 Number of children reached by cash transfers as a humanitarian response (Please indicate (a) number of children as beneficiaries, while parents/carers may be the recipients, and (b) whether delivered through (i) the national system, (ii) a new or parallel mechanism, or (iii) a system combining both.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ACTION AREA 10: LINKING HUMANITARIAN CASH TRANSFERS TO SOCIAL PROTECTION SYSTEMS

### Shock-responsive social protection systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Plan 2018-2021 Goal and Result Area</th>
<th>Strategic Plan indicators</th>
<th>SMQs</th>
<th>RAM indicators</th>
<th>Expenditure codes (PIDB/SIC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal Area 5</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Result Area:</strong> Social Protection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-17 In humanitarian situations, what is the coverage of UNICEF-supported cash transfer programmes through the following channels?</td>
<td>Outcome indicator: Number of children covered by social protection systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-17a. How many households were covered:</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-17b How many children were covered:</td>
<td>Output indicators: 2.15 Number of children reached by cash transfers as a humanitarian response (Please indicate (a) number of children as beneficiaries, while parents/carers may be the recipients, and (b) whether delivered through (i) the national system, (ii) a new or parallel mechanism, or (iii) a system combining both).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a) Through an existing national social protection system (where UNICEF provided technical assistance only)?</td>
<td>a) Through an existing national social protection system (where UNICEF provided technical assistance only)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b) Through an existing national social protection system (where UNICEF provided funding for cash transfers to beneficiaries)?</td>
<td>b) Through an existing national social protection system (where UNICEF provided funding for cash transfers to beneficiaries)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c) Through a parallel system (where UNICEF provided funding for cash transfers to beneficiaries)?</td>
<td>c) Through a parallel system (where UNICEF provided funding for cash transfers to beneficiaries)?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-18 For humanitarian cash transfers funded by UNICEF, either through a parallel system or through an existing national social protection system, please indicate overall volume (in USD) given to households (do not include operational or bank costs) during the year of reporting through:</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-18a Humanitarian cash transfers SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-18b Vouchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19 For humanitarian cash transfers funded by UNICEF, either through a parallel system or through an existing national social protection system, please indicate the number of payments made to households per year. Please disaggregate for both cash, and voucher separately.</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19a Humanitarian cash transfers SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19b Vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19 For humanitarian cash transfers funded by UNICEF, either through a parallel system or through an existing national social protection system, please indicate the number of payments made to households per year. Please disaggregate for both cash, and voucher separately.</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19a Humanitarian cash transfers SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19b Vouchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19 For humanitarian cash transfers funded by UNICEF, either through a parallel system or through an existing national social protection system, please indicate the number of payments made to households per year. Please disaggregate for both cash, and voucher separately.</td>
<td>SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19a Humanitarian cash transfers SMQ-25-02-SUPP2502CT-19b Vouchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Annex 4**
Bibliography


Gordon, David, and Shailen Nandy, ‘Measuring Child Poverty and Deprivation’, Townsend Centre for International Poverty Research, University of Bristol, Bristol, no date.


Bibliography


Overseas Development Institute and UK Aid, Holding Cash Transfers to Account: Beneficiary and Community Perspectives, ODI, London 2013.


Endnotes

2. Systems assessments should include consideration of strengths and weaknesses in the shock-responsiveness of systems, including coordination. These are considered separately in Action Area 7.
4. Coordination of social protection inherently requires high-level involvement and support of relevant sectoral ministries.
5. Working towards universal access to healthcare for children and families falls into many definitions of social protection – including the ILO’s social protection floors, and has been at the core of UNICEF’s work since our founding.
8. At HQ, UNICEF has a dedicated Early Childhood Development (ECD) unit. In countries and regions work tends to be led either by dedicated ECD staff, often housed in education. Given the important role in addressing labour constraints, work may be best coordinated with social protection colleagues.
9. Work on adolescent skills for employability is technically led by education, with adolescent development sections and child protection often supporting or leading implementation. Analysis of constraints to employment will increasingly be needed from social policy to inform programme design. Coordination with Ministries of Labour and Social Welfare (or their equivalent) can help mainstream work as part of labour policies and programmes. This may be facilitated by intra-office collaboration with social policy sections.
10. In HQ child protection is leading on strengthening the social welfare workforce, which is in Goal 3 of UNICEF’s Strategic Plan 2017-2021. Increasing availability and quality of direct outreach to families addressing both child protection and social protection concerns requires collaboration between experts on social service workforce as well social protection. Links to other service providers such as schools and health centres will also often be important.
11. Work on shock-responsive social protection is generally led by social policy sections. Close collaboration with emergency colleagues is important to ensure key emergency considerations are included and linkages with national emergency authorities are made, both in national and office planning.
12. In conflict-affected areas, full use of the administration and delivery systems may not be appropriate for all populations/locations and a parallel system may be required to support those who cannot be reached through government-led social protection programmes.
13. Work on using national social protection systems, in whole or in part, is led by social policy and emergency colleagues in close collaboration with sectoral teams.
14. This framework does not include the development and use of entirely parallel systems for the delivery of HCTs. Our work in this area can be found in the Humanitarian Cash Transfer guidance, which covers the range of delivery approaches from parallel to the use of national systems.
26. The social service workforce plays a vital role in supporting children and families in communities by alleviating poverty, identifying and managing risks, and facilitating access to and delivery of social services to enhance child and family well-being. A well-developed social service workforce is also key to promoting social justice, reducing discrimination, challenging harmful behaviours, changing social norms, and preventing and responding to violence, abuse, neglect and exploitation and family separation.
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