**** LEARNING OUTCOMES

**DAY-1**

**LEGAL FRAMEWORKS**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * The Legal framework lays out the rights and obligations of all the actors within the Social Protection System to materialise human rights
* ILO Conventions, UN and other international treaties on social protection are binding to ratifying countries and need to be reflected in national legal framework
* ILO Recommendations and UN supervisory bodies provide guidelines to States in the formulation and development of a comprehensive legal framework
* Countries can develop minimum National Social Protection Floors with the view of expanding the system according to the evolving national circumstances and fiscal space (progressive realisation)
* The framework law should at the minimum establish the principles be entitlements and main parameters for determining the nature and level of the guarantees, identification of the categories of beneficiaries, and eligibility conditions, complain and appeal procedures
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * Social Protection is a human right and not a charitable undertaking
* Challenge myths associated with social protection such as SP as a moral hazard (people take advantage of it because it comes for free) National systems have responsibility to develop regulations that will address the specificities (through ministerial statutory instruments) for the effective delivery of SP services
* How legal framework embodies many other faucets of social protection (coordination, SP financing, MIS etc.)
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * The rights and obligations need to be determined within a framework law (contributory and non-contributory based on SP principles… maybe identification of gaps in national framework
* The need to develop ministerial statutory for the effective realisation of social protection
 |

**DAY-2**

**SELECTION & IDENTIFICATION**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * Selection & Identification (S&I) is a complex, political design choice that has to consider fundamentally different S&I approaches; the most common approaches are poverty-targeting and categorical targeting. Good S&I takes into account the evidence generated on the ground and feedback from operational/implementation levels.
* Targeting the poor is not necessarily the best for the poor, as the poor have limited bargaining power. The most excluded people are more likely to be excluded from schemes; the higher the overall coverage is, the more likely the poorest will be amongst the ones included in the benefits. Administrative costs of poverty targeting are not proportionate for the benefits provided. Poverty targeting presents a perverse incentive to remain in poverty. It may also undermine contributory schemes. Poverty targeting undermines social cohesion and breeds conflict.
* S&I have an impact on power structures and may (voluntarily or involuntarily) either reinforce marginalisation (e.g. add stigma), create barriers (e.g. conditionalities, bureaucracy) and fuel conflict (intra-household, intra-community or inter-community) or reduce marginalisation, reduce barriers and alleviate conflicts. Well done S&I will be transformative or as a minimum avoid any harmful impact. S&I that ignores existing barriers (disability, stigma, remote areas, lack of information, lack of awareness, lack of entitlement, local power structures) will reinforce exclusion also.
* Any perfect selection and identification approach, if poorly implemented delivers very exclusionary outcomes. So equal efforts should be given to the ideological fights over targeting approach as to improving the process and removing barriers to access of eligible households.
* Simpler S&I approaches, such as categorical or geographical schemes, have the advantages that they are more inclusive, more transparent, more predictable, more efficient (less overhead costs) and more rights-based. They add an element of prevention to provision. “Poor relief” schemes follow a deficiency perspective in trying to redress isolated vulnerabilities ex-post, in this they only address symptoms of poverty.
* Life challenges of particular populations sections are shaped in inter-sectoral intersectionality such as class, gender, disability, ethnicity, but also seasonality, access to services and markets, and political conflict.
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * Change from a supply-driven view to a demand-driven view, while considering both: 1) sustainability of resources committed and alignment between political will and long-term cost implications; and 2) the principle of progressive realisation which recognizes the human right of social security and determines prioritisation and progressive extension in a transparent, accountable and participatory manner.
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * Use a life cycle S&I approach that ensures that all sections of the population are considered and their respective vulnerabilities in a snapshot of a population at a given time; it further highlights the linkages when considering the movement through time as individuals and households move through different stages of the life cycle. As such, life cycle approaches are more comprehensive, universal and rights-based than poverty-targeting (“Poor relief”) approaches which target a certain bottom part of an income distribution (such as poorest quintile).Think about broad impact, not isolated indicators.
* Design schemes that empower people and do not reinforce marginalisation. Do not automatically exclude beneficiaries from one scheme from all other schemes.
* Create barrier-free non exclusionary selection and identification processes schemes.
* Consider the political economy of communities and aim for harm-free (or even transformative) impact
* Ensure access to information and effective communication on selection and identification.
 |

**ADMINISTRATION**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * Key components of SP programme implementation systems and how they relate to each other
* There are multiple options for design of administration system: needs to be based on contextual historical, institutional and capacity factors, existing needs and sustainability considerations
* Understand existing capacity/institutional/resource constraints and how to plan reform of administrative systems that are compatible with existing capacity.
* Understand potential constraints for successful programme implementation: where are some of the potential pitfalls and bottlenecks.
* Importance of some of the non-core components of social protection administration, such as grievance and complaints, communications, case management

*Registration, eligibility determination, enrolment:** There are **three main approaches to registering households**, each of which as pros and cons and should be selected (and ideally combined) based on country context: poorest and most vulnerable most likely to be left out (active outreach needed)
* Registration and eligibility processes require **documenting and authenticating a potential beneficiary’s identity**. Yet under-documentation is pervasive and requires creative approaches (poorest/most vulnerable most likely not to have ID)
* **Life-cycle** approaches to determining priority population are more complex to implement than ‘poor relief’ approaches, but are more effective at tackling the causes of poverty and insecurity. Similarly, **higher coverage** of those living in the greatest poverty can be achieved by expanding the coverage of schemes (e.g. universal schemes).
* The main **challenges** of designing a good poverty selection mechanism are that: in many countries there is little difference in wellbeing between the majority of the population (eligibility determination is controversial), and; households undergo continuous shocks and changes to their income (requires continuous approach to registration)
* Registration and enrollment are very **staff intensive** processes: challenging in context of low capacity.

*Payments** The **goal of a payment system** is to successfully distribute the correct amount of benefits to the right people at the right time and with the right frequency, while minimizing costs to both the program and the beneficiaries
* The **way benefits are paid is important** as this can: a) mediate the impact of a program (e.g. spending patterns, financial inclusion); b) affect the cost and risks faced by a program; c) affect burden on recipients.
* Payments can be offered through various **payment instruments** (e.g. cash, voucher, card, mobile money), using different **payment ‘devices’** (e.g. POS, ATM, phone) and distributed at a variety of **payment points** (e.g. local shops, bank branches, local money agent, etc). The combination of these three elements is the selected ‘payment modality’.
* **Each payment modality has its pros and cons** which need to be carefully evaluated in light of country context (e.g. physical, financial and technological infrastructure) and needs. Selection of one modality over another should be guided by considerations of cost-effectiveness and quality, while ensuring flexibility to respond to changing needs.
* **E-transfers have great potential** to: reduce fraud, reduce costs to government in medium-long term and at scale, guarantee faster/more flexible payments and potentially deliver financial services (if linked to bank accounts or mobile wallets). However, **they can also trigger a wide range of challenges** that require careful mitigation and may not be the most cost-effective option in every context.
* Payments can be managed **in-house** (requires high capacity) or **outsourced** (requires careful development of contractual relations and ongoing monitoring).
* Careful **management of the overall flow of funds** is also required to guarantee timely disbursement, essential for program impact.

*Exit and graduation** There is an important **distinction between programme exit, ‘graduation’ and ‘developmental graduation’** which needs to be considered at programme design stage
* Key **guiding principles** should be: a) Setting up systems to enable a ‘revolving door’ (rather than a ‘one-way door’) into the programme; b) Facilitate movement into other support, as needed, including social insurance and social services; c) Ensuring continuous receipt of support for those categories of beneficiaries and households for which ‘graduation’ or programme exit is not an option (e.g. labour constrained);
* Managing exit and graduation **requires high capacity at local level** and should ideally be linked to the programme Case Management system.

*Complaints and appeals** **Recommendation 202** (R. 202) and other international standards call for adequate systems for managing complaints and appeals and enhance accountability.
* A strong programme-level Complaint and Appeals Mechanism can **contribute to**: increase overall programme accountability; increase citizen trust and involvement; solve operational issues on an on-going basis (at low cost); curb corruption, and; standardise programme implementation and performance.
* These mechanisms are **often under-used and/or under-performing**. There are demand (not feeling entitled, lack of information, embarrassment, etc) and supply-side problems (government resistance to criticism, lack of a standardised process, lack of communication and training, etc) underpinning this, which need to be adequately addressed when designing a Complaint and Appeal Mechanisms
* Programme-level complaint and appeal mechanisms are only one of the tools to ensure accountability for social protection: these should be used **in combination with wider and independent accountability channels**: ombudsmen, courts, etc.

*Case management** A program-level Case Management system can **follow each individual ‘case’**, ensuring that beneficiaries’ needs (children, disabled people, the elderly, vulnerable households, etc) and situation are assessed on a continuous basis and addressed:
	+ **within the programme** (‘Beneficiary Management’): providing guidance/information/support while addressing case-specific issues (e.g. monitoring conditionality, ensuring information update, re-registration, graduation, etc)
	+ **outside the programme**, identifying needs and linking beneficiaries to a wider set of complementary services available within the country (through some form of a ‘Linkage and Referral System’, which could be extended to the wider community – not only beneficiaries)
* In order to usefully implement such a system, **programme staff, ad-hoc staff, or trained volunteers/Committees need to be present at community level** and routinely involved with programme beneficiaries and the wider community.
* **Programme MISs** can support these systems, especially when integrated with other social sector MISs.

*Conditionality** Steering the use of social transfers towards ‘socially relevant’ outcomes can be achieved, and has often been achieved, through **three other mechanisms of behavioural conditioning** (often referred to as ‘soft conditionalities’) other than ‘explicit conditionality’: a) Conditioning on access (linked to targeting criteria); b) Implicit conditioning (linked to intrinsic characteristics of the transfer design); c) Indirect conditioning (linked to complementary policy actions).
* Given there is a continuum between these ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ forms of conditionality (the differences between the two are sometimes blurred in practice, especially as explicit conditionality is often not monitored or enforced), it is important to **carefully evaluate in which context each approach is most cost-effective**.
* **Explicit conditionality** **requires higher capacity**: a) creating institutional agreements (MoUs, etc) and maintaining ongoing coordination with key stakeholders involved in the monitoring process; b) training a cadre of staff at local level responsible for monitoring, providing warning and offering intermediation services and support to non-compliant beneficiaries; c) ensuring cost-effective mechanisms for compliance verification (e.g. MIS integration). It may also impose additional burdens on recipients.

*Programme outreach and communications** Communication should be a **programme priority** as its quality affects staff morale, citizen perceptions, and the functioning of programme processes, most notably targeting, benefit take-up and complaints and appeals – yet communications under-funded
* Should be aimed at **regularly informing citizens** as to: their rights to social protection (and related responsibilities); the practicalities of receiving social protection benefits; the reach and impact of existing programmes.
* **Internal audiences** (e.g. programme staff at local level) will also need outreach activities including newsletters, seminars, etc in order to ensure they are giving accurate information to citizens and motivation.
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * Administration is the backbone of a comprehensive social protection system. It ensures the provision of social protection services in a way that is timely, efficient and effective – ultimately serving the needs of beneficiaries
	+ Put beneficiary at the centre of the system
* If schemes are to be institutionally and politically sustainable, they should not only be efficient/effective - but also transparently account for public resources, incorporate the views/complaints of civil society/citizenship and ensure good quality service delivery
	+ Move from political favours (handout) perspective to right based/professional service delivery perspective.
	+ Civil servants are accountable to beneficiaries and general public
* Social protection administration does not ‘end’ with the delivery of core functions (registration/enrolment/payments). Essential role in terms of determining quality and enhancing accountability is played by complaints and appeals mechanism, communications and case management.
	+ This requires a move from a silo-based conception of social protection administration, to appreciating interlinkages across functions and departments. Adopt overall programme performance as a joint obligation/responsibility.
	+ Also requires long term planning & vision (no quick fixes), as well as ongoing adaptation (based on learning)
	+ Social protection programmes are evolving systems that can increase scale/functionalities over time and increasingly focus on performance-enhancing systems
	+ Important to ensure that systems are flexible to scale-up and developed in a modular fashion – slowly learning from and building on existing practice (not straining capacity with ‘big bang’)
* Open up for innovative thinking in terms of systems delivery (e.g. use of new technology in payments), while at the same time maintaining sense of realism and need for simplicity
	+ Important to learn on what already exist instead of inventing the wheel
	+ What seems to be best practice or more fancy practice worldwide is not necessarily what is best fit for your country.
	+ While there is much hype around the efficiency-gains of technology intensive administrative solutions (e.g. e-payments, use of MISs, etc), these need careful consideration in terms of their cost-effectiveness and feasibility.
* Open up to partnership and explore alternative governance models, while evaluating and addressing risks
	+ Certain processes and innovations may be easier to deliver via partnership with non-state stakeholders (e.g. external payment service providers) or using volunteer community structures (e.g. committees for channelling grievances), but government should retain control and oversight and should not depend on these
	+ Ultimately, the long term vision should be to provide statutory services embedded in public administration, so to ensure rights-based access to social protection and full accountability.
* Design of administration systems should be context specific: there are pros and cons to various systems design options that have to be considered in the economic, social, institutional and cultural process
* Capacity and lack of resources can be important barriers to designing and implementing high-quality administrative systems for social protection. Countries striving in this direction need to ensure the feasibility of each system encompasses a focus on the capacity to implement (e.g. human resources) and to deliver (e.g. costing and financial sustainability).

*Registration, eligibility determination, enrolment** Focus on catering to life-cycle risks
* Importance of having up-to-date registration data

*Payments** The way payments are made greatly affects impacts, the cost and risks faced by a program and the burden on recipients – quality and cost effectiveness as guiding factors
* E-payments are not necessarily a panacea. Manual systems may be still more appropriate in certain circumstances. Need a blended approach to payments systems

*Exit and graduation** Important that exit and graduation strategies do not effectively exclude beneficiaries who are still in need of support (revolving door)
* Important to ensure continuous receipt for those categories of beneficiaries and households for which ‘graduation’ or programme exit is not an option (e.g. labour constrained);

*Complaints and appeals* * Complaints/appeals are an opportunity for improvement, incorporating beneficiary perspectives into ongoing programme re-design. Important to be open to failure and accepting of ‘negative’ feedback: not creating a culture of blame
* Complaints and appeals are also a key channel for accountability, with impacts on longer term sustainability: results in outcomes that are seen as fair, effective, and lasting
* Potential also for cost-saving: solving operational issues on an ongoing basis and curbing corruption

*Case Management** Shift to inter-dependency and coordination culture for case management. Joint institutional responsibility on case management (across different functions; across institutions)

*Conditionality** Other options to explicit conditionality worth considering and incorporating into programme design and implementation

*Communications** Communication should be a programme priority as its quality affects staff morale, citizen perceptions and the functioning of programme processes, most notably targeting, benefit take-up and complaints and appeals.
* Requires allocation of adequate budget and forward planning
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * Make an informed judgement of where administration weaknesses are and capacity to develop action plan to respond to those weaknesses
* Consider resources, capacity constraints, institutional constraints – and longer term sustainability – when it comes to designing and budgeting and admin system that is functional/feasible on the ground
* Plan for the medium-long term and build in options for modular scale-up, incorporating learnings and ensuring flexibility
* Creating opportunities for beneficiaries voice to inform programme administration design
 |

**DAY-3**

**COORDINATION**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * A clear definition and different interpretations of the concept of co-ordination in the field of social protection.
* The various analytical frameworks and approaches for understanding social protection coordination including the continuum of relationships; the Social Protection Floors approach; and the systems approach to social protection coordination.
* The various factors and challenges that lead to poor coordination and fragmentation of the social protection system.
* That coordination occurs both between the social-protection system and other areas of public policy; and also within the social protection system.
* That coordination within the social protection system is composed of:
	+ Horizontal coordination at different levels (policy, programme and administration);
	+ vertical coordination across the different layers of the administration (national/central and sub-national levels).
* Contextualized knowledge and appreciation of the predictors of horizontal coordination at the policy, programme and administration levels.
* Contextualised knowledge and appreciation of the key enablers of vertical coordination across the different layers of the administration.
* An understanding of the various processes and instruments which can be utilised to strengthen vertical and horizontal coordination through examples and case studies from the region.
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * That coordination in the field of social protection is a necessity to improve the effectiveness, efficiency and consistency of the social protection system.
	+ That undertaking social protection activities jointly is likely to be more effective in achieving the final outcome than doing so separately and individually.
	+ That there is a need for coordination in the field of social protection to ensure different programmes are complementary and are not in contradiction; they are well understood as part of a single social protection system.
	+ That by pooling the best of our resources we can provide better solutions; diversity of thinking and skills which can produce better results and better quality services.
* That achieving SP coordination requires planning, leading and monitoring:
	+ SP coordination should move beyond just sharing of knowledge and information towards a more complex and integrated arrangement where objectives, activities and resources are shared.
	+ a truly integrated approach requires common goals, recognised interdependencies, high levels of commitment, and shared responsibilities and rewards.
	+ effective SP coordination requires the support and input from a range of actors involved in the provision of social protection services and transfers including line ministries, civil society organisations and the private sector; and it also needs to take place at different levels: horizontal coordination at the policy, programme and administration levels; and vertical coordination across the different layers of the administration.
* That decentralised structures and local government have a critical role to play in SP coordination because service delivery takes place at local level.
* That service delivery should take place as close to the beneficiaries as possible to ensure access and equity.
* That the cost of coordination should not be ignored and dedicated resources should be allocated for coordination.
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * Identify and create awareness of the barriers that exist to social protection coordination and convince the different stakeholders of their own interest in more coordination including government, civil society and private sector social protection actors.
* Identify horizontal coordination needs at policy, programme and administration levels.
* Identify vertical coordination needs across the different layers of government.
* Revise, plan and implement coordination processes and instruments that work best in particular contexts with a view to strengthening both vertical and horizontal coordination.
* Build on opportunities for coordination and address coordination challenges and work out or develop linkages with others with a particular emphasis on decentralised structures and local government who are responsible for SP service delivery.
 |

**M&E and Accountability Systems**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * To understand what Governance and accountability and their constituent parts are and reasons why they are important for the social protection sector.
* To learn and appreciate the multiplicity of options for institutional and organisational structures that evolve from historical context of a given place and are shaped by their broader institutional framework and existing organisational structures. To understand the main features of different institutional and organisational structures and their potential benefits or pitfall (or constraints?)
* The institutional structures for social protection typically involve a wide range of state and non-state stakeholders, which can present challenges for coordination and communication.
* There is wide variation in the extent to which social protection programmes have been established in legislation. However, providing a formal legal basis leads to greater certainty that programmes will be sustained, and gives beneficiaries assurance about their rights and entitlements.
* To understand how to assess existing capacity of the system and how to plan reform of administrative systems that are compatible with existing capacity.
* Recognition of the importance of management and support functions for delivery of social protection programmes in terms of setting standards, performance, accountability and learning
* Appreciation of the different elements and requirements for adequate management support within social protection
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * Better institutions, more functioning systems and professional staff will improve the wellbeing of many citizens of their country
* While some aspects of governance and institutions may seem beyond their level of influence or reach, that there are nevertheless many elements that emanate as a result of their own immediate roles, responsibilities and actions
* There is no “one size fits all” model that they can replicate but rather that their situation will be unique and proposed solutions need to be adjusted to exiting institutional and organizational capacity of their systems
* Organisational design has to be aligned with the wider institutional framework within which a non-contributory social protection system has to operate – for example, reforms of organisational structure intended to improve efficiency or responsiveness will be ineffectual if they rely on a degree of increased delegation and managerial autonomy which the legal framework for the public service cannot accommodate.
* Balances have to be struck between different desirable features of a system – for example, the greater the degree of decentralization, the harder it is to guarantee uniform service standards and equity of treatment of beneficiaries across the country.
* Outsourcing of elements of service delivery may offer a route to reducing administrative costs, or of improving service coverage and quality when public sector capacity is very constrained. However, it demands the development of different sorts of technical capacity – e.g. in procurement, contract management and oversight of service providers – if the rights of beneficiaries are to be protected, and the longer-term interests of the state are not be jeopardised by becoming locked-in to a restricted set of providers.
* The different elements of the management support functions are important and matter to service delivery in their respective countries
* Governance and institutional dimension of the social protection system require a long term vision, change takes time but is made up of many shorter term steps and actions.
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * Apply this module and framework for understanding governance and institutions to their own context and assess where gaps and opportunities for improvement exist
* Map the existing laws, regulations and institutions to assess their adequacy, coherence and complementariness with one another
* Map the key stakeholders involved in social protection to understand whether the roles, responsibilities and actions of each are clear, coherent within the system & coordinated.
* Carry out an assessment of capacity of the institutions, organizations and staff to help with a plan of action to improve service delivery
* Consider resource availability (staff & finance) & wider institutional setting when designing systems, to ensure operational within context & administratively sustainable.
* Ultimately develop a longer term vision and plan of action for the sector that can be introduced over a number of years
 |

**DAY-4**

**Programme MISs and approaches to integration**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * The reason for and benefits of a programme MIS (implementation, evaluation and accountability)
	+ The core functions supported by a program MIS
	+ The key components of a functional program MIS
* The difference between a program MIS, and an integrated system for social protection information management (including different approaches to developing an integrated system)
* The advantages and risks of data and information integration in the Social Protection sector
* The main drivers of integration (incl country context) and how these affect design choice
* Understand the potential to use data beyond the programme, and beyond social protection sector
* The key steps involved in setting up an MIS or integrated system for information management
* How to conduct a feasibility study and needs assessment to inform your design choice
* The need for strong engagement at different levels of administration, notably at local level when developing a solution
* The importance of ensuring confidentiality, security and integrity of data, especially in the context of integration
* The types of resources, including human resources, required for the development and implementation of the MIS or integrated system
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * A digital/computerised MIS can greatly enhance programme management and effectiveness
* Developing an Integrated System for Information Management can ensure a more equitable, responsive and inclusive distribution of resources while also increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of delivery and most importantly – better serving citizens.
* The type of approach chosen to create and integrated system for information management depends on your country context and policy objectives – International best practice is not always best.
* What matters most when creating an integrated system for information management is the level of connectivity, interoperability and linkages between different systems - not the creation of a super-sized, comprehensive social protection registry
* Integration is mainly a policy issue requiring political and institutional arrangements rather than ‘technical’ fixes
* MIS/integrated system development is complex, time consuming and costly. It could potentially pose risks to data privacy and security as well as risks of exclusion to social sector schemes.
* Design and implementation of such systems requires investment in the right skills.
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * Make programme MIS a priority and allocate the necessary resources
* Assess the country’s needs and context before engaging in the development of SP-wide integrated system for information management
* Identify what functions you would like your programme MIS or integrated system to achieve
* Identify key stakeholders that must take part in the definition of system specifications to ensure coordination across social protection actors and beyond
 |

**FINANCING & FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT**

|  |
| --- |
| **Learning Outcomes (impact of training interventions)** |
| **What do they need to know? (Acquisition of new *knowledge*)** | * Understanding of main issues related to the debate of social protection affordability and sustainability and relationships between social protection, public finances and the economy
* Identify and interpret social protection financial governance indicators.
* Understanding of public budgeting process, public social expenditure reviews and social budgeting
* Understanding of financial administration of social protection
 |
| **What do they need to think/believe?(*Mind-set shift*)** | * Political commitment for social protection reform is influenced by adequate long term planning, sufficient resource mobilization and financial and economic evidence on its costing and social and economic returns
* Public support for financing of social protection is supported by equitable and sustainable financing
* Beneficiaries and the public in general are more engaged in social protection finance reforms by increased transparency and availability of evidence on financial management of social protection
 |
| **How should they act? What should they do? (*Behavioural change*)** | * Use financial policy knowledge to analyse and inform social budgets.
* Analyse budgets with a view to identify resource gaps and have a sustainability plan
* Apply and monitor social protection financial governance indicators.
* Ability to use available data sources to assess costs of social protection programmes and overall social protection systems
* Use data to make a social and economic case for social protection as an investment.
* Capacity to identify of determinants of fiscal space for social protection and potential sources of revenue mobilization
* Disseminate social protection financial data.
 |