

Enhancing social protection for strengthened disaster resilience in ASEAN Community

Prepared by Sinta Satriana, Social Protection Consultant
For International Labour Organization (ILO) Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank in particular Celine Peyron Bista (Chief Technical Advisor on Social Protection, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific) for her guidance to prepare the paper, as well as, for their technical inputs, Shukuko Koyama (Expert on Disaster and Employment, Lecturer at Waseda University, Japan), Nicholas Mathers (Cash Transfer Specialist, UNICEF Nepal), Gaspar Fajth (Regional Adviser, Economic and Social Policy, UNICEF regional office for East Asia and the Pacific), Noemie Feix (National Officer for Employment, ILO Mexico), Peter Townsend (Chief Executive Officer, Canterbury Employers' Chamber of Commerce), Mohammad Maulana (National Team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction, Indonesia), Hang Thi Thanh Pham (Expert on Climate change and Resilience, FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific), Ma. Lourdes Macapanpan (Programme Assistant, ILO country office for the Philippines), Gwyneth Anne Palmos (Project Coordinator, ILO country office for the Philippines) and the Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns, Department of Labour and Employment of the Philippines.

The findings, interpretations and conclusions expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the policies or views of the ILO or of the United Nations.

CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. LINKING SOCIAL PROTECTION WITH DISASTER RISK MANAGEMENT.....	4
Social protection	4
Disaster risk management.....	6
Disaster-responsive social protection: How both fields can benefit from each other.....	6
3. ASEAN FRAMEWORKS ON DISASTER MANAGEMENT AND SOCIAL PROTECTION..	11
ASEAN Community Vision 2025.....	11
ASEAN Social Cultural Community (ASCC) Blueprint 2025	11
ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER).....	12
ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection.....	13
ASEAN Declaration on One ASEAN, One Response: ASEAN Responding to Disasters as One in the Region and outside the Region.....	15
Declaration on Institutionalising the Resilience of ASEAN and Its Communities and Peoples to Disasters and Climate Change.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Relevant ASEAN Sectoral Bodies	15
4. CASE STUDIES.....	19
Nepal’s Emergency Cash Transfer Programme for Vulnerable Groups	19
Mexico’s Temporary Employment Program	24
Social protection and disaster management components of Indonesia’s Community Empowerment Programme.....	27
Japan’s employment policies in response to the 2011 great earthquake.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Philippines’ Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Program.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Collaboration between the Government and the business community in New Zealand to help businesses survive a disaster.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5. RECOMMENDATION FOR IMPROVING THE POTENTIAL OF SOCIAL PROTECTION TO BUILD DISASTER RESILIENCE.....	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	42

1. Introduction

The economies of the Association of the South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) are projected to continue robust growth in the coming years, partly driven by positive effects of the economic integration (ADB, 2014; OECD, 2016). However, the region's vulnerability to disaster often puts this economic and social progress at risk. The ASEAN region is located in one of the most disaster-prone regions of the world, exposed to almost all types of hazards including typhoons, earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, volcanic eruptions, landslides, forest-fires, and droughts (UNISDR, 2010). Between 2000 and 2015, 777 natural events hit the South-East Asia region, causing the deaths of over 360,000 people, and affecting 236 million people (UNISDR database, 2015). In 2013, the region had the most number of disaster victims relative to its population size and the highest cost of reported damages relative to its Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Recent disasters in ASEAN countries have shown their significant impacts to GDP. The 2011 catastrophic floods in Thailand were estimated to have reduced its predicted real GDP growth by 1.1 per cent (World Bank, 2012). Tropical storm Ondoy and typhoon Pepeng that struck the Philippines in 2009 has left one of the provinces hit hardest, Rizal, with almost double poverty incidence, from 5.5 per cent in 2006 to 9.5 per cent in 2009 (Hillier and Nightingale, 2013).

A global Study by the Overseas Development Institute (2013) expounds on disaster risks as an important hurdle for poverty reduction across the world. This study presents the overlay between countries' exposure to hazards as measured by the Multi-hazard Index (MHI) and their vulnerability to poverty through the Poverty Vulnerability Index (PVI), projected to 2030. Among the ASEAN countries, Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia, Viet Nam and Myanmar are considered countries with high and significant vulnerability. A confluence of geophysical factors, high population density, poverty, and ill-equipped infrastructure explains the high costs of disaster.

Natural hazards are a threat in both rich and poor countries. However, due to lower prevention and response capacities, disasters affect poorer countries disproportionately. Disasters can also set back progress in poverty reduction. In the short and medium term, disasters decrease national income and tax revenues, raising fiscal and trade deficits (e.g. Lis and Nickel, 2009; Otero and Marti, 1995; Hochrainer, 2009). In the long term, disasters may have long-lasting impacts on wellbeing and income through disruptions in the provision of health services and education. Also, victims often have to rely on harmful coping strategies such as reducing essential food consumption and health care, pulling children out of school or depleting productive assets. Poor households are often disproportionately affected by disasters due to heightened vulnerabilities and fewer resources for coping. Against this backdrop, social protection can play a potentially crucial role in times of disasters to complement and strengthen an existing Disaster Risk Management System.

Social protection and disaster risk management are both gaining increasing prominence due to their efficacy in mitigating risks, improving the resilience of individuals and households to cope with shocks, protecting people from falling (deeper) into poverty, and safeguarding the national economy. Social protection systems, including social assistance, social insurance and labour market policies, when properly designed, can help to mitigate the effects of disasters and build the resilience of individuals and households to external shocks. International experiences show that countries that have social protection systems in place before a shock hits are better able to respond (ILO, 2009). However, to date, efforts to reduce and mitigate the risks of disasters have often been ad hoc, and reactive emergency programming is now seen to be insufficient to address

natural events and hazards (World Bank, 2013). This has been highlighted, among others, by the World Humanitarian Summit's commitment to scale up social protection in times of crisis (UN, 2015).

Before disasters strike, social protection helps households obtain reliable income, build human capital and accumulate assets, which allow them to have better living condition and lower vulnerability to disasters. When a hazard event hits, established social protection systems provide the avenue to better respond to disaster by using the existing population and recipient data to identify the affected population; using existing benefit disbursement mechanisms; using existing networks of social workers for needs assessment as well as the delivery of assistance; and scaling up existing programmes by increasing benefit levels and covering more beneficiaries in the wake of natural disasters; among others. At the same time, the importance of addressing vulnerabilities even before disaster strikes is crucial; a disaster-preparedness mind-set should be an important part of social protection systems. There is an apparent need for social protection to be mainstreamed in the disaster risk reduction continuum, which does not only address post-disaster response, recovery and rehabilitation but also prevention, mitigation and preparedness.

The adoption of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) places social protection and the protection of the environment as key elements of the new development agenda for the coming 15 years. The International Labour Organization (ILO)'s Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No.102) and Social Protection Floors Recommendations, 2012 (No.202), provide guidance for countries in developing social protection systems based on worldwide-agreed minimum standards. The universal approach to social protection extension, which is emphasized in Recommendation No. 202, is particularly relevant in disaster settings since natural hazards affect all members of the population regardless of their prior welfare levels. Most recently, recognising the urgency of ensuring decent work, including social protection, in times of disaster, the ILO's constituents proposed a revision to the Employment (Transition from War to Peace) Recommendation, 1944 (No. 71) to include natural disasters and catastrophic events as part of the crisis situation to address. Strengthening social protection to better protect people from disasters and mitigate the impacts of climate change is part of the ILO's Global Flagship Programme Strategy (2016-2020) on Building Social Protection Floors for All", as well as ILO's programme on Jobs for Peace and Resilience.

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015-2030) was adopted by United Nations (UN) Member States in 2015, outlining seven clear targets and four priorities for action to prevent new and reduce existing disaster risks. Across the targets and priorities, social protection stands as a crosscutting area. Under the Sendai Framework "Words into Action", a guide is to be developed to provide models for integrating disaster risk management into national social protection programmes.

At the ASEAN-level, the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) adopted in 2005 reflects efforts to improve inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination. The AADMER Work Programme (2016-2020), which translates the AADMER into concrete programmatic actions, highlights the importance of social protection in disaster management as a priority programme. Significantly, ASEAN has placed premium in building its resilience through the adoption of the Declaration on Institutionalising the Resilience of ASEAN and its Communities and Peoples to Disasters and Climate Change, which was adopted by the ASEAN Leaders in April 2015 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Similarly, the ASEAN Ministers in-charge of disaster management adopted the "ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management" in December 2015 in Phnom Penh, Cambodia, which identifies social protection as a key strategy in ensuring

resilience to disasters. More recently, the ASEAN Declaration on One ASEAN, One Response: ASEAN Responding to Disasters as One in the Region and Outside the Region was adopted at the 28th and 29th ASEAN Summit in Vientiane, Lao PDR in September 2016.

Likewise, the Regional Framework and Action Plan to implement the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection (2013) has also identified the impact of climate change and disasters as an area of support for the policy and programme development.

Adopting an integrated approach to social protection and disaster risk management would result in more effective and efficient protection for the affected population. Social protection schemes, including social assistance, social insurance and labour market policies, are not only useful means for disaster response (ex-post interventions), it also increases long-term resilience by reducing risk and improving people's capacity to cope (ex- ante).

This paper analyses the need and the potential of social protection in building disaster resilience, particularly in the ASEAN region. A desk review was conducted to obtain information on the current development in social protection and disaster management in ASEAN and at global level, with particular attention to whether, and to what extent, linkages has been made between the two fields. Case studies were then collected from ASEAN and other regions of the world, which demonstrates how social protection has been utilised to improve disaster resilience before and after the occurrence of hazard events. The case studies presented in this paper represent different types of social protection schemes (cash transfers, public works, social insurance, active employment policies) and the different ways they helped improve disaster resilience (disaster risk reduction projects, scaling up benefit amount and/or coverage in times of disaster, adjustment of qualifying condition or a combination of thereof). Lessons learned from the case studies complement theoretical analysis in drawing up the recommendations of this paper.

Chapter two discusses the rationale for taking a more integrated approach to social protection and disaster management. Chapter three presents the ASEAN Framework on disaster management and social protection with an emphasis on the overlay between them. Chapter four analyses selected case studies and lessons learned from the ASEAN region and beyond. Chapter five provides recommendations.

This paper complements the information discussed in the seminar on the potential of social protection to build resilience to disasters, co-organised by ASEAN, the ILO and the Government of Philippines on 22-24 November 2016 in Manila, Philippines. Participants of the seminar adopted the seminar recommendations, available in annex 1.

2. Linking social protection with disaster risk management

Disasters are not the result of hazard events alone. The major factors influencing disaster risks are societies' vulnerability and their capacity to mitigate and respond to the impacts of natural hazards. Poverty and marginality significantly increase disaster risk by increasing vulnerability to disasters and reducing the capacity to cope with the impacts of disasters (IPCC, 2012; Sanghi et al., 2011; UNISDR, 2008).

The world has seen hazards with similar nature and strength resulting in radically different scales of crises, depending on a community's capacity to mitigate and respond. In many instances, the poor are disproportionately affected by disaster events. For instance, globally, high income countries account for 39 per cent of the exposure to tropical cyclones but only 1 per cent of the mortality risk while low income countries represent 13 per cent of the exposure but more than 81 per cent of the mortality risk (UNISDR, 2009b). Within countries, poor households are often disproportionately affected by disasters due to heightened vulnerabilities and fewer resources for coping while the wealthiest are much more able to recover and return to pre-disaster conditions.

Poverty and marginalisation hampers asset accumulation, income diversification and access to financial support such as credit and insurance, which helps households to maintain themselves in the face of a disaster. The poor tend to dwell in more risk prone areas such as in informal settlements, areas lacking access to clean water and sanitation, and in structurally weak and badly built housing and with deficient infrastructure and services. Lack of productive land, technology, credit and other productive assets means that many poor rural households are dependent on rain-fed subsistence agriculture. Their sustenance may be entirely affected by weather events such as drought and floods. Difficulties in accessing markets, adverse trade policies and a lack of investment in infrastructure compound this vulnerability (UNISDR, 2009b).

The poor also suffer more from disaster in the long-term since they often have to resort to harmful coping mechanisms such as reducing food consumption, selling productive assets or taking children out of school, which further exacerbate their poverty (ODI, 2013). The Global Assessment Report on Disaster Risk Reduction (2015) highlighted the bidirectional relationship between disaster risk and poverty: Poverty increases vulnerability to disaster and at the same time disaster losses aggravate the depth and breadth of poverty and undermine any progress towards poverty reduction and sustainable development. These issues require an integrated solution.

Disaster risk management and social protection, albeit initially developed in separate domains, have shown complementarity to address the issues at hand. They are both increasingly gaining prominence due to their urgency in mitigating risks, increasing resilience to cope with shocks, and as such protecting people from falling (deeper) into poverty and safeguarding national economy. Linking the two would result in more effective and efficient protection for the affected population.

Social protection

Throughout its evolution and varying definitions¹, social protection has an inherent objective to collectively support people against shocks and improve their capacity to mitigate them. Social

¹ Social protection has had different interpretations over time and still carries a range of definitions, from the narrow scope similar to that of social welfare for the "deserving poor" to a broader domain which includes social equity, empowerment and economic rights (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2006). In many contexts the terminology "social security" and "social protection" may be largely interchangeable, and the ILO uses both in discourse with its constituents. The term social protection is used in institutions across the world with a wider variety of meanings than

protection is the protection that a society provides to its members against a number of individual and collective risks.

The ILO Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No. 202) defines national social protection floors as “nationally defined sets of basic social security guarantees which secure protection aimed at preventing or alleviating poverty, vulnerability and social exclusion”. National social protection floors should comprise at least the following four social security guarantees, as defined at the national level: (1) access to essential health care, including maternity care; (2) basic income security for children, providing access to nutrition, education, care and any other necessary goods and services; (3) basic income security for persons in active age who are unable to earn sufficient income, in particular in cases of sickness, unemployment, maternity and disability; (4) basic income security for older persons. The Social Protection Floors Recommendation reaffirms social protection as a human right and applies the principles of universality, non-discrimination and social inclusion, among others.

ILO Social Protection Floors Recommendations, 2012 (No.202), together with the earlier Social Security (minimum standards) Convention, 1952 (No.102) provide guidance for countries in developing social protection systems based on worldwide-agreed minimum standards. The universal approach to social protection extension, which is emphasized in Recommendation No. 202, is particularly relevant in disaster settings since natural hazards affect all members of the population regardless of their prior welfare levels.

Most recently, recognising the urgency of ensuring decent work, including social protection, in times of disaster, the ILO constituents proposed a revision to the Employment (Transition from War to Peace) Recommendation, 1944 (No. 71) to include natural disasters and catastrophic events as part of the crisis situations to address.

The Regional Framework and Action Plan to Implement the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection defines social protection as “Interventions that consist of policies and programmes designed to reduce poverty, inequalities, and vulnerability by assisting the poor, at risk, vulnerable groups such as but not limited to persons with disabilities, older people, youth, women, children, undernourished, victims of disasters, migrant workers, and as well as families and communities to enhance their capacities to better manage risks and enhance equal access to essential services and opportunities on a rights based/needs based approach.”

Echoing the Social Protection Floors principles, the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection states that “everyone, especially those who are poor, at risk, persons with disabilities, older people, out-of-school youth, children, migrant workers, and other vulnerable groups, are entitled to have equitable access to social protection that is a basic human right and based on a rights-based/needs-based, life-cycle approach and covering essential services as needed” (principle 1).

ASEAN member countries have shown progress in improving their social protection system. However, in the majority of member countries social protection coverage still excludes large shares of populations, specifically those who are not formally employed and enrolled in social insurance schemes and are not recipients of social assistance (ILO, 2015b). Through the adoption of the Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection and the Regional Framework and Action

social security. It is often interpreted as having a broader character than social security (including, in particular, protection provided between members of the family or members of a local community), but it is also used in some contexts with a narrower meaning (understood as comprising only measures addressed to the poorest, most vulnerable or excluded members of society) (ILO, 2011).

Plan for its implementation, the ASEAN community is committed strive to make social protection a reality for everyone.

Disaster risk management

The disaster risk management (DRM) sphere has also evolved from a focus on ex post humanitarian relief and rehabilitation activities to more emphasis on ex ante interventions aimed at preventing disasters and vulnerability to hazards (Newsham et al, 2011). This approach was emphasized by the Hyogo Framework for Action (2005-2015), with its 10-year plan to “Building the resilience of nations and communities to disasters. The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction (2015–2030) further reinforces the comprehensive approach to disaster risk reduction within the context of sustainable development and poverty eradication. UNISDR (2009a) defines disaster risk management as “The systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster.” AADMER, echoing the same principles, defines disaster management as “the range of activities, prior to, during and after the disasters, designed to maintain control over disasters and to provide a framework for helping at-risk persons and/or communities to avoid, minimise or recover from the impact of the disasters.”

The Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction sets seven targets for countries to achieve by 2030; these aim to (1) substantially reduce global disaster mortality, (2) substantially reduce the number of affected people, (3) reduce direct disaster economic loss in relation to global gross domestic product, (4) substantially reduce disaster damage to critical infrastructure and disruption of basic services, including health and educational facilities, (5) substantially increase the number of countries with national and local disaster risk reduction strategies by 2020, (6) substantially enhance international cooperation to developing countries through adequate and sustainable support to complement their national actions for implementation under the present framework and (7) substantially increase the availability of and access to multi-hazard early warning systems and disaster risk information and assessments to people. Across the targets and priorities, social protection stands as a crosscutting area.

Under the Sendai Framework, practical guidance is being developed to support implementation, ensure engagement and ownership of action by all stakeholders, and strengthen accountability in disaster risk reduction. One of the documents being developed is a guide to provide models for integrating disaster risk management into national social protection programmes (UNISDR, 2015a). This reflects the growing awareness of the need for combined approach to social protection, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation to address effectively the multiple risks and vulnerabilities faced by the poor and excluded, while at the same time realizing that there remain few examples of such integration in practice (UNISDR, 2015b).

Disaster-responsive social protection: How both fields can benefit from each other

As recent international frameworks have affirmed, social protection has an important role to play in DRM. Countries that have social protection systems in place before a shock hits are better able to respond (ILO, 2009). Social protection schemes are not only useful means for disaster response (ex-post interventions), it also increases long-term resilience by reducing risk and improving people’s capacity to cope (ex- ante).

The role of social protection before disaster strikes

Hazards become disasters when people remain vulnerable and have limited capacity to withstand and cope. In many instances, poverty and marginalisation stand as the main deterrent to people's ability to cope with shocks.

Social protection attempts to alleviate underlying situations of poverty and vulnerability. Social protection schemes such as cash transfer or public employment programmes provide reliable income that allows households to accumulate assets or support systems to buffer against the impacts of disasters. These assets allow households to maintain themselves when a disaster hits and help them avoid harmful coping strategies such as taking children out of school and sending them to work or selling off productive asset, which further aggravate their poverty and vulnerability.

Social protection also enables livelihood diversification, which reduces the poor's vulnerability to disaster. Low diversification of livelihood exacerbates vulnerability to disaster, particularly among those in agriculture sector. Diversification of livelihood options allows for diversification of risk and therefore reducing the impact of disaster on household sustenance. Higher level of asset and diversity of income source are both associated with higher resilience.

Regular cash transfers have shown to increase household investment on their usual livelihood as well as on new productive activities, increasing their long-term income and livelihood diversification². This effect has been tested in a number of cash transfer programmes including Mexico's Rural Oportunidades programme (Gertler et al., 2012), Zambia's Child Grant Programme (Daidone, 2014; FAO and UNICEF, 2014) and Ghana's Livelihood Empowerment Against Poverty Programme (FAO, 2013; Barca, 2015). Cash transfer programmes with explicit objective of improving households' risk management through income diversification have also been tested with promising outcomes. Such programmes include Nicaragua's Atención a Crisis programme, where cash transfer beneficiaries are provided with additional training and start-up capital to branch out to different types of livelihood (Macours et al., 2012).

Other social protection programmes contribute to ex-ante disaster risk management by implementing environmental conservation projects while providing income security for the intended communities. This approach has been demonstrated by public employment programmes such as those in Mexico, Philippines and Haiti.

Mexico's Programa de Empleo Temporal (Temporary Employment Programme) or PET is a public employment programme with the main objective to provide income to the poor and unemployed with temporary public works that build infrastructure. Some of the public work projects are intended to reduce the risk and impacts of recurrent natural hazards such as floods, droughts and hurricanes. These projects include conservation of natural resources, rehabilitation and maintenance of rural and feeder roads, and disaster risk management education. Haiti implemented an employment programme with specific objectives of environmental protection and disaster prevention in Gonaives, a region prone to tropical storms and the resulting flash floods. The severe impact is linked to the area's vulnerability to erosion, partly caused by deforestation and environmental degradation. The programme generated income for the local population by working in reforestation and construction of a network of ditches, small dams and weirs that protect the watersheds (ILO, 2007).

² Studies show that the significance of such impact varies depending on the programme design and benefit level as well as household and community context (e.g. see Barca et.al. 2015; FAO and UNICEF, 2014)

The role of social protection in response to a disaster

Social protection systems if properly designed can effectively contribute to mitigate the effects of disasters. To date, the majority of disaster responses in ASEAN countries have been ad hoc, and reactive emergency programming is now seen to be insufficient to address natural events and hazards (World Bank, 2013a; OPM, 2016).

Established social protection systems provide the avenue to better respond to disasters by deploying or scaling up their pre-existing resources and mechanisms. Ongoing social protection programmes have beneficiary database, disbursement mechanism, networks of social workers and other resources that can be swiftly utilised to channel humanitarian assistance in times of disaster. This spares the Government and partners from having to establish a completely new system for disaster response. A review by Overseas Development Institute (Bastagli, 2014) show that various studies on the subject point unanimously to the difficulty of setting up functioning systems or programmes once a crisis has struck, and that responses to shocks are most effective if they build on existing programmes and institutional capacity established prior to a shock.

The following are some of the ways disaster response can take advantage of the existing social protection programmes:

- **Using the existing population and recipient data to identify beneficiaries of humanitarian assistance**

A well-functioning social protection programme maintains a database of its beneficiaries, often segregated by area (village, districts etc). For targeted programmes, the database would contain individuals or households in the poor and vulnerable category. Such programme typically target low-income households with children, pregnant women, elderly, people with disabilities or other vulnerable groups. These target groups are usually also the most vulnerable to disasters since they lack the asset, manpower and support system to cope with hazard events and are therefore most in need of immediate assistance. By using the existing database, disaster response can effectively and promptly reach the most vulnerable in the affected areas. The faster support reaches them, the less likely they are to resort to negative coping strategies (UNICEF, 2014a).

It is important to note that a disaster may affect other (previously non vulnerable) groups as much or even more than those covered by existing social protection schemes. This is particularly a concern if the programme is targeted to only a small portion of the population. Other methods of identifying and providing assistance to the rest of the affected population must be employed. That being said, immediately after a disaster hits, in the absence of a comprehensive population database and needs assessment, being able to reach the most vulnerable groups quickly is a crucial part of disaster response.

In this context, improvements in database and registry system of existing social protection programmes do not only benefit the performance of those programmes, but also the effectiveness of disaster response. With the development of many social protection programmes, ASEAN countries are improving their social protection database to increase efficiency and reduce duplication. National Social Protection data and interagency registry recently developed/piloted in many ASEAN countries such as Indonesia (Unified Database for Social Assistance), Cambodia (Social Services Delivery Pilot Programme) and the Philippines (National Household Targeting System for Poverty Reduction) can be a good basis for further development.

- **Using existing benefit disbursement mechanisms**

Following a disaster, a quick and efficient disbursement of social assistance makes a big difference in saving lives and protecting current and future wellbeing of the affected population. However, establishing a disbursement system takes time. On the other hand, existing social protection programmes such as cash or in kind transfer programmes already has a system with networks that reach their beneficiaries. For instance, conditional cash transfer programmes such as Pantawid Pamilyang Pilipino Program in the Philippines and Program Keluarga Harapan in Indonesia and Vietnam categorical social transfers have payment mechanisms using a combination of bank transfer, postal delivery and other alternate payment methods that reach beneficiaries nationwide. Utilising the pre-existing delivery system saves a significant amount of time and cost.

➤ **Using existing networks of social workers for needs assessment and delivery of assistance**

In all areas covered by conditional or unconditional cash transfer programmes, public employment programmes, food Assistance programmes or community development programmes that exist in many ASEAN countries, social workers or facilitators are an important part of the running of the programme. These people work with households and communities on daily basis, giving them good knowledge of the situation on the ground. In times of disaster, these social workers may be the best people to be deployed in their respective working areas to work with local communities to do initial assessment of the situation. Their on-going communication with affected communities is also useful beyond the emergency phase. For example, following the 2004 tsunami, reconstruction effort in the province of Aceh in Indonesia faced a challenge in accurately identifying land borders and ownership due to drastic changes on the landscape and missing documents (BRR, 2005). The Sub-district Community Development Programme (KDP) facilitators worked with local communities in assessing needs and determining the land borders, which paves the way for reconstruction works.

➤ **Scaling up existing programmes by increasing benefit levels and covering more beneficiaries in the wake of natural disasters**

As has been demonstrated in the context of financial crises as well as natural hazards, countries with well-established social protection programmes or institutions have benefited greatly from scaling up social protection in response to crises (McCord, 2013). Scaling-up the existing programmes allow for faster and cost effective delivery of assistance. Scale up may involve increasing the amount of benefits for existing beneficiaries to cover additional needs in disaster (vertical expansion), covering more beneficiaries during crises (horizontal expansion) or both.

A number of social protection programmes around the world have demonstrated the success of this approach. Vertical expansion has been implemented, among others, in conditional cash transfer programmes in the Philippines, Brazil, Lesotho and Nepal. Examples of horizontal expansion include the increased number of beneficiaries of public works programmes such as those in Mexico (PET) and Philippines (DILEEP) in times of disaster and other crises. The 2007-2008 global food crisis provides examples of horizontal expansion of cash transfer programmes, mainly in Latin America (Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Mexico) (Bastagli, 2014; Demeke et al., 2009). Some programmes have inbuilt mechanism for both vertical and horizontal expansion in times of crises. They include Kenya's Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) and Ethiopia's Productive Safety Nets Programme. Some of the case studies are presented in the next section.

Vertical expansion is considered easier to implement than horizontal expansion (Smith, 2016) as it doesn't require additional data and delivery system. It is recognized that in many contexts this method is crucial to reach the most vulnerable in a quick manner. However, as mentioned

previously, it is important to note its limitation as it excludes other groups that may be equally or even more affected by the disaster. Programmes that have mechanisms to expand vertically and horizontally respond to crises better. However, they are still limited in number since they require more advanced planning and data system.

➤ **Adjusting the revisions of eligibility criteria and relaxing participation requirements**

Social protection programmes may also greatly help their beneficiaries by allowing for flexibility or adjustments in times of disaster so that they sustain the benefits despite the changing situation. The conditions of programmes may be impossible to fulfil in times of disaster due to disruptions caused by the disaster. For example, following the floods in 2008, Colombia's Familias es Accion (FA) conditional cash transfers programme suspended programme conditionalities temporarily and allow beneficiaries to claim their benefits in different locations to accommodate the shortfalls in service provision as a result of damaged infrastructure (Bastagli, 2015).

During the severe floods in Thailand from September to December 2011, the Thailand Social Security Office launched several relief measures to ensure that Unemployment Insurance continues to operate as a cushion for the workers in time of crisis. The period of unemployment status report at the Department of Employment was extended from 30 to 60 days if workers became unemployed during September 30 to November 30. The contribution rate collected from employers and workers was reduced from 5 per cent to 3 per cent for the period of 1 January to 30 June 2012; and from 5 per cent to 4 per cent for the period of 1 July to 31 December 2012 (ILO, 2012c; ILO, 2015).

3. ASEAN frameworks on disaster management and social protection

At the ASEAN level, the complementarity of social protection and disaster management has been increasingly acknowledged and highlighted in the recent regional agreements and declarations concerning both subjects. Among others, the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) adopted in 2005 reflects efforts to improve inter-sectoral cooperation and coordination, highlighting in the AADMER Work Programme 2016-2020 the importance of social protection in disaster management. Likewise, the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection, adopted in 2013, has also identified the impact of climate change and disasters as an area of importance in its Regional Framework and Action Plan.

ASEAN Community Vision 2025

The “ASEAN 2025: Forging Ahead Together”, endorsed by the ASEAN Member States at the 27th ASEAN Summit on 22 November 2015, charts the path for building the ASEAN Community over the period of 2016-2025. It articulates ASEAN goals to realise further consolidation, integration and stronger cohesiveness as a Community.

The document elaborates the broad goals that will further consolidate and strengthen the community over the next ten years, which includes greater emphasis on the peoples of ASEAN and their well-being; a politically cohesive, economically integrated and socially responsible Community; fundamental freedoms, human rights and better lives for all ASEAN peoples; and strengthened capacity to deal with existing and emerging challenges while maintaining ASEAN centrality; among others (ASEAN, 2015b). Specific action lines and strategic measures to realise the targets are laid out in three pillars: (i) the Political-Security Community; (ii) the Economic Community; and (iii) the Socio-Cultural Community.

The ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community vision 2025 addresses issues relevant to both Social Protection and Disaster Management. It aims to achieve “an ASEAN Community that engages and benefits the peoples and is inclusive, sustainable, resilient, and dynamic” (ASEAN, 2015b). The ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2025 elaborates this vision.

ASEAN Social Cultural Community (ASCC) Blueprint 2025

At the heart of the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community (ASCC) is the commitment to lift the quality of life of its peoples through cooperative activities that are people-oriented, people-centred, environmentally friendly, and geared towards the promotion of sustainable development. The ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community strategy and planning mechanism, the ASCC Blueprint 2025, aims to heighten commitment to realise an ASEAN community that: (a) engages and benefits the people; (b) moves towards an inclusive community; (c) ensures sustainable environment in the face of social changes and economic development; (d) builds resilience. This is done through the formation of policy and legal frameworks and improving the coherence of policy frameworks and institutions within the ASEAN Social Cultural Community (ASEAN, 2016a).

Among the strategic measures of the ASCC Blueprint 2025, the following are particularly relevant to strengthening social protection and disaster resilience:

- reduce inequality, and promote equitable access to social protection and enjoyment of human rights by all and participation in societies such as developing and implementing

frameworks, guidelines, and mechanisms for elimination of all forms of discrimination, violence, exploitation, abuse and neglect;

- promote regional inter-sectoral mechanisms towards a holistic, multi-disciplinary approach in enhancing quality care, well-being, gender equality, human rights, social justice, and fundamental freedoms of all, especially the vulnerable groups, in response to all hazards and emerging social and economic risks/threats;
- support accelerated implementation among ASEAN Member States to extend coverage, accessibility, availability, comprehensiveness, quality, equality, affordability and sustainability of social services and social protection;
- promote sustainable financing mechanism for social protection, particularly universal health coverage, early childhood care and development, financial risk protection for disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation, and social pension, through strategic partnerships with private sector and other relevant stakeholders;
- strengthen social protection for women, children, youths, elderly/older persons, persons with disabilities, ethnic groups, migrant workers, other vulnerable and marginalised groups, and people living in at-risk areas including people living in remote and border areas and climate sensitive areas to reduce vulnerabilities in times of climate-change related crises, disasters and other environmental changes;
- promote policy coherence and interlinkages, and synergise initiatives on disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation and mitigation, humanitarian actions and sustainable development;

The ASCC Blueprint 2025 emphasizes that “integrated, comprehensive, and inclusive approaches are necessary to build resilient communities in the ASEAN region post-2015” (ASEAN, 2016a).

ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER)

The AADMER is a legally-binding regional agreement signed in 2005 by all 10 ASEAN Member States with the objective of providing “effective mechanisms to achieve substantial reduction of disaster losses in lives and in the social, economic and environmental assets... and to jointly respond to disaster emergencies through concerted national efforts and intensified regional and international co-operation.”³ The AADMER sets in place regional policies, operational, and logistical mechanisms to enable ASEAN Member States to seek and extend assistance in times of disasters and carry out collaborative undertakings on disaster prevention and mitigation, preparedness, response, and recovery and rehabilitation (ASEAN, 2010). To facilitate collaboration among ASEAN Member States and with other relevant international agencies, Article 20 of the AADMER mandates the establishment of the ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre).

With the adoption of the AADMER, the ASEAN Disaster Management and Emergency Relief Fund (AADMER Fund) was established for the implementation of the agreement. The Fund is collected from voluntary contributions of ASEAN Member States as well as other sources, and administered by the ASEAN Secretariat (art. 24).

With regard to the role of social protection in disaster management, there has been an apparent growth of acknowledgement and pursuit for integration. The AADMER Work Programme 2016-

³ Article 2. Objective, AADMER

2020 identifies social protection in disaster management as one of the approaches in protecting the economic and social gains of ASEAN Community. Priority Programme 4 PROTECT: Protecting Economic and Social Gains of ASEAN Community Integration through Risk Transfer and Social Protection, aims to “protect the economic and social gains of ASEAN Community through innovative market-based solutions, private sector engagement, and social protection programmes”. Specifically, programme component 6 provides that ASEAN Member States will work towards “ensuring social protection and establishing social safety nets in the context of disasters”, through the development of a regional social protection protocol under AADMER (output 6.1) and support mainstreaming of DRR and Climate Change Adaptation into national policies, strategies and mechanisms to strengthen social protection programmes (output 6.2) (see Box 1). The work programme expresses that “closing the inequality gap through social protection programmes targeting most vulnerable groups is a significant disaster management strategy...” (page 48). Relatedly, Priority Programme 7 RECOVERY: ASEAN Resilient Recovery aims to capacitate ASEAN to undertake swift recovery resulting from disasters that is locally-driven and with sufficient resources. Under programme component 1 “Harmonising standards and guidelines on recovery”, a specific output is on developing guidelines on social protection in recovery (output 1.4).

The implementation of the AADMER and the AADMER Work Programme 2016-2020 is further guided by the ASEAN Vision 2025 on Disaster Management, which maps out the broad strategic direction on disaster management in the next ten years. As an approach to better assess the needs and provide protection to populations of concern during humanitarian crises, ASEAN will endeavour to establish a regional social protocol under AADMER by 2025. Also, ASEAN recognises the involvement of various stakeholders, particularly ASEAN home-grown civil society organisations, in the mainstreaming of social protection in disaster management and disaster risk management in the next ten years. Other regional instruments expound on ASEAN’s commitment to building resilience to disasters and articulate the link between disaster risk reduction and management and social protection. These instruments include the ASEAN Declaration on Enhancing Cooperation in Disaster Management (adopted in 2013), the Declaration on Institutionalising the Resilience of ASEAN and its Communities and Peoples to Disasters and Climate Change (adopted in 2015), the ASEAN Declaration on One ASEAN, One Response (adopted in 2016), and the Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operations (SASOP). See Box 2 for some of the disaster response and monitoring activities under the AADMER.

ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection

The ten member countries of ASEAN adopted the Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection at the 23rd ASEAN Summit in Brunei Darussalam in October 2013. The declaration sets out principles, strategies and mechanisms “...towards improved quality, coverage, and sustainability of social protection in ASEAN Member States subject to each ASEAN Member State’s national policies and priorities and adapted to the different contexts of ASEAN Member States”.

The declaration noted the guiding principles of the Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012 (No.202). ASEAN Member States also recognise that achieving a Social Protection Floors (SPFs) is fundamental for reducing poverty and promoting sustainable growth (ILO, 2015).

Acknowledging the role of social protection in disaster, the declaration emphasises in one of its principles that “Social protection shall be adaptive to the different risks such as lifestyle and individual risks, social risks, and emerging risks and vulnerabilities faced by the region such as, but

not limited to, changes in the economy and labour markets and impacts of climate change, disasters and economic crises” (art. 10).

The strategies are further elaborated in the Regional Framework and Action Plan to Implement the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection, adopted in Kuala Lumpur in 2015. As stated in the Regional Framework and Action Plan, “social protection” is defined as “interventions that consist of policies and programmes designed to reduce poverty, inequalities, and vulnerability by assisting the poor, at risk, vulnerable groups such as but not limited to persons with disabilities, older people, youth, women, children, undernourished, victims of disasters, migrant workers, and as well as families and communities to enhance their capacities to better manage risks and enhance equal access to essential services and opportunities on a rights based/needs based approach. Definitions of migrant workers and applicability of social protection schemes shall be in accordance to the prevailing national laws, policies and regulations of ASEAN Member States.” Its objectives are to: i) reduce poverty, inequalities, vulnerability, and other risks; ii) enhance capacity of the poor and vulnerable groups; iii) achieve inclusion and enhance equitable access of the poor, at risk, and vulnerable groups including but not limited to persons with disabilities, older people, youth, women, children, undernourished, victims of disasters, migrant workers, to opportunities and social protection; and iv) move towards the equitable and sustainable development of the target groups. The Regional Framework and Action Plan has the four (4) core programmes, namely: i) social welfare/social assistance; ii) social insurance; iii) labour market interventions and human resources development; and iv) social safety nets. These cover targeted sectors/areas, and universal coverage, through the following key strategies: i) resource mobilisation; ii) capacity building; iii) multi-sectoral responses; iv) communications and coordination; and v) monitoring and evaluation system, including benchmarking. Under Strategic Actions “Policy and Programme Development” and “Capacity Building”, the activities envisaged in this action plan are aimed to, among others, provide support to member states in developing and implementing social protection policies that are responsive to crisis/disaster. For this, the ASEAN, in partnership with UN Agencies; Dialogue Partners; Workers’ Organisations; Employers’ organisations; World Bank and ADB, means to build capacities at regional, national and local level through technical assistance, inter-sectoral consultancies and facilitation of learning from each other’s experiences and best practices.

Declaration on Institutionalising the Resilience of ASEAN and Its Communities and Peoples to Disasters and Climate Change

Adopted by the ASEAN Leaders in 2015, the Declaration on Institutionalising the Resilience of ASEAN recognises that the exposure of ASEAN’s peoples and communities to various natural hazards, as well as the vulnerability to extreme weather events due to climate change, is rising. The growing frequency and intensity of disasters is “exacting a tremendous toll on economic, social, cultural, physical, and environmental capital of countries and communities.” Through the Declaration, ASEAN Members commit to establish a more resilient future by “reducing existing disaster and climate-related risks, preventing the generation of new risks, and adapting to a changing climate through the implementation of economic, social, cultural, physical, and environmental measures which address exposure and vulnerability, and thus strengthen resilience.” Significantly, the Declaration underlines the importance of coherence, consistency and alignment across the three (3) ASEAN Community pillars and relevant ASEAN sectors, by “systematically mainstreaming disaster risk management and climate change adaptation in relevant sectoral policies, strategies, plans, programmes, and projects as well as the need for cross-pillar and cross-sectoral collaboration on disaster risk management, climate change

adaptation and sustainable development and related cross-cutting concerns.” Such high-level policy guidance provides the impetus to thicken the link between disaster management and social protection. The ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) is assigned as the focal point for cross-sectoral cooperation on resilience building at regional level, with the support of other relevant sectoral bodies (ASEAN, 2015c).

ASEAN Declaration on One ASEAN, One Response: ASEAN Responding to Disasters as One in the Region and outside the Region

The declaration on “One ASEAN, One Response: ASEAN Responding to Disasters as One in the Region and outside the Region” supports the AADMER as the main regional policy backbone for disaster management and emergency response in the region. Adopted in Vientiane in 2016, the One ASEAN, One Response declaration aims to reinforce cooperation and coordination mechanism to achieve faster response, mobilise greater resources and establish stronger coordination to ensure ASEAN’s collective response to disasters. It affirms the AHA Centre as the primary ASEAN regional coordinating agency on disaster management and emergency response and the ASEAN - Emergency Response and Assessment Team (ASEAN-ERAT) as the official resource of ASEAN in emergency response.

Based on this declaration, the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Disaster Management (AMMDM), AADMER Conference of the Parties (COP), and the ACDM are tasked with providing strategic guidance to the AHA Centre on operationalising One ASEAN, One Response, including development of necessary protocols to prescribe measures, procedures and standards as well as engagements with relevant sectors and stakeholders in ASEAN. The AMMDM shall also initiate a forum to promote dialogues among the relevant ASEAN ministerial bodies in realizing One ASEAN, One Response (ASEAN, 2016b).

Relevant ASEAN Sectoral Bodies

The ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection promotes coordination among relevant ASEAN sectoral bodies, including by convening inter-sectoral regional consultation meeting. These bodies include the Senior Officials Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (SOMSWD), Senior Officials Meeting on Rural Development and Poverty Eradication (SOMRDPE), Senior Officials Meeting on Health Development (SOMHD), Senior Labour Officials Meeting (SLOM), ASEAN Committee on Women (ACW), and ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM). The ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (AMMSWD), with the support of the Senior Officials Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (SOMSWD) is the assigned focal point for inter-sectoral cooperation on social protection at regional level (ASEAN, 2013a).

Senior Officials Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (SOMSWD) and ASEAN Ministerial Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (AMMSWD)

All activities undertaken under the ASEAN cooperation on social welfare and development, including social protection, come under the purview of the Senior Officials Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (SOMSWD). The ASEAN Ministerial Meeting for Social Welfare and Development (AMMSWD), which meets once every three years, oversees the overall work under the cooperation. In accordance to the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection, the AMMSWD is also the focal point for inter-sectoral cooperation on social protection.

The ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM)

The ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM) consists of heads of national agencies responsible for disaster management. The ACDM provides oversight to the implementation of AADMER Work Programme, as well as serves as the Governing Board of the AHA Centre, which is the main operational engine for AADMER. The ACDM reports directly to the Conference of Parties (COP) to AADMER, a ministerial level body, on the progress of AADMER implementations.

National Focal Points of AADMER

The National Focal Points (NFP) is an entity designated and authorised by each member country to receive and transmit information pursuant to the provision of the AADMER. NFP therefore plays an important role in facilitating communication with other Parties and the AHA Centre, and serves as the single point of contact for the country (AHA Centre, n.d).

The ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre)

The ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre) is an inter-governmental organisation that aims to facilitate cooperation and coordination among ASEAN Member States and with international organisations for disaster management and emergency response in the ASEAN Region. The AHA Centre was established based on the AADMER and is governed by the members of the ASEAN Committee on Disaster Management (ACDM). The activities of the AHA Centre include notification of disaster, facilitating request for assistance and offer of assistance, disaster situation update, joint assessments, mobilisation of assets and capacities and reporting. Some of these activities are described in Box 1. As mentioned in the relevant agreements and declarations, both social protection and disaster management require multi-sectoral responsiveness and coordination. Sectoral bodies including the Senior Officials Meeting on Rural Development and Poverty Eradication (SOMRDPE), Senior Officials Meeting on Health Development (SOMHD), Senior Labour Officials Meeting (SLOM) and ASEAN Committee on Women (ACW) are regularly consulted and have provided inputs to the advancement of social protection and disaster management in ASEAN from their respective areas.

Box 1

AADMER Work Programme (2016-2020)
Priority Programme 4: PROTECT

“Protecting Economic and Social Gains of ASEAN Community Integration through Risk Transfer and Social Protection”

Priority Programme 4 of the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (AADMER) Work Programme 2016-2020 emphasises the importance of social protection in disaster management and identified key activities to improve integration between disaster management and social protection.

The components of this priority programme include:

1. Establishing the Regional Risk Financing and Insurance Framework
2. Enhancing access to finance for private sector, which includes SMEs, micro-enterprises, small holder producers
3. Strengthening evidence-based policy analysis and strategies on the linkage between disaster management and the economy to contribute to a more deeply-integrated and highly-cohesive ASEAN economy
4. Establishing resilient regional production and supply chains in ASEAN
5. Enhancing the capacities of private sector companies in the region to position ASEAN as the production and service hub of humanitarian goods and services
6. Ensuring social protection and establishing social safety nets in the context of disasters.

Under component 6, ensuring social protection and establishing social safety nets in the context of disasters, by the end of 2020 the ASEAN aims to Develop a regional social protection protocol under AADMER (output 6.1) and support mainstreaming of DRR and CCA into national policies, strategies and mechanisms to strengthen social protection programmes (output 6.2).

Activities under these outputs include:

- Stocktaking of social protection initiatives on disaster management at the national level
- Establishing a multigovernment agency dialogue on the standards of social protection in disaster management
- Compiling and sharing case studies and best practices of social protection initiatives as a prevention and mitigation instrument in high risk
- Establishing a mechanism to facilitate dialogues on mainstreaming DRR and CCA as part of social protection of high risk communities
- Developing capacities on formulating social safety nets
- Adopting social protection and safety net programmes on disaster management

This paper and the seminar on the potential of social protection to build resilience to disasters, co-organised by ASEAN, the International Labour Organization and the Government of Philippines, intends to contribute to component 6, specifically by facilitating cross-sectoral dialogue, stocktaking initiatives and sharing case studies and best practices to improve integration between social protection and disaster management. The seminar also agreed on a set of seminar recommendations, which is intended to provide inputs to the development of the regional social protection protocol under AADMER. The seminar recommendation is available in annex 1.

Disaster Response and Disaster Monitoring Activities under AADMER

Disaster Monitoring and Information

Utilising, the AHA Center distributes summarized information on natural disasters that occur in the region, including through the ASEAN Disaster Information Network (<http://adinet.ahacentre.org>). This platform is planned to be an open community disaster information network in the region, where everyone can post information on a disaster in the region on verification and approval by the AHA Centre administrator. Following a disaster, the AHA Centre also disseminates updated information to the National Focal Points and the public by means of flash alerts, daily situation updates during emergency, weekly and monthly regional disaster update, annual regional disaster information, and other forms of communication.

The ASEAN Emergency Response & Assessment Team (ASEAN-ERAT)

The ASEAN Emergency Response & Assessment Team (ASEAN-ERAT), managed by the AHA Centre, is designed to be deployed in short notice anywhere in the ASEAN region to provide support to national disaster management offices. Assistance provided include: (i) conducting rapid assessment; (ii) coordinating mobilization and deployment of regional disaster management capacity; and (iii) facilitating incoming relief assistance from the ASEAN Member States (AHA Center, 2010). The ASEAN-ERAT consists of trained responders in disaster and emergency management from the ASEAN Member States, ASEAN secretariat, AHA Centre, and Civil Society Organization. The ASEAN-ERAT will be activated and mobilized after the AHA Centre receives request for assistance from affected Member State, or after the Affected Member States accepts the offer of assistance from the supporting Member States. The ASEAN-ERAT has been utilized in response to recent major disasters including the following.

➤ **Cyclone Nargis in Myanmar**

The first deployment of ASEAN-ERAT was in response to cyclone Nargis in Myanmar. Cyclone Nargis made landfall in the Ayeyarwady and Yangon Divisions of Myanmar on 2-3 May 2008. On 5 May, ASEAN Secretary-General called on all Member States to provide urgent relief assistance through the framework of the AADMER. Myanmar government agreed to work with the ASEAN Secretariat to assemble an ASEAN Emergency Rapid Assessment Team (ERAT), which was then deployed from 9–18 May. The ASEAN-ERAT mission was to assess the situation and conduct field assessments to provide recommendations on the support for the Government of Myanmar. The ERAT report was submitted to a Special ASEAN Ministerial Meeting, which resulted in the establishment of an ASEAN-led coordinating mechanism to manage international assistance (AHA Center, n.d.).

➤ **Tsunami in Mentawai Island, Indonesia**

Another ASEAN-ERAT mission was deployed to Indonesia in the aftermath of a tsunami that hit Mentawai Island, West Sumatra Province, in October 2010. The ASEAN-ERAT worked closely with Indonesia's National Disaster Management Agency (BNPB) to conduct a rapid assessment and produce a "snapshot" of the situation, focusing mainly on the life-saving needs of the affected communities. The report was submitted to the Secretary-General of ASEAN to discuss the next steps (AHA Center, n.d.).

➤ **Floods in Thailand**

In response to the 2011 floods in Thailand, ASEAN ERAT was dispatched to assess flood-affected areas. The team worked under the supervision of the Emergency Operation Centre of Thailand. As part of the assessments, the team identified the basic and immediate needs of the affected population (ASEAN, 2011).

The ASEAN Standby Arrangements

The ASEAN Standby Arrangements consists of earmarked assets and capacities voluntarily made available by the ASEAN Member States for disaster relief and emergency response. Those assets and capacities includes search and rescue directory, military and civilian assets, emergency stockpiles of disaster relief items, and disaster management expertise and technologies which, when needed, can be requested by a disaster-affected Member State. Its implementation is governed by the Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operations (SASOP) (ASEAN, 2009).

Disaster Emergency Logistics System for ASEAN (DELSA)

The Disaster Emergency Logistic System for ASEAN (DELSA) Project was established in Royal Malaysia Air Force Base in Subang, Malaysia. DELSA aims to establish a logistics system that can immediately serve disaster-affected Member States during the emergency response. DELSA also provides trainings and technical supports to enhance the capacity of the AHA Centre and ASEAN Member States in disaster emergency logistics operation.

4. Case Studies

Nepal's Emergency Cash Transfer Programme for Vulnerable Groups

Co-authored by Nicholas Mathers

Overview

Devastating earthquakes of magnitude 7.8 and 7.3 struck Nepal on 25 April and 12 May 2015, followed by hundreds of aftershocks of magnitude 4.0 or more. Over 8,790 people were killed and 22,300 injured in the earthquakes. It is estimated that the series of earthquakes affected the lives of nearly one-third of the country's population and led to a total financial loss equivalent to 36 per cent of GDP in 2013-2014 (NPC, 2015). Thirty-one of the country's 75 districts have been affected, and 19 districts were categorized as severely affected.

The Post Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) conducted by the National Planning Commission (2015) revealed that the earthquakes disproportionately affected poorer households and poorer areas. A poverty impact simulation showed that an additional 2.5 to 3.5 per cent of Nepalese (at least 700,000 people) were pushed into poverty (p. xiv). In addition to this, the resulting disruption of health, education, water and sanitation services had even more serious impacts on multidimensional poverty (UNICEF, 2016).

As part of the multi-sector disaster response, UNICEF supported the Government of Nepal to implement an emergency cash transfer programme for vulnerable groups by expanding the existing social protection system. The programme was implemented in two phases - a vertical expansion (increase in benefit values) during the relief phase and a horizontal expansion (reaching new beneficiaries) during the period of recovery and reconstruction.

➤ *Phase 1: vertical expansion*

To address the immediate needs of the most vulnerable, the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MOFALD), with technical and financial support from UNICEF, implemented the Emergency Top-up Cash Transfer Programme (ETCTP) through the government social assistance programmes in the 19 most affected districts. An additional cash benefit of NRs. 3,000 (USD 30) was distributed to beneficiaries of the existing social assistance schemes including (1) Senior citizens over 70 years of age or over 60 if Dalit⁴; (2) widows and single women over 60 years of age; (3) people with disabilities; (4) Dalit children under five years old; and (5) the highly marginalised Janajati⁵ ethnic groups.

The top up benefit, combined with the regular social transfers, was intended to provide additional support to meet immediate household needs during the humanitarian crisis. It also aimed to

⁴ According to National Dalit Commission, Dalit are "those communities who, by virtue of atrocities of caste based discrimination and untouchability, are most backward in social, economic, educational, political and religious fields, and are deprived of human dignity and social justice". Dalit are also known as lower caste under the Hindu caste system (DWO, 2016).

⁵ Janajati is Nepali word for indigenous people. All through the Nepalese history the Janajatis have been excluded from the mainstream and as such most of these people are living in abject poverty (Jha, 2014).

increase the resilience to any negative side effects during post-disaster recovery for these vulnerable populations who have limited coping capacity when affected by disasters.

➤ *Phase 2:horizontal expansion*

It was anticipated that during the period of recovery and reconstruction, families would continue to experience poor living conditions, disrupted livelihoods, increasing debt and multiple stresses on household budgets. In this context, young children are among the most at-risk of deprivation and harm. Moreover, due to coverage limitations of the Child Grant, many young children had not benefited from the vertical expansion. As a result, UNICEF and MOFALD launched the second phase, expanding to more beneficiaries (horizontal expansion). Covering the 11 most-affected districts, the horizontal expansion aimed to identify and register all children under five years of age and to deliver a cash transfer of NRs. 4,000 (USD 40). A secondary objective of the programme was to achieve near universal Birth Registration among the target group.

In the longer term, the programme also envisioned to use the emergency cash transfer experience as a catalyst to assist the government in strengthening the Child Grant programme, to establish a model for rapid emergency cash transfers to vulnerable groups and to strengthen the national social protection system (Gurung et al., 2015).

Programme history

The government of Nepal has implemented a number of social assistance programmes over the years. The non-contributory social pension for senior citizens started in 1995 and subsequently the programme has been extended to include widows and single women and people living with disabilities. The Child Grant was launched in 2009 and targets children under age 5 living in households in the Karnali region or with poor Dalit families who have faced long-standing discrimination and poverty (Hagen-Zanker et al. 2015).

The regular social assistance programmes are funded and delivered by the Government of Nepal (Drucza, 2016; Hagen-Zanker et al. 2015). The amounts of the regular transfers are:

- Old age pension: NRs. 1000 (USD 10) per month.
- Widows and single women without support: NRs. 500 (USD 5) per month.
- Disability grant: NRs. 1000 (USD 10) per month for those deemed “fully disabled” and NRs. 300 (USD 3) per month for the “partially disabled”.
- Child grant: NRs. 200 (USD 2) per month per child below 5 years of age, with a maximum of two children per family.
- Marginalised Janajati ethnic group allowance: NRs. 1,000 (USD 10) per month.⁶

Following the earthquakes in 2015, UNICEF made an initial funding allocation of USD 15 million to distribute top-up payments to these beneficiaries in the 19 districts most severely affected by the earthquakes. The first top-up payments took place in Sindhupalchowk district on 9 July, two and half months after the first major quake. The payments were completed in all districts by mid-November (UNICEF, 2016). A further USD 10 million was allocated for the recovery and reconstruction phase to cover all children under-five years of age in the 11 most affected districts. An identification exercise (census) was complete by July 2016 and distribution has been on-going

⁶ From fiscal year 2016/17 all social assistance benefit levels have been doubled.

since the end of August. As of the end of October, approximately 75 per cent of the distribution had been completed.

Programme's disaster-response and systems strengthening component

The existing social assistance schemes were not originally designed with a specific disaster-response component. However, following the earthquakes, UNICEF and the Government recognised that the existing system can be a good vehicle to deliver additional assistance to vulnerable populations on a large scale, and comparatively swiftly and efficiently. In the original UNICEF proposal (Rabi, et al., 2015), the intervention was also seen as an opportunity to “constitute a tested mechanism that can be integrated into the menu of response options ready to be activated swiftly in the wake of another future emergency” (p. 3). The project briefing states that as well as providing immediate relief to those affected by the earthquakes, it also provides an opportunity to reinforce the building blocks of an integrated social protection system and help develop a model for social transfers that works in both regular development and emergency contexts (UNICEF, 2016).

Institutional set-up and delivery mechanism

The Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MOFALD) manages the regular social assistance schemes at the central level. Registration and delivery of the grants are managed by the Village Development Committees and Municipal Ward offices with supervision from the District Development Committees and Municipalities (IDS 2014; UNICEF, 2015). Both phases of the emergency cash transfer programme were implemented jointly by MOFALD, UNICEF, and the local government structures. While the first phase ETCTP was based on existing beneficiary lists, the second phase required creation of a new registry. UNICEF partnered with an NGO, PHD Group, to provide technical support to local government to conduct a census and to produce initial beneficiary lists.

The regular social assistance schemes use a combination of bank transfer and direct distribution at village level. Funds are disbursed from MOFALD through the District Development Committees which then transfer the funds to the Village Development Committee or Municipal Ward office. In most areas, cash payments are made in person at the Village Development Committee office, while in some Municipalities payments are made directly to beneficiary bank accounts. Because of the challenging geographic context and manual delivery systems, the regular payments are made every four months. Assessment of the first phase ETCTP (Gurung et al., 2015) shows that around half of the beneficiaries (52.2 per cent) reported that they collected the cash transfer at their local Village Development Committee office, 24 per cent received the money in their village, 18 per cent received a bank transfer, and 6 per cent received the cash in another Village Development Committee office.⁷

Programme communications was strengthened through use of local FM radio and leaflet distribution through local government offices and civil society networks. Additional real-time monitoring mechanisms were put in place using RapidPro, an SMS based communications system, and District Focal Persons in each district to collect data on distribution progress. A research NGO, the Nepal Participatory Action Network (NEPAN), was engaged to undertake an independent post-distribution assessment of coverage and implementation effectiveness.

⁷ Sampling was slightly biased towards urban areas and may overestimate the proportion of bank-based payments.

Identification of beneficiaries

Nepal's social assistance programmes consist of universal and targeted schemes. The old age pension is provided universally to all Nepalese citizens over the age of 70. The pension is also available to members of the Dalit community and those living in the Karnali region aged over 60 years. The benefits for widows and single women above 60 years are subject to a means test proving they don't have sufficient income support. Disability benefits are available to all people with disabilities, with two different levels of benefits for partial disability and full disability. The Child Grant is targeted at all households with children aged up to five years in the Karnali region and at poor Dalit households in the rest of the country. However, the poverty criteria for the Dalit Child Grant were rarely applied in practice and have recently been removed. In total, these five cash transfers reach more than two million people or 7.9 per cent of the population (Druzca, 2016).

The vertical expansion used the existing registry of beneficiaries of the above programmes in the 19 most affected districts. The payments have directly benefited around 434,000 vulnerable individuals, and indirectly supported an estimated 1.2 million family members of the recipients (UNICEF, 2015; Gurung et al., 2015). As there was no existing registry of under-fives, the horizontal expansion required a census and registration exercise to be conducted first. Children were eligible for the payment if they lived in the concerned locality and were born on or after 1st December 2010. The vertical expansion aims to reach approximately 350,000 children, and had covered approximately 260,000 by the end of October 2016.

Outcomes and lessons learned

Overall, UNICEF allocated USD 25 million to the emergency cash transfer programme, representing more than 20 per cent of the total emergency funds available. This is a strong indication of the growing acceptance of the role that cash transfers can play in humanitarian response and recognition of the benefits of using and building on existing systems.

In the first phase, the vertical expansion provides an example of using existing social assistance programmes for comparatively quick, efficient and cost-effective delivery of emergency cash transfers at scale. Assessment of the programme confirmed that it reached approximately 93 per cent of registered beneficiaries and showed that it was cost-effective, as additional funds were not needed to create a beneficiary list or delivery mechanisms (Gurung et al., 2015). By using the existing registry of cash transfers recipients, the additional benefits reached households that are most vulnerable and have more limited labour capacity. It should be noted, however, that this targeting mechanism does not address the need of households that were not within the vulnerable category before the disaster but were nonetheless affected. The experience of the second phase has shown that horizontal expansion is possible but has been more challenging and time consuming. Based on regular monitoring and interaction with local officials, it is anticipated that coverage will be high (a systematic independent assessment is currently underway). However, delivery of the programme has not been as timely as initially planned. This is due to the technical challenge of identifying and registering new beneficiaries on a large scale, competing priorities at different levels of government, and limited local capacity for implementation.

As stated in its original proposal (Rabi et al., 2015), the project also intended to help strengthen the existing social protection system. To this end, several longer-term outcomes have been achieved. First, the rate of birth registration among under-fives will have been increased in the second phase to nearly 100 per cent compared to a national average of 58 per cent (UNICEF, 2015). As well as improving children's access to civil rights, this has strengthened the civil registry

at the local level. Second, use of the existing social protection system as part of the emergency response brought the concept of shock-responsive social protection to the attention of policy makers and government officials for the first time.⁸ There is now a platform on which to build for improving future disaster response through social protection systems. Third, the heightened attention that the programme brought to the social assistance schemes contributed to decisions behind several policy reforms in the 2016/17 budget speech, including increasing the regular benefit levels for all existing schemes and initiating an expansion of the Child Grant beyond Dalit households (Ferrie and Gautam, 2016 draft).

A number of important areas can be identified to improve the responsiveness of the social protection system to future disasters. First, integration of social protection expansion as a disaster response mechanism into the national disaster management framework will speed initial decision making and reduce reliance on external actors. Second, improving local capacity through both regular systems strengthening (e.g. extending use of electronic transfers, management information systems) and contingency planning for front-line surge capacity, will improve the timeliness, frequency and accountability of identification, registration and delivery processes. Third, overcoming some of the rigidities in the existing system (e.g. fixed eligibility criteria and registration processes) by developing complementary standard operating procedures for emergency contexts, will allow for the response to be better tailored towards the particular needs of the affected population.

⁸ In February 2016 MOFALD and UNICEF held a joint conference on shock-responsive social protection, attended by the Vice Chair of the National Planning Commission and other senior officials.

Mexico's Temporary Employment Program

Reviewed by Noemie Feix

Overview

Mexico's Temporary Employment Programme or PET (Programa de Empleo Temporal) provides employment to eligible households in communities that are highly marginalized, suffer high unemployment levels, and/or whose livelihoods have been affected by the impact of natural disasters and other economic or social crises.

PET is a social protection programme that integrates disaster resilience and disaster response as part of its objectives. Through its regular programme, PET aims to provide income to the poor and vulnerable in case of employment contraction or crisis through temporary public works that build infrastructure as well as environmental improvements. In addition, the programme makes funds available for special projects dedicated to people affected by disasters.

Programme history

In 1995, the Ministry of Social Development introduced a Special Employment Programme with the objective of creating temporary employment and building community assets and rehabilitating roads. In 1997, this scheme became the Temporary Employment Programme (PET). It has since developed to include wider variety of projects and incorporate more ministries in project implementation (World Bank, 2013b). In 2003, a subcomponent of the PET was established as the emergency PET (PET Inmediato or PETi), and was assigned the task of emergency response.

Programme's disaster-response component

The PET has two components with different but complementary goals. The standard PET is the regular programme that supports community public works with the goal of providing temporary sources of income to unemployed and vulnerable populations. The Emergency PET (PETi) is specifically targeted to households affected by a disaster. PETi beneficiaries receive income by working in projects to rebuild their community (from post-disaster clean-up to rehabilitation activities).

PETi springs into action when the Ministry of the Interior issues an emergency declaration or an early warning of an impending hazard event. Once a state of emergency is declared, the Ministry of Social Development local office or State-level branch convenes an extraordinary session of the PET State Commission which assesses the situation. The PET State Commission submits a request for resources endorsed by the authority responsible for Civil Protection in the concerned state to the PET's central level. Once the request has been approved, the emergency response actions are launched, including a damage assessment, planning visits to identify potential beneficiaries based on damage, and beneficiary selection and enrolment.

Although the PETi mechanism operates inside the broader PET framework, its systems and procedures are modified for a post-disaster context. Requirements applied to standard PET such as the procedures for municipality and project selection are fast tracked in PETi, cutting down the normal time of implementing a project from 3-4 months under standard PET to as short as 6-8 days under PETi (World bank, 2013b)

Institutional set-up, funding and delivery mechanism

The programme is solely funded by the Government of Mexico. Each agency involved in the implementation of the programme is mandated to keep an annual contingency fund of up to 20 per cent (or 30 per cent in case of SEDESOL), which, if not used, could later be executed through regular programming (UAM, 2006, in World Bank, 2013b). If considered necessary, all remaining funds in that year's budget for the PET could be channelled through PETi to address the needs of those affected (Reglas de Operacion, 2013). If the more resources are needed, a national disaster response contingency fund, managed by the Ministry of Interior, may be made available as a last resort.

The Ministry of Social Development is the central coordinating and implementing institution for PET. Within the Ministry of Social Development, the General Directorate for Attention to Priority Groups is responsible for overall oversight of the programme. Other ministries involved in the implementation of PET are (World Bank, 2013b):

- The Ministry of Communications and Transportation supervises community works related to rural road rehabilitation;
- The Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources supervises works for the preservation of the natural environment; and
- The Ministry of Labour and Social Security links participation in community works with existing demand through its National Employment Service area. STPS refer unemployed beneficiaries to the programme (World Bank, 2013b)

The PET also coordinates with the Ministry of the Interior, which oversees institutional response to natural disasters, and manage the national disaster response contingency fund. The fund can be made available to provide supplementary resources if this PET's contingency fund does not adequately cover all needs in a certain disaster.

Identification of beneficiaries

In standard PET, the programme first selects areas of intervention based on unemployment or marginalization indices⁹. Municipalities with medium, high or very marginalization levels or high unemployment are selected for operation of the PET. Men and women who are 16 years or older can apply to the programme. However, preference is given to those individuals who are PROSPER¹⁰ beneficiaries or have registered in the programme through the National Employment Service.

In PETi, Participation is mainly limited to households residing in municipalities inside the area where the emergency has been declared. Since 2009, housing damage surveys have been the

⁹ The marginalization index is a composite measure published by CONAPO (National Population Commission) that allows classifying municipalities based on their lack of access to services (education, medical services, water, electricity, and sewer systems), housing conditions, income, and remoteness or size of the locality.

¹⁰ POSPER is a conditional cash transfer program aimed at poor and marginalized households to ensure school enrolment and health care and guarantee access to higher education and formal employment. For more information, see: <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2014/11/19/un-modelo-de-mexico-para-el-mundo>

mechanism used as a proxy for livelihoods losses to identify eligible households within disaster-affected communities.

Outcomes and lessons learned

The PET provides an example of a social protection programme that strengthens disaster resilience from both disaster recovery and disaster risk reduction sides. Whereas PETi focuses both for ex-post disaster recovery/reconstruction, PET regular programme include projects intended to improve ex-ante disaster risk reduction such as environmental conservation, climate change adaptation, and disaster risk management education. Moreover, employment opportunities for poor and vulnerable households provide them with better resources to cope with the shocks in times of disaster.

Social protection and disaster management components of Indonesia's Community Empowerment Programme

Reviewed by Mohammad Maulana

Overview

Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Mandiri (PNPM Mandiri) is Indonesia's flagship community empowerment programme. The programme was established with the objective of improving economic and social welfare through empowering communities. The programme provides block grants¹¹ to villages, and communities are free to choose from all productive investments options except those listed as bringing negative development impact. Activities can include infrastructure construction and maintenance, provision of micro credit, skills training, among others. Although a big proportion of the programme focuses on infrastructure development, it has a strong social protection and employment aspects.

The programme has various components grouped as the core components (PNPM Inti), implemented in all areas, and support components (PNPM Penguatan) for targeted areas with specific needs. PNPM's core components include PNPM Rural and PNPM Urban, where villages and urban wards are provided with direct financial and technical support to improve basic infrastructure, increase access to services and create employment opportunities through an "open menu" project option system. Support components include PNPM Generasi (Generation), PNPM Green, PNPM Disaster Management, PNPM Sanimas (Water and Sanitation) and other specialty components (TNP2K, 2015c). For instance, PNPM Generasi focuses on nutrition, health and education, where the majority of funds are used for items such as supplementary feeding, financial assistance to poor households to access health and education facilities, as well as awareness raising. PNPM Green intends to mainstream environmental management practices into PNPM programmes, PNPM Sanimas implements urban water and sanitation projects, and PNPM Disaster Management implements disaster response and reconstruction.

PNPM has a network of facilitators who provide support to communities throughout project planning and implementation. Their job includes distributing information, mediating meetings, connecting communities to technical assistance, monitoring implementation, and receiving and channelling complaints. Assessments of PNPM show that facilitators' contributions are critical to programme achievements (TNP2K, 2015c).

PNPM Mandiri contributes to disaster management both directly through specialized components such as PNPM Disaster Management (ex-post disaster response and reconstruction) and PNPM Green (ex-ante disaster resilience), as well as indirectly by improving infrastructure, employment and access to services.

Programme history

Community-based antipoverty policy in Indonesia was marked by the implementation of Presidential Instruction for Underdeveloped Villages (*Inpres Desa Tertinggal*) in 1994 (Sumodiningrat, 1995). Subsequently, community empowerment programmes such as the Village Infrastructure Development Project (Pembangunan Prasarana Pendukung Desa Tertinggal/P3DT)

¹¹ Block grants are distributed from the central to local level for broadly defined functions without specific provision as to how the money should be spent.

and Rural Infrastructure Development (Pengembangan Prasarana Perdesaan/P2D) Village Infrastructure Program and P3DT (VIP – OECF funded). In 1997, the Kecamatan Development Project (KDP) was piloted in 12 subdistricts (kecamatan), shifting the scope of rural development programme from village level to sub-district level. The project intends to alleviate poverty and empower communities. It gives communities more control over the plans and resources to develop their villages. With similar goals, the Urban Poverty Project (UPP) was subsequently created for poor urban areas.

In 2007, the previously segmented community empowerment programmes were merged into a national programme called Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Mandiri or PNPM Mandiri. PNPM Mandiri gradually expanded its coverage to all subdistricts in Indonesia.

In 2014 Indonesia passed the Village Law (Law No. 6 of 2014) which provides higher autonomy and authority to the villages and guarantees that the central government allocates a specific amount of funds to villages so that they can finance their own development based on their individual needs and priorities. With the passage of this law, the values and principles of Community Empowerment Programme are incorporated in the village development mechanism. With this, community empowerment planning aligns with regular local planning processes (TNP2K, 2015c). The new mechanism, also known as the village fund (*dana desa*) mechanism, is now in transition stage, expected to be in full capacity in 2019. Since *dana desa* is still in its infancy, there is so far no substantial assessment or documented experience of its performance with regards to disaster management. For this reason, this paper focuses on the experiences of KDP, UPP and PNPM Mandiri, the Community Empowerment Programme prior to the adoption of Village Law.

Programme's disaster-response component

PNPM contributes to disaster management ex-post through PNPM Disaster Management projects as well as ex-ante through environmental conservation projects such as those under PNPM Green. Beyond the specialized projects, various other projects under PNPM have contributed to poverty alleviation, income generation and improvement of infrastructure and access to services (TNP2K, 2015c). As discussed in chapter 2, these factors also contribute to communities' resilience.

PNPM Disaster Management was activated in 2010 when Indonesia was struck by several major natural disasters, including an earthquake that hit West Sumatra and the volcanic eruption of Mount Merapi in Central Java and Yogyakarta. Under the PNPM Disaster Management project, the government disbursed additional block grants in the disaster-affected areas. Post-disaster grants are additional to the regular PNPM block grants. In a situation where a disaster occurs before the regular grant has been disbursed, the project's operational policies allow communities to use the regular block grant to conduct cash-for-work activities and to facilitate the provision of social funds to respond to emergency situations, to build temporary shelters and other similar purposes, before the post-disaster grant becomes available. The additional grant then allows villagers to rebuild damaged infrastructure (World Bank, 2015c).

One of PNPM's strengths is its wide network of village facilitators. These facilitators work closely with community members and are familiar with local situations. In disaster situations, they are valuable in supporting early assessments and channelling communication to and from the communities. Such support has been put into action since the earlier implementation of the Community Empowerment Programme. In 2004 following the Indian Ocean tsunami, reconstruction effort in the province of Aceh in Indonesia faced a challenge in accurately identifying land borders and ownership due to drastic changes on the landscape and missing

documents (BRR, 2005). The Sub-district Community Development Programme (KDP) and Urban Poverty Project (UPP), PNPM's predecessor, provided its facilitators to work closely with local communities in assessing needs and determining land borders, which facilitates further interventions.

From disaster mitigation side, PNPM Green was introduced specifically to improve environmental sustainability. The programme aims to improve the utilization and conservation of natural resources by communities through (i) mainstreaming natural resource management issues in the village development planning, (ii) increasing environmental awareness and management capacity, and (iii) allocating grants to fund environmentally supportive projects. Projects under PNPM Green include protection and restoration of the environment (such as protection of watershed and replanting trees to prevent erosion and landslides) as well as introduction of sustainable income generating activities and renewable energy (PNPM Support Facility, 2012).

Institutional set-up and delivery mechanism

PNPM-Mandiri includes two major components: core components (PNPM Inti) and support components (PNPM Penguatan). The core component includes PNPM-Rural and PNPM-Urban. Each subdistrict is assigned to either PNPM-Rural or to PNPM-Urban based on characteristics of their location. The implementing agency for PNPM-Rural is the Ministry of Home Affairs, while the implementing agency for PNPM Urban is the Ministry of Public Works. The technical assistance teams at the national, provincial, and district levels consist of consultants or technical experts rather than civil servants. These technical assistance teams have expertise in civil engineering, community development, financial management, complaint handling, and information management. The teams at the district and subdistrict levels are often referred to as district facilitators and subdistrict facilitators, respectively. The subdistrict facilitator team typically comprises two community development facilitators and one technical (engineering)

PNPM Mandiri funding mainly comes from the state budget, both from internal sources and external sources including grants from donor countries and World Bank loans. PNPM Support Facility, administered by the World Bank, coordinates the multi donor trust fund. Aside from the national budget, beneficiary communities and local governments are required to provide counterpart funding. This counterpart funding varies based on the fiscal capacity of the district concerned, but in general accounts for 20–30 per cent of the total funds (ADB, 2016). From national level funds are dispersed directly to the Subdistrict Activity Management Unit, which in turn disburses the block grant allocations to the beneficiary villages.

In deciding on the specific project, a series of meetings at hamlet (subvillage), village and intervillage levels take place, and village-level proposals are developed to compete for PNPM funding. Priority projects are then decided in the subsequent intervillage meeting. Detailed technical designs and cost estimates of the priority projects are performed jointly by the village technical cadres elected by village residents and the subdistrict facilitators. Decisions regarding the final funding allocations are then made. Village implementation teams, elected by the community, are responsible for implementation of the projects as well as management of the funds (ADB, 2016). In all community meetings, women representation is compulsory.

Identification of beneficiaries

Indonesia's community development programme started as a programme targeted to only poor subdistricts. As the programme expanded, in 2009 it achieved national coverage reaching all 33 provinces, 495 districts and 6,680 sub-districts of Indonesia. With the new Village Fund

mechanism based on Village Law of 2014, the community empowerment principles will continue to be implemented universally all over Indonesia.

Outcomes and lessons learned

PNPM Mandiri is a community empowerment programme with an integrated approach that combines elements of poverty reduction, community participation, gender-balanced participation, social protection and disaster resilience. PNPM' addresses disaster resilience both from disaster response and reconstruction side (ex-post) through specialized component such as PNPM Disaster Management as well as from disaster risk reduction side (ex-ante) through environmental conservation improvement in infrastructure and access to services. PNPM's key strengths in disaster response are its universal coverage and wide network of facilitators, which allowed the programme to promptly reach and work with communities affected by disasters.

Japan's employment policies in response to the 2011 great earthquake

Co-authored by Shukuko Koyama

Overview

On 11 March 2011, a strong earthquake with a 9.0 magnitude on the Richter scale hit the eastern coast of the Tohoku region in Japan. Around 16,000 people were confirmed dead, 27,000 injured, and 3,000 missing. The tsunami also caused a number of nuclear accidents at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant. In the aftermath of the disaster, employment and labour were considered among the most challenging recovery issues for those affected by the disaster. Many people, particularly the younger generations, left the disaster-affected prefectures (ILO, 2015c).

➤ Job creation project in crisis response scheme: 'Japan as One' Work Project

Japan was able to quickly respond to labour needs in disaster-affected areas by using existing social protection schemes, such as the employment insurance system and the employment adjustment subsidy programme. Japan has a relatively comprehensive social protection system, which functioned as a set of ex ante measures to prevent people from losing jobs.

In order to create new job opportunities, the government set up the inter-ministry Committee on Promotion of Employment Support and Job Creation for Disaster Victims headed by the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW). In less than three weeks, a comprehensive measure on employment called the 'Japan as One' Work Project was formulated, covering the three stages of emergency, recovery, and reconstruction.

The 'Japan as One' Work Project has three main characteristics. First, the existing government emergency schemes established as a safety net in response to the 2008 Lehman shock have been utilized. Second, the eligibility requirements on all the measures under the Project have been flexibly relaxed in accordance with the employment situation (see the section below for more details). Third, the Project has shifted its direction from provision of benefits and cash to job creation in industries with a prospect of growth in long-term reconstruction in consideration of the need to include socially vulnerable groups such as the elderly, women and people with disabilities.

In addition to support for individual workers, the government also provided assistance for small and medium size enterprises (SMEs). One example is the SME Group Subsidy. The Subsidy was provided to groups of SMEs sharing common production, processing and retail facilities. SMEs found the funds very useful as the support offset a high proportion of reconstruction costs that would have been born by themselves. The early release of the subsidies was instrumental in kick-starting business operations, too.

Furthermore, the government provided assistance not only to companies located in disaster-affected areas but also companies located elsewhere, since those companies play an important part of Japan's supply chain. This had a number of benefits including a) minimising impacts of the disaster in other parts of the country and b) promoting rapid establishment of operations and jobs, which allowed the government to refocus assistance to coastal areas where damage was greater.

Long-term effects and impacts of the measures require further examination through in-depth survey and participatory research. However, based on the research conducted by the ILO so far,

the recovery measures by the government have contributed significantly to improving the employment status after the 2011 Earthquake.

➤ Extension of the employment insurance

Prior to the 2011 earthquake, Japan had in place a set of policy measures to protect employment. In an effort to prevent and reduce unemployment, the Employment Insurance Act was enacted in 1974 when the unemployment situation became increasingly severe due to the first oil crisis. Following the Act, the employment insurance system was set to stabilize workers' living circumstances during times of unemployment and to encourage the unemployed to find new jobs. The system is now comprised of two main functions: (i) the provision of unemployment benefits (insurance); and (ii) subsidies (service provision) to enterprises through the Public Employment Security Offices.

Employment situation in Japan faced yet another severe challenge in 2008 as a result of the financial crisis known in Japan as the Lehman Shock. In response to the financial crisis, the Government formulated packages of employment measures from 2008 to 2009.

These measures were extended to respond to the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake. Under Japan's Labour Standard's Act (1947), employers are not required to pay allowances to laid off workers if the reason for layoff includes damage to facilities and equipment caused by an earthquake or tsunami. As a result, support from the Employment Adjustment Subsidy Programme was, initially, not available to many disaster victims that lost their jobs post disaster. In response to this situation the government relaxed its requirements on unemployment insurance for a duration of 330 days. The number of people supported by these unemployment benefits peaked at 79,340 people June 2011, after which there was a progressive downtrend in applications until December 2012 when the programme was terminated. Insurance funds were allocated from a special national labour insurance account (JPY 294 billion) approved 2 May 2011.

Under the subsidy component of the employment insurance system, the government provided subsidies to employers hiring people affected by the disaster, amounting to JPY15.8 billion in total. Firms were paid between JPY 500,000 and JPY 900,000; depending on the size of the company. Unemployed persons were also included under this initiative by being provided access to free vocational training in the construction sector.

Funding mechanism

➤ National budget

Japan had a large number of reserved funds that had been pooled prior to the 2011 Great East Japan Earthquake, the existing employment insurance fund used to support workers who lost their jobs. The government took two financial measures to finance recovery and reconstruction efforts. After the disasters, the salary for the national public sector workers were cut down by 10 per cent for a period of two years. In Japan, the salary scale is discussed at the Labour Policy Council consisting of representatives from the government, employers' and workers' organisations. The National Diet makes the final decision. Concurrently, the government issued government bonds. Additionally, the government requested for supplementary budget of JPY 350 billion for the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) activities. There were insufficient funds available at the time of the 2011 Earthquake to support the rapid increase in subsidy applications. To make up for this deficit, the national government transferred funds for

unemployment benefits to the subsidy programme on a temporary basis. Between FY2011 and 2012 1,237 employers applied for subsidies totalling JPY 350 billion¹².

➤ International assistance

Japan received a large number of international assistance. Private donation consisted of the majority of the assistance, whilst the UN assistance was limited to the very initial coordination role by United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN OCHA). Japan received foreign assistance from 126 countries. The total amount of financial assistance reached USD 7.2 billion, out of which USD 5.0 billion was donated from the private sector and individuals, and USD 2.0 billion from the governments. The foreign financial aid was compiled by the Japanese Red Cross and distributed at the municipality level.

➤ Local government resources

Since 2000 the Japanese government has pursued a decentralization policy that allowed municipal governments to independently plan and respond to the disaster. This meant that they have capacities and funds available to immediately initiate a local response post disaster. While the central government continues to be an important source of large scale funding, the system of decentralization allowed prefectures and municipalities to adapt national programmes to be response to local needs.

Institutional set-up and delivery mechanism

Unlike other countries, Japan does not have a centralised agency specialised in disaster response. The Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport (MLIT) has been a de facto lead agency in the field of disaster response, given their roles in water management issues. Upon the Great East Japan Earthquake, the MLIT and its local branches were the first government bodies that reached most severely affected areas, as they were often the first public sector actors clearing debris and opening access, even prior to the arrival of the Self Defence Forces. Therefore, the MLIT and their local branches in particular became a de facto hub to coordinate emergency response operations such as research and rescue of victims as well as delivery of food and water, at the very initial stage. As the time passed and the situation became relatively more manageable after a few weeks, respective line ministries came to take a charge of assistance operations. Some officials state that the coordination was more efficient at the initial stage.

Employment insurance and employment policies in the disaster response falls under the responsibility of the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW). MHLW designed the national strategy and requested for the budget. The funds are distributed to the local labour institutions for the actual execution.

Shortly after the tsunamis hit, the government set up the inter-ministry Committee on Promotion of Employment Support and Job Creation for Disaster Victims headed by the MHLW. In less than three weeks, a comprehensive measure on employment, called the 'Japan as One' Work Project, was formulated, covering the three stages of emergency, recovery, and reconstruction.

In the emergency situation, some local authorities and its administrative bodies in general were severely damaged and lost a large number of civil servants. Thus, other local municipality governments sent their own staff to the disaster affected governments to supplement their

¹² This is approximately One-third the amount of applications during the financial crisis.

administrative tasks. Those from former disaster-affected communities were found most fit to the staff-exchange initiatives, as they could apply their previous experience.

Identification of beneficiaries

Beneficiaries were identified based on the data registered in the labour institutions. However, many of the local labour institutions were damaged by the tsunamis and earthquakes and official documents including beneficiaries' IDs were often lost during the disasters. The government thus relaxed the regular requirement for identification of beneficiaries by accepting alternative documents, not necessarily the original document, if the beneficiaries could prove their identities. Information on the beneficiaries' information was thus required to be cross-checked with data registered at the MHLW HQ database. The central data stored at the MHLW headquarters, however, had a risk of being affected as a regular power cut was planned and it may have affected the system. The power cut did not take place in the governmental area fortunately, thus the restored data was not affected fortunately.

Outcomes and lessons learned

The experience of the 2011 earthquake in Japan emphasizes the relevance of social protection to disaster risk reduction. Japan's example demonstrates that the flexible utilisation of pre-existing social protection schemes were proven to be effective post-disaster recovery measures.

In addition, it is noteworthy to point out that the MHLW played a pivotal role in coordinating line ministries when the government designed and planned the post-disaster response strategy, i.e., the 'Japan as One' Work Project, while labour ministries in other countries are often not included in such a disaster response related policy making process. Having the MHLW play a coordination role helped to develop a disaster response strategy with a primal focus on labour and social protection issues.

Collaboration between the Government and the business community in New Zealand to help businesses survive a disaster

Reviewed by Peter Townsend

Overview

In September 2010 and February 2011 Christchurch, New Zealand's second largest city, was rocked by two destructive earthquakes. The 2011 quake, a magnitude 6.3 centred just ten kilometres from the central business district, resulted in 185 deaths and unprecedented infrastructure collapse. After the 2011 quake, the entire central business district became a "red zone", too dangerous to enter. As many as 6000 businesses were shut out from their premises, unable to recover stock and vital records and 50,000 people who lived or worked in the central city were dislocated.

The Canterbury economy was dominated by small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), and it immediately became clear an agency was needed specifically to address the needs of these SMEs. Recover Canterbury was created to provide support to all earthquake-affected SMEs in the city and wider region in the short to medium term. Its goals were to: (i) help Canterbury business to survive, revive and thrive post-earthquake; (ii) accelerate business recovery and enhance business capability for future growth; (iii) provide a mechanism to connect government support to businesses effectively; and (iv) maintain economic activity in the region (Recover Canterbury, 2012).

Through its team of Business Recovery Coordinators as well as call centre and website, Recover Canterbury provides services including:

- Recovery planning – assessing available help, drawing up a business plan.
- Referrals to other agencies – for example, New Zealand Inland Revenue, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise, banks or insurers – who can offer specialised assistance.
- Mentoring – providing objective and impartial assistance to help clarify business plans.
- Training – providing advice and information on how to build the skills to achieve success.
- Funding – providing information about and facilitating access to available grants or loans – for example, the Canterbury Business Recovery Trust Fund or the Red Cross Independent Advice for Small Business Grant.

Programme history

Immediately after the first earthquake in 2010, the Canterbury Employers' Chamber of Commerce (CECC) and Canterbury Development Corporation (CDC) worked together to meet the needs of the business community. Within days, a website was built and an earthquake recovery helpline was advertised.

The CECC, CDC and Enterprise North Canterbury approached the Ministry of Economic Development to fund staff to solely focus on earthquake-affected businesses. Funding was approved, and 2.5 full time equivalent staff began work on February 21, 2011. In addition, funding to support other work such as marketing campaigns was also approved.

Following the February 2011 earthquake, a request for funding from the Ministry of Economic Development for an additional 20 full time equivalent staff was submitted. Funding for 10 full

time equivalent staff was approved along with funding to subsidise the operations of the organisation. Recover Canterbury was formally established in March 2011. By this time, a call centre was established, predominantly dealing with enquiries about commercial building access in cordoned off zones, staff obligations and temporary premises. Recover Canterbury has also built a system to capture information gathered from interactions with businesses. This was first a paper-based data, which was later transferred into an electronic database (Recover Canterbury, 2014).

Institutional set-up and delivery mechanism

Recover Canterbury is a joint venture between the CECC and the CDC. The key stakeholders in Recover Canterbury are: CECC, CDC, Ministry of Social Development, Internal Revenue, Ministry of Economic Development, Accident Compensation Corporation, New Zealand Trade and Enterprise and the Department of Labour. Government and non-government agencies are united under the Recover Canterbury brand. It is managed by a part-time CEO, with the management team and other key staff largely seconded from the CDC, CECC, Internal Revenue and Ministry of Social Development.

Recover Canterbury's team of Business Recovery Coordinators is the main point of contact for clients. They visit clients, assess their business needs and work with them to develop a personalised action plan for recovery. Recover Canterbury call centre and website also provide information about available services.

Outcomes and lessons learned

Since its creation, Recover Canterbury interacted with around 6,700 businesses and has provided in-depth support to around 1300 businesses. The partnership between public and private sector agencies is key to Recover Canterbury's success. Recover Canterbury has also forged links with other service providers and community organisations, such as insurance providers, banks, accountants and lawyers. Another strength of the Recover Canterbury is that serves as a one-stop shop. Businesses can access a range of services through one door, avoiding the need to visit multiple agencies and retell their story. Recover Canterbury offers improved access to New Zealand Inland Revenue through quality referrals.

Philippines' Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Program

*Reviewed by Bureau of Workers with Special Concerns,
Department of Labour and Employment of the Philippines*

Overview

The Philippines Department of Labour and Employment's (DOLE) Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Program (DILEEP) links disaster and climate risk management with social security and active labour market policies. It provides short-term wage employment and facilitates entrepreneurship for people affected by natural calamities and economic shocks. DILEEP is composed of two components: (i) the Emergency Employment Program or *Tulong Panghanapbuhay sa Ating Displaced/Disadvantaged Workers Program* (TUPAD), which is an immediate post-disaster response that aids in the rehabilitation of affected workers through short-term wage employment for a minimum period of 10 days up to a maximum of 30 days; and (ii) the DOLE Integrated Livelihood Program (DILP) or *Kabuhayan Program*, which promotes entrepreneurship and serve as a post disaster recovery strategy.

Beneficiaries of TUPAD receives not only the prevailing regional minimum wage, but also access to health insurance, accident insurance through the Government Service Insurance System, orientation on occupational safety and health, and personal protective equipment to protect them from accident and other forms of hazards/risks. As such, it follows a rights-based approach to decent working conditions while supporting beneficiaries in their search for better livelihood opportunities (ILO, 2015d). At recovery stage, the DILP provides assistance in the form of: (i) working capital (raw materials, equipment, tools); (ii) trainings on skills, entrepreneurship, productivity, occupational safety and health; and (iii) coverage to social security schemes.

The DILEEP targets the poor, marginalized, and vulnerable workers. For TUPAD, the target beneficiaries include the underemployed poor and displaced workers as a result of economic shocks or natural calamities such as typhoon Yolanda in 2013. The target beneficiaries of DILP include the self-employed with insufficient income, marginalized and landless farmers, marginalized fisherfolks, unpaid family workers, women and youth, low/minimum wage earners and seasonal workers, workers displaced or to be displaced as a result of natural and man-made disasters or closure of establishment, retrenchment, termination, persons with disability, senior citizens, indigenous people, parents/guardians of child laborers, rebel returnees, victims of armed conflict, and distressed undocumented OFW returnees (DOLE, Forthcoming).

Programme history

The DILEEP was initiated in 2009 in response to the global economic crisis. It aims to restore livelihoods to survivors of calamities by providing short-term employment as well as facilitating access to credit and training (ILO, 2015d). The programme was further enhanced in 2014 by integrating a transitional emergency employment and promotion of entrepreneurship and the development of community enterprise through the issuance of the Department Order 137-14 (Guidelines in the Implementation of DILEEP). Since then, DILEEP remains as Philippine's major public employment programme. It has been utilised as regular programme as well as a response to emergency situations.

Programme's disaster-response component

TUPAD is the sub programme that covers workers in emergency situations, including victims of disaster. In the aftermath of typhoon Haiyan (2013) and typhoon Hagupit (2014), the programme was swiftly activated by DOLE in cooperation with the ILO. The programme provides short-term employment to typhoon victims through various community projects including cleaning and repairing public infrastructure and buildings, unclogging canals, and clearing and sorting debris. The goal was to enable people to rebuild their communities while simultaneously being granted income support. DILEEP also contributes to building resilience to disasters through its infrastructure projects that are geared to environmental conservation or sustainable livelihood. For instance, under TUPAD, the programme implements (i) agro-forestry community projects such as tree planting, seedling preparation, re-forestation, and (ii) economic community projects like repair, maintenance and/or rehabilitation of farm-to-market roads, bridges, post-harvest facilities, public markets, and common service facilities such as production and display centers, fish ports, etc.

Institutional set-up and delivery mechanism

DOLE is the main department in charge of DILEEP. DOLE regional offices implement the programme across the country in coordination with co-partners. Accredited co-partners include local government units and civil society organizations that have undergone an accreditation process. The DILEEP is implemented either through Direct Administration by the DOLE or through an Accredited Co-Partner. Funds are sourced from the General Appropriations Act (GAA) and from external donors.

Identification of beneficiaries

Workers eligible to work under the TUPAD include: (i) those who are under- employed; (ii) those who were laid- off or terminated as a result of retrenchment or permanent closure of an establishment; and (iii) those who were self- employed (including farmers and fishermen) and have lost their livelihoods because of natural calamities/disasters, economic crisis, armed-conflicts and/or seasonality of work.

From 2010 to 2014, a total of 465,718 informal economy workers benefitted from DILP and 115,948 benefitted from TUPAD. TUPAD assisted 79,655 people who were affected by Typhoon Haiyan (DOLE, 2014). Data on the number of projects and beneficiaries is recorded by DOLE and consolidated in the Community-based Employment Programme Online Monitoring and Reporting System, which is a common monitoring system for all government-run projects.

Outcomes and lessons learned

An analysis of the DILEEP programme done by the ILO (2015) highlights the strength of the programme's comprehensive approach in providing decent work to workers in the informal economy. Beneficiaries do not only receive regional minimum wage, they are also registered with social security and health insurance, provided with Personal Protective Equipment and trained in workplace safety. DILEEP also demonstrates that pre-existing administrative capacity of social protection and employment programmes can improve the readiness and ability of countries to set up emergency measures and reconstruction programmes in the event of natural disasters. DILEEP confirms that cooperation and coordination between government departments and local administrations is necessary to maximize outreach and effectiveness. This is an on-going effort

since adequate coordination at the policy level is not always complemented by the same extent of coordination at implementation level (ILO, 2015).

5. Recommendation for improving the potential of social protection to build disaster resilience

The following are factors that need to be taken to account when designing disaster-responsive social protection systems.

Improve coverage and benefit level of regular social protection programmes

In order for the social protection system to be effective in building disaster resilience, it needs to first have good coverage, sufficient level of benefits and reliable registry system. As higher proportion of population receive regular and predictable benefits, more people can improve their resilience to disaster and, in the event of a disaster, the scale up of the programme can also reach more beneficiaries. The level of benefit should be adequate to be able to help beneficiaries build asset, human capital and decent livelihood to reduce household's vulnerability to disasters. Aside from its disaster resilience function, the extension of social protection is in itself instrumental for people's welfare and the economy. The experience of Mexico and Indonesia recalls the benefits of incorporating disaster prevention and preparedness in social protection programmes to reduce social and economic impacts of natural hazards.

Improve data and information on risk and vulnerability

Disaster-responsive social protection also requires information on risk and vulnerability. Looking at Priority Programme 1 AWARE of the AADMER Work Programme 2016-2020, each ASEAN Member State would be developing national risk profiles. The information in these profiles can be used in designing social protection programmes, particularly in targeting beneficiaries in the most risk-prone and vulnerable areas. Also, the risk maps that will be developed can aid in the delivery mechanisms of the social protection programmes.

Adopt an integrated approach to provide more comprehensive package of social protection in time of disaster

Social protection and disaster management goals can be achieved more effectively through programmes that provide comprehensive packages of benefits. Such programme caters for the multiple needs of beneficiaries, particularly in disaster situations. The experience of the Philippines show how beneficiaries of the public works programme benefit not only from the wage they make but also from the decent work condition ensured by the programme, including access to healthcare and social security. In New Zealand, through multi agency collaboration, businesses affected by disaster are provided with a one-stop shop that forges links with various service providers that collectively help these businesses recover and resume operation.

Create programme flexibility and scalability

Programmes need to be designed with flexibility to accommodate prompt scale-up when a disaster hits. Ideally programmes should have a mechanism to both increase support to existing beneficiaries and to extend to new beneficiaries when needed. Achieving scalability requires sound registry and payment systems that can identify eligible participants and deliver benefits efficiently and funding reserves that can be rapidly disbursed. The experience of Japan shows the importance of these factors in making optimal use of social protection programmes to respond to disasters. Furthermore, as exhibited by the experience of Nepal, there is a need to overcome

rigidities of existing programmes (eligibility criteria, registration process) by developing complementary standard operating procedures for emergency contexts.

Innovative delivery mechanism and advances in technology such as the use of mobile devices and web-based applications may be useful tools to implement social protection in times of disasters

Make financial arrangements for scaling up in disasters

Disaster-responsive social protection requires financial arrangements that enable rapid disbursement of resources in times of disaster. Various funding options can be explored in accordance to country situation. They can include resources from governments, donors or through insurance. Programmes need to set up in advance a comprehensive strategy and clear guidelines that ensures access to post-disaster financing whenever disaster hits.

Improve coordination

In many countries social protection and disaster management are under different ministries that do not always confer. Coordination can be particularly challenging since both social protection and disaster risk management themselves already involve many actors, and do not necessarily falls under the responsibility of one ministry only. A starting point towards coordination can be a mapping of key stakeholders and existing coordination mechanisms to identify gaps and priority actions. Other actions for reinforcing coordination can include: (i) identifying high-level champion(s) to promote linkages; (ii) establishing effective communication channels; (iii) exploring the cluster approach for coordination of external assistance; (iv) linking existing data systems used for social protection and disaster management; and (v) setting up legal frameworks for the approach.

Improve social partners engagement and tripartite dialogue

Businesses and workers are very much affected by disaster and their capacity to survive and resume economic activities after a disaster greatly affects the economy overall. The active engagement of workers and the business communities are therefore imperative in developing disaster-responsive social protection systems. Social protection and disaster management policies need to go through tripartite dialogues in order to accommodate their perspective and gain their support.

On the other hand, workers' organisations and employers' associations also have potential human and financial resources to contribute to disaster response and mitigation. An example from New Zealand demonstrates how an employers' organisation can work with the government in helping businesses survive and thrive following a disaster. The experience of workers organisation such as Pakistan Workers' Federation (ILO, 2010) show their active role in disaster response interventions and in ensuring that interventions take into account workers' rights and protection.

Bibliography

Asian Development Bank (ADB). 2016. *Towards mainstreaming and sustaining community-driven development in Indonesia: Understanding local initiatives and the transition from the national rural community empowerment program to the village law* (Manila).

— and International Labour Organization (ILO). 2014. *ASEAN Community 2015: Managing integration for better jobs and shared prosperity* (Manila).

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). 2016a. *ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community Blueprint 2025* (Jakarta, ASEAN Secretariat)

—. 2016b. *ASEAN Declaration on One ASEAN, One Response: ASEAN Responding to Disasters as One in the Region and outside the Region*, adopted in Vientiane

—. 2015a. *Regional framework and action plan to implement the ASEAN declaration on strengthening social protection*, adopted in Kuala Lumpur.

—. 2015b. *ASEAN 2025: Forging ahead together* (Jakarta, ASEAN Secretariat)

—. 2015c. *Declaration on Institutionalizing the Resilience of ASEAN and Its Communities and Peoples to Disasters and Climate Change*, adopted in Kuala Lumpur

—. 2013a. *ASEAN declaration on strengthening social protection*, adopted in Bandar Seri Begawan.

—. 2013b. *Chairman's statement of the 23rd ASEAN Summit: Our people. Our future together*. 9 Oct. 2013 (Bandar Seri Begawan).

—. 2011. *The ASEAN-Emergency Rapid Assessment Team Dispatched to Respond to Floods in Thailand*. Press release (Jakarta). Available at <http://asean.org/the-asean-emergency-rapid-assessment-team-dispatched-to-respond-to-floods-in-thailand/> [12 Nov. 2016]

—. 2010. *ASEAN agreement on disaster management and emergency response (AADMER)*, presentation at 26th ALNAP Conference given by Dato Misran Karmain, Deputy Secretary General of ASEAN, Kuala Lumpur, 17 Nov.

—. 2009. *Standard Operating Procedure for Regional Standby Arrangements and Coordination of Joint Disaster Relief and Emergency Response Operations (SASOP)*. (Jakarta, ASEAN Secretariat)

—. 2005. *ASEAN agreement on disaster management and emergency response*. Adopted in Vientiane.

ASEAN Humanitarian Assistance (AHA) Centre. 2016. *About AHA Centre* Available at: <http://ahacentre.org/content/history> [29 Sept. 2016].

—. 2014. *About ASEAN-ERAT* (Jakarta). Available at: <http://www.ahacentre.org/content/asean-emergency-response-and-assessment-team-asean-erat-0> [9 Nov. 2014].

—. Not dated. *ASEAN-ERAT Guidelines*. The ASEAN Coordinating Centre for Humanitarian Assistance on disaster management (AHA Centre) (Jakarta)

—. Not dated. *National Focal Point* (Jakarta) Available at <http://ahacentre.org/content/national-focal-point> [28 Sept. 2016]

Bachelet, M. 2011. *Social protection floor for a fair and inclusive globalization*, report of the

Advisory Group chaired by Michelle Bachelet, convened by the ILO with the collaboration of the WHO (Geneva, ILO).

Badan Rekonstruksi dan Rehabilitasi [Reconstruction and Rehabilitation Agency] (BRR) Indonesia. 2005. *Aceh and Nias one year after the tsunami: The recovery effort and way forward*, a Joint Report of BRR and International Partners (Jakarta).

Barca, V. et al. 2015. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Synthesis report* (Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations).

Bastagli, F. 2014. *Responding to a crisis: The design and delivery of social protection*, ODI Working Paper (London, Overseas Development Institution (ODI)).

Bowen, T. 2015. *Social protection and disaster risk management in the Philippines: The case of typhoon Yolanda (Haiyan)*, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 7482 (Washington DC, The World Bank Group).

Capannelli, G. 2014. *ADB Working Paper Series in Regional Economic Integration* (Manila, ADB).

Creach, Y and L. Fan. 2008. *ASEAN's role in the Cyclone Nargis response: implications, lessons and opportunities*. Humanitarian Practice Network. Available at <http://odihpn.org/magazine/asean%20s-role-in-the-cyclone-nargis-response-implications-lessons-and-opportunities/> [11 Nov 2016]

Daidone, S. et al. 2014. *Zambia's child grant programme: 24-month impact report on productive activities and labour allocation*. (Rome, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)).

Dalit Welfare Organisation. 2016. *Who are Dalit?* Available at: <http://www.dwo.org.np/dalit.php> [6 Oct. 2016].

Demeke, M.; G. Pangrazio and M. Maetz. 2009. *Country responses to the food security crisis: Nature and preliminary implications of the policies pursued* (Rome, FAO).

Development Pathways. 2016. *Social assistance in Vietnam: A review and proposal for reform* (Hanoi).

Devereux, S. and R. Sabates-Wheeler. 2006. *Transformative social protection*, IDS working paper (Brighton, Institute of Development Studies).

Drucza, K. 2016. *Cash transfers in Nepal: Do they contribute to social inclusion?* Oxford Development Studies, Vol. 44:1, 49-69; doi: 10.1080/13600818.2015.1065313.

DOLE (Department of Labour and Employment of the Philippines). Forthcoming. *Amended guidelines of the DILEEP*. Manila

Ferrie, G. and Gautam, R. 2016. *Cash Preparedness in Nepal - Lessons from the 2015 Earthquake*. Draft report for the Nepal Cash Coordination Group (Kathmandu).

Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). 2016. *Shock-responsive social protection for resilience building: Supporting livelihoods in protracted crises, fragile and humanitarian context*, FAO webinar document, 2 Aug.

— and UNICEF, 2014. *The economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa* (Rome).

- . 2013. *Qualitative research and analyses of the economic impacts of cash transfer programmes in sub-Saharan Africa: Ghana country case study report* (Rome).
- Gertler, P.; S. Martinez and M. Rubio-Codina. (2012) "*Investing Cash Transfers to Raise Long Term Living Standards*", in *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 164-92.
- Guha-Sapir, D.; Hoyois, P.; Below, R. 2013. *Annual Disaster Statistical Review 2013: The numbers and trends* (Brussels, Centre for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters).
- Gurung, Y.B. et al. 2015. *Assessment of the emergency top-up cash transfer programme for vulnerable groups in Nepal* (Kathmandu, Nepal Participatory Action Network (NEPAN)).
- Hagen-Zanker, J.; R. Mallett and A. Ghimire. 2015. *How does Nepal's child grant work for Dalit children and their families?* ODI and UNICEF report, Sept. 2015.
- HelpAge International. 2009. *The universal social pension in Nepal: An assessment of its impact on older people in Tanahun district*, HelpAge briefing (Chiang Mai, HelpAge International - Asia/Pacific).
- Hillier, D. and K. Nightingale. 2013. *How disasters disrupt development: recommendations for the post-2015 development framework* (Oxford, Oxfam GB).
- Hochrainer, S. 2009. *Assessing the macroeconomic impacts of natural disasters: Are there any?* World Bank Policy Research Working Paper (Washington, DC, The World Bank Group).
- International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED). 2013. *Urban poverty in Vietnam – a view from complementary assessments* (London).
- International Labour Organization (ILO). 2015a. *Building social protection floors for all: Global flagship programme strategy (2016-2020)*. Available at: <http://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowProject.action?id=3000> [19 Aug. 2016].
- . 2015b. *The state of social protection in ASEAN at the dawn of integration*. ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific. Bangkok
- . 2015c. *Research on employment and labour measures in the Post-Great East Japan Earthquake recovery process / Japan Earthquake Project: Dissemination of Employment and Labour Measures for Recovery from the Great East Japan Earthquake as International Public Resources*, ILO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (Bangkok)
- . 2015d. *DOLE's Integrated Livelihood and Emergency Employment Program. Building Social Protection Floors*, Country Note Series. ILO. Geneva
- . 2014a. *World Social Protection Report 2014/15: Building economic recovery, inclusive development and social justice* (Geneva, ILO).
- . 2014b. *Philippines: Assessment based national dialogue on social protection, employment promotion and disaster management* (Manila). Available at: www.social-protection.org
- . 2012a. *Social Protection Floors Recommendation, 2012* (No. 202) (Recommendation concerning national floors of social protection). Available at: http://www.ilo.org/secsoc/areas-of-work/legal-advice/WCMS_205341/lang-en/index.htm
- . 2012b. *Analysis of the Vietnam national social protection strategy (2011-2020) in the context of social protection floor objectives: A rapid assessment* (Hanoi, ILO).
- . 2012c. *Report of study visit on unemployment insurance and employment services Bangkok*

and Ayutthaya, Thailand, 24-26 July 2012 (Bangkok, ILO).

—. 2011. *World Social Security Report 2010/11: Providing coverage in times of crisis and beyond* (Geneva).

—. 2010. *ILO-UN social protection floor initiative: The role of social security in crisis response and recovery and beyond*. Available at: http://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/features/WCMS_141818/lang--en/index.htm [20 Aug. 2016].

—. 2009. *Protecting people, promoting jobs: A survey of country employment and social protection policy responses to the global economic crisis* (Geneva).

—. 2007. *Programme to prevent natural disasters by environmental protection and employment creation in the Gonaïves Region: Demonstrating Green Jobs*, presentation. Available at: <http://www.ilo.org/emppolicy/countries/haiti/lang--en/index.htm> [29 Oct. 2016].

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). 2012. *Managing the risks of extreme events and disasters to advance climate change adaptation: A special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Jha, H.B. 2004. *Janajatis in Nepal* (Kathmandu, ILO). Available at: <http://un.org.np/node/10312> [6 Oct 2016].

Koehler, G. and D. Chopra. 2014. *Development and Welfare Policy in South Asia* (London and New York, Routledge).

Lis, E. M. and C. Nickel. 2009. *The impact of extreme weather events on budget balances and implications for fiscal policy*, European Central Bank Working Paper Series (Frankfurt).

Maunder, N. et al. 2016. *Evaluation of the use of different transfer modalities in ECHO humanitarian aid actions 2011-2014*. (Belgium, European Commission Publication Office).

McCord, A. 2013. *Review of the literature on social protection shock responses and readiness* (London, ODI).

Meinzen-Dick, R. et al. (2011). *Gender, assets, and agricultural development programs: A conceptual framework*, CAPRI Working Paper No. 99 (Washington, DC, International Food Policy Research Institute).

Ministry of Social Development of the Kingdom of Lesotho. 2014. *Policy brief: The broad range of impacts of the child grant programme in Lesotho*. Available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3848e.pdf>

National Planning Commission (NPC). 2015. *Nepal earthquake 2015: Post disaster needs assessment* (Kathmandu, Government of Nepal).

Newsham, A.; M. Davies and C. Béné. 2011. *Making social protection work for pro-poor disaster risk reduction and climate change* (Brighton, Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex).

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). 2016. *Economic Outlook for Southeast Asia, China and India 2016: Enhancing regional ties* (Paris).

Overseas Development Institute (ODI). 2013. *The geography of poverty, disasters and climate extremes in 2030* (London).

Oxford Policy Management (OPM). 2016. *DFID shock-responsive social protection systems*

research: Literature review (Oxford).

—. 2015. *Shock-responsive social protection systems: Working paper 1: Conceptualising shock-responsive social protection* (Oxford).

Philippine Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE). 2014. *90 per cent of livelihood beneficiaries report increased incomes; 45 per cent created more community employment*, DOLE News (Manila) Available at: www.dole.gov.ph.

Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat [National Community Empowerment Program] (PNPM) Support Facility. 2012. *About PNPM Green Program*. <http://pnpm-support.org/program/green/about> [6 Nov. 2016].

Rastall, R. 2010. *Programme final evaluation report: Post typhoon Ketsana cash transfers in Gia Lai, Kon Tum, Quang Nam and Quang Ngai Provinces* (Hanoi, The IDL Group).

Rabi, A. et al. 2015. *The Road to Recovery: Cash Transfers as an Emergency Response to Nepal's Earthquake of 2015 and a Catalyst for Consolidating Nepal's Social Protection Floor*. UNICEF Nepal Working Paper Series (Kathmandu)

Recover Canterbury. 2014. *A City Rebuilds: The Recover Canterbury Story*. Recover Canterbury (Christchurch)

Recover Canterbury. 2012. *Christchurch Innovations: Recover Canterbury, Case Study*. Christchurch, New Zealand

Rusch, J. V. 2013. *The impact of natural disasters on Poverty in Indonesia* (Honolulu, Department of Economics University of Hawaii at Manoa).

Rusch, J. V. 2013. *The impact of natural disasters on poverty in Indonesia* (Honolulu, Department of Economics University of Hawaii at Manoa).

Sanghi, A. et al. 2011. *Natural hazards, unnatural disasters: The economics of effective prevention* (Washington, DC, The World Bank Group).

Satriana, S. and V. Schmitt. 2012. *Social protection assessment based national dialogue: Towards a nationally defined social protection floor in Indonesia* (Jakarta, International Labour Organization).

Smith, G. 2016. *What do we know about how social protection systems can respond to needs during a crisis?* OECD Insights. Available at <https://oecdinsights.org/2016/05/24/what-do-we-know-about-how-social-protection-systems-can-respond-to-needs-during-a-crisis/> [1 Nov.2016].

Sumodiningrat, G. 1995. *Program Inpres Desa Tertinggal: Kebijakan dan arah baru penanggulangan kemiskinan*. Disampaikan pada penataran warga KBG-B unit Kantor Menteri Negara PPN/Bappenas (Jakarta)

Stokkel, I.M.M. 2015. *Social protection for disaster risk management: Opportunities for Myanmar*, Myanmar Social Protection Notes Series; note 6 (Washington, DC, The World Bank Group).

Thailand Development Research Institute (TDRI). 2012. *A review of unemployment insurance in Thailand after 9 Years of implementation* (Bangkok).

Tim Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan [The National team for the Acceleration of Poverty Reduction] (TNP2K). 2015a. *Indonesia's single registry for social protection programmes* (Jakarta).

—. 2015b. *TNP2K frequently asked questions (FAQs): Family hope programme (PKH)*. Available at: <http://www.tnp2k.go.id/id/tanya-jawab/klaster-i/program-keluarga-harapan-pkh/> [13 Sept. 2016].

—. 2015c. *Integrating community driven development principles into policy: From PNPM Mandiri to the village law* (Jakarta).

Toan, N.N. 2014. *Vietnam: The actual situation and reform orientation up to 2020* (Hanoi, Ministry of Labour, Invalids and Social Affairs (MOLISA)).

United Nations (UN). 2015. *Restoring humanity global voices calling for action: Synthesis of the consultation process for the World Humanitarian Summit*. Available at: <http://synthesisreport.worldhumanitariansummit.org> [22 Jul. 2016].

UNDP. 2014. *Disaster risk reduction makes development sustainable*, UNDP factsheet. Available at: http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/crisis%20prevention/UNDP_CPR_CTA_20140901.pdf [30 Jul. 2016].

UNICEF. 2016. *The road to recovery: Cash transfers as an emergency response and a catalyst to enhance the social protection system in Nepal* (Kathmandu, UNICEF Project Briefing 2016).

—. 2015. *Nepal Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey 2014, final report* (Kathmandu)

—. 2014. *Protecting children from poverty, disaster and climate risk: Linking social protection with disaster risk management (DRM) & climate change adaptation (CCA)*, PPT presentation at a symposium on linkages between social protection and disaster risk (Bangkok).

— and European Union (EU). 2014c. *Lesotho child grant programme, impact evaluation* (Oxford, OPM).

United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (UNISDR). 2015a. *Sendai framework action under way*, news archive. Available at: <https://www.unisdr.org/archive/45452> [23 Oct. 2016].

—. 2015b. *Concept Note: Development of the Sendai frameworks “words into action” implementation guideline for social protection for disaster risk reduction* (Geneva).

—. 2015c. *Making development sustainable: The future of disaster risk management. Global assessment report on disaster risk reduction* (Geneva).

—. 2010. *Synthesis report on ten ASEAN countries disaster risks assessment: ASEAN disaster risk management initiative*. Available at http://www.unisdr.org/files/18872_asean.pdf [27 Jul. 2016].

—. 2009a. *UNISDR terminology on disaster risk reduction* (Geneva).

—. 2009b. *Risk and poverty in changing climate: Invest today for a safer tomorrow*. Global assessment report on disaster risk reduction (Geneva).

—. 2008. *Linking Disaster Risk Reduction and Poverty Reduction: Good Practices and Lessons Learned* (Geneva).

United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). 2016. *Cluster Coordination*. Available at <http://www.unocha.org/what-we-do/coordination-tools/cluster-coordination> [3 Oct. 2016].

Villaruel, A. M. 2015a. *The experience of public works programs in Myanmar: Lessons from a*

social protection and poverty reduction perspective, Myanmar Social Protection Notes Series; note 4 (Washington, DC, The World Bank Group).

— 2015b. *The experience of cash transfers in Myanmar: Lessons from a social protection and poverty reduction perspective*, Myanmar Social Protection Notes Series; note 5 (Washington, DC, The World Bank Group).

World Bank. 2015a. *Building resilience, equity and opportunity in Myanmar: The role of social protection – Overview* (Washington, DC). Available at: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/22318>.

— 2015b. *Strengthening social protection systems to manage disaster and climate risk in Asia and Pacific* (Washington, D.C).

—, 2015c. *15 years of Indonesia’s national community-driven development programs; The kecamatan development program (KDP) and the national program for community empowerment (PNPM)* (Jakarta, The World Bank – PNPM Support Facility).

— 2013a. *Building resilience to disaster and climate change through social protection: Synthesis note* (Washington, DC).

— 2013b. *Mexico’s temporary employment program (PET): Case study* (Washington, DC).

— 2012. *Thai flood 2011 overview: Rapid assessment for resilient recovery and reconstruction planning* (Bangkok)

— 2011. *Project paper for additional financing from the PNPM support facility trust funds for third national programme for community empowerment in rural areas – Disaster management support project, third national programme for community empowerment in urban areas – Disaster management support project, and community based resettlement rehabilitation and reconstruction project* (Jakarta).

Annex 1

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SEMINAR ON THE POTENTIAL OF SOCIAL PROTECTION TO BUILD RESILIENCE TO DISASTERS

**22-24 NOVEMBER 2016
MANILA, PHILIPPINES**

The seminar on the potential of social protection to build resilience to disasters was held on 22-24 November 2016, Manila, the Philippines. The representatives of the Senior Officials Meeting on Labour (SLOM), Senior Officials Meeting on Social Welfare and Development (SOMSWD), the ASEAN Committee on Disasters Management (ACDM), and employers' and workers' organizations of Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao PDR, Malaysia, Myanmar, the Philippines, Thailand and Viet Nam, together with representatives of the ASEAN Secretariat, ASEAN Confederation of Employers (ACE), ASEAN Trade Unions Council (ATUC), United Nations agencies, namely the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Funds for Children (UNICEF), the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) participated in the Seminar.

Recalling the collective commitment of the ASEAN Member States to implement the ASEAN Community Vision 2025 and the Blueprints, the Regional Framework and Action Plan on implementing the ASEAN Declaration on Strengthening Social Protection (2013) and the ASEAN Agreement on Disaster Management and Emergency Response (2005), and the Declaration on Institutionalising the Resilience of ASEAN and its Communities and its Peoples to Disasters and Climate Change (2015), and the Declaration of "One ASEAN, One Response" (2016),

Recalling the commitment of the ASEAN Member States to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals by 2030, and to implement the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (2015),

Guided by the principles of the Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction (2015), and the ILO Recommendation on Social Protection Floors, 2012 (No.202),

We, participants, agree on the following recommendations to continue promoting linkages between social protection and disasters:

Improve understanding of social protection opportunities for managing disaster risks.

1. Improve knowledge, and conduct vulnerability and needs assessments, with a special attention to vulnerable groups - including, but not limited to, people living in hazard areas, indigenous people, persons with disabilities, women, children, older persons, workers in informal economy, small and medium enterprises, and family corporate – in order to define social protection measures that can contribute to build resilience of the population and business to disasters.
2. Assess, at national level, gaps and opportunities to expand existing social protection systems for improved disaster risk management, in particular in terms of coverage,

mechanisms for rapid scale-up, and financial and institutional capacity; and compile these national assessments into an ASEAN review.

3. Build knowledge, document and share good practices, organize exchange of know-how, and strengthen stakeholders' capacity for improving linkages between social protection and disaster risk management.

Strengthen institutional capacities and governance for better managing disaster risks through social protection.

At country level:

4. Recognizing that governments have the leading role in disaster management and social protection, ensure engagement and build partnerships with workers and employers' organizations in these areas.
5. Establish a special unit and appoint a focal point organization within workers and employers' representatives to coordinate with the government on disaster risk reduction and management.
6. Mainstream social protection in the national and sub-national disaster risk management plans, including preparedness plans.
7. Establish national guidelines, including setting up standards operating procedures, for scaling up social protection systems for an effective and timely disasters response.
8. Learn from countries that are using integrated or unified social protection registries, and implement information systems that will integrate vulnerabilities and disaster risks mapping.

At ASEAN level:

9. Encourage the engagement of multi-stakeholders, including workers and employers' representatives, in ASEAN initiatives on social protection and disaster risk management.
10. Develop ASEAN guidelines for integrating social protection and disaster risks management.

Invest in social protection to build resilience.

At country level:

11. Strengthen social protection systems by extending coverage to all, improving level of benefits, and ensuring financial sustainability, as a mean to improve resilience of the population and business to disaster risks.
12. Explore financing mechanisms for extending social protection for all, including government's subsidies to support informal workers' contributions to social insurance schemes, to prevail resilience against disaster shocks.
13. Ensure that vulnerable groups have access to existing social protection schemes, including employability programmes, to build their resilience to disasters.
14. Develop and enhance mechanisms, including legal provisions and funding methods,

to swiftly scale up existing social protection schemes in time of disasters.

At ASEAN level:

15. Assess the feasibility of establishing a regional risk pooling system across the ASEAN Member States for disaster response, including through scaling up social protection schemes.

Seize opportunities to “build-back-better-safer- smarter” through the enhancement of social protection systems.

At country level:

16. As part of the emergency response and recovery planning, capitalize on opportunities and create institutional linkages to build and strengthen longer term social protection systems as well as to provide immediate support.
17. Encourage the government and donors’ community, and explore innovative financing, to better use emergency and recovery funds for building sustainable social protection systems, where appropriate, and thus support the longer term recovery and improve resilience.

Manila, 24 November 2016
