

GUIDELINES FOR WRITING THE CASE STUDY

This is the general structure for the case studies; the resource person should put emphasis on point no. 4. The parts in red are to be retained in the format of the final paper. Please maintain the font and ensure that it does not exceed ten pages

Programme/policy ID card

The Programme or policy ID card provides a snapshot of the programme, policy or service for quick reference.

- **Programme name:** Chile Solidario - Puente
- **Date of inception:** 2002
- **Legal framework:** Law 19.949 (2004) which created the Social Protection System Chile Solidario; Regulation Reglamento of the Law 19.949. Supreme Decree 235 (2004), which aims to execute the Law 19.949; Law N° 20.379 (2009), which created the Intersectoral Social Protection System Chile Solidario (and Chile Crece Contigo (Chile Grows With You)
- **National social protection strategy or development plan:** The Social Protection System Chile Solidario is part of Chile's social protection system based on rights that protected citizens along the life cycle. It was boosted by 2006, under the leadership of Michelle Bachelet.
- In 2008, a new system was launched, namely the Red Protege, integrating education, health, housing and social security programs, which, covered Chile Solidario and put online information about people's rights, subsidies and social programmes. Social Protection System is enhanced by the enactment in 2009 of Law No. 20,379 which creates the Intersectoral Promotion and Protection Social System and articulated Chile Solidario with all the programs that are the central axes of social protection for the poorest and most vulnerable groups. The institution in charge for Management and Coordination is the Ministry of Social Development.
- **Objectives:** (reviser objetivos) Bring integral psycho-social service to families in a situation of extreme poverty in the country, in order for them to improve their situation through the achievement of 79 minimum conditions of quality of life. The Families sign a contract in which they undertake to carry out the agreements made to perform these minimum conditions.
- **Target population:** Extremely poor Families (268.000) and other vulnerable people (elderly living alone, homeless, and children of prisoners)
- **Institutions involved:** Ministry of Social Development, Solidarity and Social Investment Fund-FOSIS. The execution agency of the program is the municipality and NGOs.
- **Status of program:** implementation
- **Services provided:** Chile Solidario provides Psychosocial Support, preferential access to social services and monetary transfers. Services are provided in the following dimensions: identification, health, education, family dynamics, housing, work and income, regarding the compliance of the clauses of the contract. The clauses refer to the 79 minimum quality of life conditions.
- **Lessons to be learned:** To establish a management model for a progressive social protection system, based on rights, focused on families and people in extreme poverty in order to promote their inclusion in social networks and access to better living conditions, as a strategy to overcome indigence. The personalized psychosocial support and a Family Protection Cash Transfer with Guaranteed monetary subsidies and preferential access to social promotion programs are essential. Also a strong management model (support local networks, budget and information system). (revisar)

1. Background

➤ **Country context:** According to the IMF, Chile had in 2012 a GDP per capita of U.S. \$ 18,419 measured in purchasing power parity (PPP). This was due largely to economic stability and growth accumulated, which from January 2010 to December 2012 was 5.9% per year. Also in the first half of 2012, Chile showed the seventh lowest unemployment rate in the region, ranking with 6.6%. Social policies have improved over decades, which makes the country possess an HDI Human Development Index of 0.805 (Very High) in 2011, as it has good social indicators such as life expectancy (79, 1 years) and infant mortality rate (7.0 / 1,000). Poverty rate is 14.4% (CASEN 2011), of which 2.8%, refers to people living in a situation of extreme poverty.

➤ **Justification and process of development:**

The national context that promotes the emergence of CS is the evidence that in the early 2000 of the existence of a core of extreme poverty refractory to be hit for social policies and economic growth. In those years poverty rate was reduced from 38, 6% on 1990, to 20, 2% on 2000, but the extreme poverty rate had slowed the decreasing rate, going from 5, 8% in 1996, to 5,6% in 2000. The analysis drawn in 2000, shows problems in intra-poverty targeting process. The main reasons being: a “waiting model” for services and benefits delivery; information availability was not working for these families; weak community linkages, isolation, very low self esteem and self efficacy, particularly among women; social interventions focused on individuals, not on families; and very low communication between social programs; benefits had been allocated to the poor families but not to families living in a situation of extreme poverty and exclusion. A lot of different programs not coordinated at family level generated duplications and inefficiencies. So the social program needed would aimed to: a better use of the existing resources; strengthen local public institutions – municipalities are the leading providers of social services; improve the performance of social services; and with social intervention strategies focused on families more than administrative strategies to maintain programs over time.

CS was designed in 2002 to benefit 225.000 families on extreme poverty situation, (5.6% of the national population), for which the policies implemented at that time had had little effect (Palma & Urzúa, 2005). To address these households in 2002 was launched the “Puente” (Bridge) program, which starts as a pilot before becoming a broader strategy of intervention to families in situation of poverty. Thus, in 2004 CS was institutionalized by Law N° 19.949. This law not only enacts a program, but it lays the foundation for a more comprehensive system of social protection, including an integrated system of social information and the coordination of public offering for the poor and vulnerable.

CS provides intensive support to the poorest households in Chile across three main components which are Psychosocial Support, Preferential Access to Social Services and Cash Transfers, recognizing seven dimensions of poverty: identification, family dynamics, education, health, housing, employment and income. Unlike conditional cash transfer programs in the region, which are mainly focused on schooling, health and nutrition, CS acknowledges the multidimensional nature of poverty to a much greater extent. It also address social exclusion and extend what can be termed ‘social guarantees’, that is, basic levels of service provision guaranteed by public agencies to all citizens. In this way CS add important qualitative new dimensions to social policy reform, and suggests that a more progressive, dynamic approach to poverty relief is possible

From the beginning CS is conceived as a way to guarantee rights, which is expressed on its foundational phrase "Chile Solidario: a bridge between the family and their rights". Families will access through the Bridge program to the public offering, which can make effective and enforceable rights, having preferential access to existing supply of social services. This includes participation in employment and training programs offered in municipalities where families reside. The concept of preferential access is crucial in the logic of the program, as

the target population is made 'visible' to the local municipalities and other social services providers.

CS started with extremely poor families (Programa Puente- Bridge Program) and extended the coverage to other vulnerable groups: Programa Vínculos (Links Program) to elderly people who live alone, Programa Calle (Street Program) to homeless people and Programa Abriendo Caminos (Opening Pathways Program) to families with a child with a parent in prison. In all these programs the access to their beneficiaries to basic social network was guaranteed, also establishing a monetary incentive or bonus and the signing of a commitment to the beneficiaries to carry out certain actions related to the different dimensions considered in the program.

Bridge had the highest coverage among all programs of Chile Solidario, focusing on extremely poor families (mainly female-headed single-parent households) to overcome poverty. Its main objectives are: a) to provide psychosocial support to families to promote the development of their own abilities, b) bringing families to the services and benefits available locally c) create minimum conditions to ensure that vulnerable families have opportunities to improve their standard of living (Mideplan, 2009).

- **Linkage with policies and national development plan:** CS was part of the intersectoral social protection system called “Red Protégé”, with the child protection system (Chile Crece Contigo) and the labor social protection system.

The program explicitly targets the extreme poor people through a national poverty survey called “Ficha CAS”, which was used between 2002 and 2006 to focus different social programs and state services. The survey was updated in 2007 to the Ficha de Protección Social (FPS), a more sophisticated targeting instrument that aims at measuring income-generating capacity and vulnerability to shocks. The objective of alleviating extreme poverty is achieved through a two-pronged strategy, working on both the demand and the supply side of public services. The CS System combining the following elements into one single intervention:

- The progressive creation of an integral social protection system for Chilean families living in conditions of extreme poverty.
- Personalized attention to families in extreme poverty so as to integrate them effectively into the network of services and programs targeted towards them.

CS is a management model, headed by Mideplan (Ministry of Planning, now Ministry of Social Development) based on the articulation of institutional and local networks, to provide social protection to extreme poor families. **CS** becomes a coordination mechanism to organize service delivery to support extreme poor families to overcome their social and economic condition.

It is centralized at the Ministry of Planning (now Ministry of Social Development), with decentralized management executed by FOSIS (Solidarity Investment Fund, a independent service from the Ministry of Planning) through agreements with municipalities, those who should create networks of local intervention. This model incorporates the figure of the Family Supporter, a social worker in charge of the psychosocial support to the family, who is responsible for linking families to the public offering to which they were entitled, and also to bring to the local network new demands unmet public offering. There was an initial decision to design a program and an intervention methodology to overcome institutional fragmentation, under the banner of intersectoral and complementarily of policies. This characteristic quality is what puts CS as a program that is committed to a rights approach, consideration of the multidimensionality of poverty and the inclusion of CCTs in broader systems of social protection (Draibe, 2009. Cohen & Franco, 2006).

CS promotes the coordination of social services from different ministries in each municipality in order to address the most urgent needs in each locality. This component was implemented effectively from 2004 onwards, after CS was certificated by law as one of the key instrument of the social protection strategy towards the poor, and it comprised two

main features. First, families participating in CS were guaranteed access to all benefits and services to which they were eligible, independently of the local vacancies available for the program (Amior *et al.*, 2011).

Description of the programme or policy

- **Target population:** CS targets on extremely poor and vulnerable people (5% population), by a national index of vulnerability. Families below a threshold could be invited to participate in the program, unless they were already participating on it, or had participated before.
- **Services and transfers:** CS corresponds to a set of actions and social benefits implemented and coordinated by various state agencies, focused on a group of people or families in socio-economic vulnerability. These services and benefits are articulated through three components which are Psychosocial Support, Preferential Access to Social Services and Cash Transfers.
 - **Psychosocial Support:** Participation in CS provides personalized support process to each participating family for a period of two years, during which you work on achieving a set of 79 minimum conditions of empowerment and social inclusion. It is important to note that the conditions are linked to the signing of a contract between the family (the woman) and family support. The State (represented by the family support) commits in providing the means to achieve conditionalities. In practice, the conditions in the contract are not verifiable.
 - **Preferential Access to Social Services:** System Participating families have to offer preferential access to comply with the 79 minimum conditions that ensure social protection floor, along multiple dimensions of welfare (identification, family dynamics, education, health, housing, employment, income).
 - **Cash Transfers:** All participating families have access to cash transfers while participating in the program are maintained (bond of protection) and for three years following their exit (exit bonus). The transfer is uniform across families, and is intended to compensate them for costs incurred in the application for benefits and social services.
- **Institutional set-up:** The Ministry of Social Development is the institution in charge for managing and coordinating the implementation of the services provided to the CS population. The institution related to this implementation was:
 - **Social Department of Promotion and Protection of Social Development Ministry.** In this Division, CS execution is in charge of the Unit of Psychosocial Support Programs, where they run the 4 programs that form the Social Protection System Chile Solidarity. Puente (Bridge) Program, that works with extreme poor families; Abriendo Caminos (Opening Pathways) that work with families that have children of prisoners; Calle (Street) that work whit homeless people; and Vínculos (Links) that work with older adults living alone.
 - **Solidarity Social Investment Fund (FOSIS):** A Service of the Ministry of Social Development, which is functionally decentralized, with legal personality and its own. The purpose of FOSIS is to finance, complete or on part, plans, programs, projects and special social activities, which shall coordinate with other programs conducted by the state. FOSIS must ensure the proper execution of the Bridge Program in the country, either through the subscription of resource transfer contracts or collaboration contracts with municipalities or in exceptional cases with other organs of state. Also, FOSIS should develop and implement a national technical assistance and monitor the proper implementation of psychosocial support component of the program. At national level, FOSIS has a professional team that establishes the technical norms of the Program, directs, supervises, and evaluates its

execution and results. At regional level, FOSIS has a team of people which does the supervision and technical support in the communities under that jurisdiction.

- **Municipalities:** Municipalities are those running the program in the territory, through Family Intervention Units in the municipality. These units are created specifically to implement the Bridge Program (Chile Solidarity Program to extreme poor families) according to local context. This unit is composed of professionals called “Family Supporter”, which are responsible for performing direct work with families, making the linkages to other services and programs. To run the Family Intervention Unit, the municipalities must provide with one of their own professionals, who must assure the implementation of the contract with FOSIS, which, define the functions of these professionals and includes the technical guidance of the program. In addition, there is an Intervention Local Network in each community, convened by the municipality and composed of the representatives of all the institutions and organizations which provide services and benefits to the families or people under extreme poverty
- **Decentralisation and harmonisation of service delivery:** CS organization reflects a management model centered on facilitating the functioning of local networks (Frenz, 2007). The implementation of CS, is in charge of the FOSIS regional team, which is the regional representation, has the responsibility to monitor the work of municipalities and give technical assistance for the implementation of the program conform to local realities. The management model developed by CS considers multiple dimensions. Though each element is accompanied by specific mechanisms, instruments and/or tools, the model is essentially flexible and draws on regional and municipal operational expertise, with the support and supervision of the Division of Social Promotion and Protection of the Ministry of Social Development, which monitors performance. Nevertheless regional and local variation is important; capacities, practices and results vary, although the identification and sharing of good practice is also built into the system (SUR 2007). Network Management consists of articulating and coordinating institutional horizontal linkages (State institutions) to guarantee the coverage, quality and pertinence of benefits and services. This element privileges the local community, since the municipalities are the public entities that respond to the multiple needs of citizens of scarce resources, and therefore are the mainstay of all social sector and integrated programs. The web of public services with institutional support from the national, regional and provincial political authorities, works in a connected and integrated manner in tune with community demand and requirements, so that the public social supply can be converted into opportunities and capacities (SUR 2007).
- **Operations and processes to avail benefits:** Families in the program receive frequent visits by “Family Supporters”. In the first few visits, this professionals and the representative of the family jointly identify the main sources of vulnerability and risk to the family, identifying with the family which of the 79 minimum conditions they have to accomplish to improve their life quality, and flagged in the system as "pending work". When the minimum conditions, needed to be improved, are identified, families and their “Family Supporters” make commitments to take actions necessary to accomplish these minimum conditions, designing a coordinated strategy to address them to which they both commit, the beneficiary representing the family, usually a woman, and the family support representing the state (this agreement is even formalized in a contract). Families with minimum conditions identified as “pending work”, are identified in databases and sent to other social services providers, so they can support for the needs in these specific subject. When minimum conditions where accomplished, as known in family visits, the “Family Supporter” identify them as “accomplished”.

All these process are monitored by both FOSIS and Minister of Social Development, to ensure the results of the intervention.

➤ **Management information systems: Database of beneficiaries, services and programmes:**

The targeting mechanism adopted has been adequate with respect to the transparent and objective selection of beneficiaries, which is a national instrument validated for many years. This has avoided the inclusion of families outside the defined circuit. The registration system is regarded as an excellent management tool which main difficulty has been, in some cases, the lack of access of the Family Support Groups to the Internet. For this, an agreement has been made with institutions that could offer this service free of charge. The system aims to coordinate multiple services/transfers for the vulnerable population intended to address their multiple needs and risks. This system includes various public agencies across different sectors who deliver services or transfers, many of which need to be coordinated and delivered in a timely fashion. A crucial instrument for the management and operation of this strategy for social protection is the Integrated Social Information System (SIIS). This is a computerized, technological platform which functions at both the national and the municipal level. It is primarily a management tool for the system. The SIIS records stores and processes the information necessary to assign and organize the social services provided by the State. It includes modules for the targeting instrument, as well as the database for several key programs including CS. The SIIS has interoperability functionality (through Web services) and can be used to validate social information and to apply for benefits, among other features. For example, most recently, it has played a key role in the implementation of the pension reform.

Also the SIIS is used in the creation and re-orientation of programs for needs of CS beneficiaries. This data source contained a set of qualitative indicators on the local supply side (Instrumento de monitoreo al funcionamiento de la red local de intervención, REDES) collected at municipality level with the goal of obtaining indicators of different dimensions of the way the local services were organized within the logic of local 'system' of social protection. The set of information collected was organized along three main themes: (a) indicators to measure the degree of involvement of the local institutions (municipality and suppliers of local services) to the local network (e.g., whether they understand and share the need to work in network, whether the institutions adapt the supply size to the needs of the families); (b) indicators to measure the degree of knowledge and dissemination of the program; and (c) indicators to assess the degree of institutionalization of the network.

➤ **Identity cards:** CS does not deliver a card. CS beneficiaries are registered at the municipal level on the online database system. CS beneficiaries automatically get subsidies and transfers (monetary and in-kind) and preferential access to all social programs locally and nationally level. Individuals are eligible for CS if their score on an national index of vulnerability is below a threshold.

➤ **Monitoring and Evaluation:** There is an online monitoring mechanism, which is a web based computational system on which the family support groups register their information and results of each of the working sessions with the families and the subscribed contracts, including content as well as compliance. For this, standardized registration forms are used across the country. On the other hand, the regional FOSIS teams provide supervision, advice and technical support to the municipalities; perform periodic inspections in the field for the Family Intervention Units; and select random sample of families to visit to supervise the work done with them. In addition, the family participation is considered to evaluate the Program, through the execution of evaluative exercises called "Juntos Ganamos". A monitoring and progress report of the Program is performed on a monthly basis. With respect to evaluation, external evaluations are performed on specific areas and on general aspects of the program.

Monitoring via the internet: System for registration, monitoring, and evaluation via the internet; Registers each family, with standardized cards. The Family Support individuals update the registration; The Family Protection Transfer is assigned via this system; The Family Support individual, on behalf of the Program, signs a confidentiality agreement with the family in the participation contract; Provides statistics and official information of the Program, and at the same time serves as the data base for the processes of evaluation.

- **Financial and legal sustainability:** Founded on 2002. Law 19.949 (2004) which creating the Social Protection System Chile Solidarity. In terms of budget, CS has grown strongly, growing from around US\$ 5 million in 2002 to more than US\$ 140 million in 2007, using total resources equivalent to around 0.1% of that year's GDP.
 - **Communication and awareness generation:** The efforts for increase awareness of the program on target groups is focused on one of the components of this strategy, which consists in matching the already available social programs to those households who need them the most. The family support have a dual role of helping households restore their basic socio-emotional capital, and helping them get connected to a local network of social services. This can be done, for example, by alerting them to the existence of these programs, providing information on how to access them, helping with the application procedures, giving them priority when there are waiting lists, or just motivating them to take-up these programs. Because of its integral approach to extreme poverty focusing on both the demand of services (through the psychosocial support) and the supply of services (requiring the involvement and coordination of multiple government agencies), and its direct focus on the social inclusion of very vulnerable families. Community participation is expressed by the inclusion of community representatives in the Intervention Local Networks in each community, but it has proven to be insufficient until now. (Amior *et al* 2011) shows that CS increases the awareness of CS beneficiaries about some subsidies as SUF, and CS reduce transaction costs of information.
- 2. Financial and social inclusion of beneficiaries:** On employment, several programs were created especially for CS beneficiaries, nationwide or nationwide or many existent programs reoriented their targeting criteria. Among the set of the several employment programs offered in Chile by different agencies we can trace the following general trend. The main provider of employment programs to facilitate the employment of unemployed in a job dependent, SENCE (Servicio Nacional de Capacitación y Empleo - National Service Training and Employment), not only created vacancies for individuals in Chile Solidario, but also created special incentives to employ CS youth aged 18-24, which included bonuses to the company's hiring of workers with 50% (instead of the regular 40%) of the minimum monthly wage for a minimum period of 5 months and a maximum of 12 months (maximum is 4, in regular component), and in addition, job training delivery up to CLP60,000 per beneficiary (more CLP10,000 than in regular component). Another provider of several employment programs is FOSIS (Fondo de Solidaridad e Inversión Social - Solidarity and Social Investment Fund) who promotes PAME (Programa Apoyo al Microemprendimiento - Microenterprise Assistance Program), a program of investment in human capital launched in 2006 that promotes self-employment and where women are 84% of participants.
- **Impact of the programme, policy or service and linkages with the guiding principles of R202**
 - **Impact on final beneficiaries and their dignity, graduation out of poverty and social inclusion:** Over time, the effective coverage of the Bridge Program exceeded its own target, increasing from 126,271 households in 2005 to 332 995 in 2008, equivalent to 6.8% of the national population and 51.7% of the poor (Robles, 2011). Hoces, Hojman & Larrañaga

(2011) shows that the initial results using the Chile Solidario Panel suggest that the program had positive effects on psychosocial welfare and on take-up of subsidies and social programs. However, it is not possible to obtain reliable results due to data shortcomings, particularly the lack of baseline data. Also Martorano & Sanfilippo (2012) shows at the household level CS has a significant impact on lifting families out of extreme poverty and that it does not have disincentive effects on labour market participation. For children, CS has contributed to increasing participation in school for those between the ages of 6 and 15, and to increased enrolment with the public health services. Galasso (2011) shows the impact evaluation on CS in many dimensions. Employment: Participation rates increase by around 30 percentage points in urban areas, and about 14 percentage points in rural areas for self-employment programs. The same pattern is observed for public employment program (increased by about 6% points in urban areas, and 4% points in rural areas), while the effect on take-up training programs is significant only in urban areas. There is also a very strong effect in increasing the likelihood of household members to be enrolled in the local employment office (OMIL), one of the minimum conditions previewed by the CS program for unemployed members. Being enrolled in such offices not only should facilitate the process of looking for a job, but also represents a pre-condition for eligibility to various public training programs. Qualitative work suggests that improvements in employment (especially those related to having a stable source of income in the household) and housing are among the most important aspirations of participating families and those conditions that are perceived as structural factors preventing households to escape extreme poverty. In this light, they are also perceived as the most difficult minimal conditions to meet. Education effects: Galasso (2011) says increases in the likelihood of having all children aged 4-5 year olds enrolled in a pre-school. The effects for pre-school enrolment are in the range of 4-6 percentage points, consistently found in both urban and rural areas, as well as across different methods. School enrolment of children from 6 to 15 has mildly improved (with estimates ranging between 7-9%), although the results are not robust across all matching specifications. Household in urban areas are also more likely to have taken-up complementary programs of school materials, meals, and dental care directed to subsidize direct costs of schooling for households with lower socioeconomic conditions. There are no fees for public schools in Chile, so most of costs of enrolment are indirect (opportunity cost of the child's time). There are no significant differences in terms of literacy of children aged 12-18. The results show a statistically significant take-up of adult literacy and education completion programs of around 4% in urban areas and 5 percentage points in rural areas. Health effects: participating households are more likely to be enrolled in the public health system (SAPS) (2-3% in urban areas, 3% in rural areas). Perceptions towards the future: Households in Chile Solidario are more likely to be aware of social services in the community (10 percentage points in rural areas and 13-16 percentage points in urban areas, corresponding to an increase of the order of 20-30% relative to the non-participants). This result is in line with the main objectives of bridging the demand gap. Households in urban areas are also reporting to be more likely to proactively look for help from local institutions (7 percentage points). Finally, households seem to be more optimistic about their future socioeconomic status (7-8 percentage points in rural areas and 10-11 percentage points in urban areas, corresponding to an increase of about 15-20% relative to non-participation).

- **Impact on the transparency, accountability and traceability of the implementation of the Social Protection Floor:** A fundamental assumption of the design is that the institutions of the public network (the ones in charge of the programmatic service supply for the compliance of the minimum conditions of the families) are available to offer services in pro of the benefited families. Even though, great progress has been achieved in this regard, the difficulty has been that the individual goals of the institutions have prevailed over the common ones.

- **Impact on the efficiencies of the social protection system as a whole and its financial sustainability:** Some of the most important impacts on the social protection system were: 1) changes in the approach and practice of social intervention against poverty, specially at local level (where services are provided); 2) Availability of local human resources that drive a new practice of social intervention – sustainability; 3) Increasing and improving a joint work of local institutions – effective networking; 4) More resources for communities as a result of the territorial concentration of a diverse program supply; 5) Changes in the criteria for resource allocation of supply side (complementary by results based interventions); 6) More relevant existing social programs and new public supply when is needed (programs adaptations to family profiles).

About the financial structure, it's important to note that CS is a management model and the resources for this program are along the lowest on Latin America (0, 01% PGB). CS is a very good example for countries that can't, for many and different reasons, to make a major fiscal spending. CS But there are weaknesses about this design: fresh resources in the national budget are available for the execution of the Program Bridge (Puente), but no additional budget is available for the programmatic supply which supports the compliance of the minimum conditions. There is a consideration to improve the current programmatic supply, but in some cases, it is clearly insufficient.

- **Impact on the coherence of the social protection system:** CS is designed as a social protection system to the universal access to services and benefits of all people of the country. In addition, CS connect people with their social rights on the whole social protection system
- **Impact on representation and democratic governance, empowerment of populations and local administration, communities:** CS empowers municipalities to promote local networking and installation services in the municipalities of a special unit in charge of the intervention families and beneficiaries of different programs CS

- **Lessons to be learned:**

Lessons: CS is an innovative conditional cash transfer (CCT) in the Latin American context, introducing innovative features aimed at addressing specifically the multidimensional nature of poverty. Also CS was designed as a management model, working with networks at national and local level. The mechanisms to facilitate joint action include (Frenz, 2007):

- Integrated intersectoral action is backed by law and not just the political will of a given administration.
- The rights-based approach and the psychosocial support model contribute to building social capital and civic participation.
- A management model with multiple pillars supports IA around common goals and shared objectives.
- Strong tools and mechanisms support the management model: information system, results-based budgeting.
- IA efforts are concentrated on supporting Local Intervention Networks and ensuring the sufficient and opportune supply of benefits for effective action at this level.
- The use of evidence, evaluation, and knowledge sharing to identify problems and to adjust the system to secure results

Family support with psychosocial intervention is a key to improve positive effects on psychosocial welfare and on take-up of subsidies and social programs. This program is innovative in explicitly recognizing that a focus on access to resources is not necessarily an effective way of alleviating extreme poverty in the medium run, because extreme poor families lack fundamental organizational skills. Families sign a contract for compliance with the conditions according to their needs and abilities. Indeed, a particular feature of the

program is that benefits do not depend on specific behavior, but rather on recognized efforts to respect the contract they sign with the social worker (Galasso, 2006). An innovative feature of the program consists of developing the supply side in order to provide programs more specifically tailored to meet the needs of the poor. This change from single and independent policies to a comprehensive and interdependent system of social protection is, in fact, one of the long-term goals of the program (Galasso, 2006).

Main challenges: Difference between coordinating programs and working in a network with the beneficiaries themselves (complementarily); Different working styles and rhythms between the different levels of government; Adjusting the programmatic supply to the characteristics and necessities of the families that participated in Chile Solidario; Lack of programmatic supply for some of the minimum conditions (housing and employment); Lack of baseline data for impact evaluations.

Key factors that have facilitated CS results: Political will; Clear results for institutions and families; Registration and monitoring systems; Clarity in access mechanisms; Local execution with the support of an institution with experience and national presence; Allocation of Family Protection Transfer via the internet; The total cost per family to access the Chile Solidario System (via the Puente Program) is US\$ 330, of which US\$ 275 correspond to the Protection Transfer.

Resources and bibliography:

- Amior, M., Carneiro, P., Galasso E. Ginja, R “Can Social Benefits Reach the Poorest Families?” paper presented on Latin American and Caribbean Economic Association (LACEA)&Latin American Meeting of the Econometric Society (LAMES), 10-12 November 2011, Santiago, [www.econ.yale.edu/conference/.../paper_093.pdf]
- Cohen, E. e R. Franco, coord. (2006). *Transferencias con corresponsabilidad. Una mirada latinoamericana*. México D. F.: FLACSO-México.
- Draibe, S (2009) “Programas de Transferencia Condicionadas” en Cardoso FH & Foxley A. (eds) *A medio camino. Nuevos desafíos de la democracia y el desarrollo en América Latina*. Uqbar. Santiago de Chile. pp 445-487
- Frenz P. (2007) Innovative Practices for Intersectoral Action on Health: A case study of four programs for social equity WHO Commission on Social Determinants of Health.
- Galasso, E (2011) Alleviating extreme poverty in Chile. *Estudios de Economía*. Vol. 38 - Nº 1, Junio Págs. 101-127
- Galasso, E. (2006), “With their effort and one opportunity: Alleviating extreme poverty in Chile”, Development Research Group, World Bank, USA
- Hoces de la Guardia, A. Hojman, and O. Larrañaga (2011) Evaluating the Chile Solidario program: results using the Chile Solidario panel and the administrative databases. *Estudios de Economía*. Vol. 38 - Nº F. 1, Págs. 129-168
- Martorano B and Sanfilippo M (2012) Innovative features in conditional Cash transfers: an impact evaluation of Chile Solidario on households and children. Innocenti Working Paper February, Unicef.
- MIDEPLAN (2009) “Fundamentos para la operación de un Sistema Intersectorial de Protección Social”, Santiago de Chile: Mideplan, junio. Disponible en: www.mideplan.cl visitado el 3/5/2010.
- MIDEPLAN (2004) Conceptos fundamentales Sistema de Protección Social. Chile Solidario. Documento. www.mideplan.cl
- Robles, Claudia (2011) “El sistema de protección social de Chile: una mirada desde la igualdad”, Documento de Proyecto (LC/W.428), Santiago de Chile, Comisión Económica para América Latina y el Caribe (CEPAL)
- Ruz M.A and Palma J. (2005) Análisis del Proceso de Elaboración e Implementación del Sistema Chile Solidario. Informe Preliminar. Instituto de Asuntos Públicos. Departamento de Políticas Públicas. Universidad de Chile. Santiago.

- Silva. V. (2004) Presentation. Second International Workshop on Conditional Cash Transfer Programs. 26-29 April, Sao Paulo, Brazil.
- SUR Consultores (2007) Sistematización y análisis de gestión regional, aplicación Chile Solidario. Santiago. Document provided by MIDEPLAN.