



Learning lessons from the policy influence of the Regional Hunger and Vulnerability Programme (RHVP)

Harry Jones (ODI), with Katharine Vincent, Tracy Cull, Nicholas Freeland, Josee Koch, Danya Pedra, Philip White and John Rook (RHVP)

September 2011

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary..... | 3 |
| Introduction and methodology..... | 7 |
| International Development Partners..... | 11 |
| Regional UN agencies and NGOs..... | 14 |
| National VACs and CSOs..... | 17 |
| Ministry technical staff..... | 18 |
| Parliamentarians..... | 21 |
| The media..... | 23 |
| Lessons learned discussion..... | 25 |
| Appendix 1: Evidence for behaviour change in stakeholder groups..... | 28 |

Executive Summary

This report presents the results of a learning process focused on assessing the influence which the Department for International Development (DFID) and AusAID-funded Regional Hunger and Vulnerability Programme (RHVP) had on policy, and capturing the lessons learned from these experiences. Drawing on the RAPID Outcome Assessment methodology, it involved first assessing the changes seen in six key stakeholder groups over the life of the programme; second, analysing the causes and influences behind these changes; and third, interpreting what lessons this has for future programmes similar to RHVP, and for DFID. The process involved three phases, first 'homework' where the RHVP team collected evidence of changes in stakeholder groups; second, a two-day workshop in which the changes were discussed and analysed; and third, the write-up, drafted by the RHVP team and compiled and synthesised by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI).

Changes seen in stakeholder groups and the influence of RHVP:

- **International Development Partners (bilateral and multilateral donors, regional organisations and international NGOs):** Over the period of RHVP there were significant increases in the level of attention and funding given to social protection by International Development Partners (IDPs), and improvements in the sophistication of their approach. RHVP undoubtedly had an impact on IDP approaches to social protection over the six years of its existence, though the degree of impact and the pace of change remained very differentiated between IDPs and it is difficult to disentangle RHVP influence from the overall policy debate and research engagement on social protection. The programme stuck to strong, clear messages on social protection and took an 'uncompromising' approach which sometimes involved controversial or critical stances. In many cases this drew defensive reactions, but over the course of the programme, not only were many of those messages vindicated, but the messages delivered can be linked to a number of concrete policy changes. On one hand, it is clear that RHVP was one voice among many on social protection, and shifts in the overall debate are difficult to attribute to RHVP with confidence, but there is also a suggestion that by taking this 'radical' and visible stance in the debate, RHVP opened the door for other more 'moderate' voices to find traction within institutions where they would otherwise have not.
- **National VACs and CSOs:** With regard to national Vulnerability Assessment Committees (VACs), the major achievements noted by the end of the programme were that some VACs were moved into government, and other new ones were set up in government. RHVP activities contributed to this improved institutionalisation, set against a broader trend for increased awareness of hunger and vulnerability, to which RHVP contributed along with other

stakeholders. The setting up of new VACs within governments was also a key outcome, with RHVP's direct advocacy and technical support important, along with wider processes such as increased donor funding and the 2008 food price crisis. With regard to Civil Society Organisations (CSOs), the two main observations at the end of the programme were the heightened CSO action around social protection, and the creation of the Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP). The Livingstone declaration and the ongoing process of operationalisation, which occurred at the same time, supported the setting up of the Platform – as did the external influence of the food price crisis and growing commitment to social protection from donors. But it was generally felt that RHVP and other NGOs, such as HelpAge International, were critical drivers.

- **Ministry technical staff:** The rising prominence of social protection responses to extreme poverty and vulnerability that followed the Millennium Declaration was boosted in southern Africa by a growing awareness, in the wake of the 2002-03 food crisis, of the need to move from reliance on emergency food aid to longer term measures to reduce vulnerability to drought and other shocks. SADC countries fell broadly into two groups: a) a 'southern' group, which began the period with more comprehensive government-driven, social protection systems, and saw a broadening/deepening of government commitment to categorical transfers over the period of RHVP; and b) others (a 'northern' group?), which started the period with a proliferation of donor-driven initiatives, and saw an expansion of donor-funded poverty-targeted social cash transfer (SCT) initiatives, and some government movement towards scaling up SCT pilots. An important driver of the changes was the Africa Union's (AU) 'Livingstone process' as well as RHVP and donor-funded efforts. These saw a growing awareness of, and expertise in, social protection on the part of Ministry staff. The reluctance in some countries to scale up pilots owes much to conflicting donor agendas as well as domestic factors.
- **Parliamentarians:** The legislature has been largely neglected in targeting policy awareness and understanding on social protection (as well as other issues). By the end of the RHVP time period there was a growing awareness of potential roles evidenced by Southern African Development Community Parliamentary Forum (SADC-PF) endorsements and engagement with RHVP, some private member bills of individuals who attended RHVP training (in Malawi and Zambia), and strong demand for the continuation of policy awareness support. Although RHVP only began working with parliamentarians at the end of the first phase, evidence of changed perceptions from the workshops suggest that it had a significant initial impact in a context where there are few other initiatives. RHVP's influence should be set against the background of the prominence given to the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which has

focused on combating poverty and provided an opportunity to look at new approaches such as social protection, and new instruments such as social transfers.

- **Media:** At the start of RHVP the media tended to feature a narrow analysis of poverty and hunger and its underlying causes, and exhibited limited knowledge and reporting on social protection. The RHVP website (wahenga.net), as well as blogs, media-packaged publications and mailing lists showed trends of increasing readership and uptake. Additionally, RHVP training given to journalists resulted in increased awareness and understanding of these issues. This resulted in an increased prevalence of news articles on poverty and social protection in many cases.

Lessons learned

The specific lessons learned for working with each stakeholder group can be found in the detail of the report, but the following factors deserve to be highlighted as key components in determining the success of initiatives such as RHVP, and are worth noting by similar programmes as well as donors supporting such programmes:

- **Strong messaging:** Strong, bold and consistent messaging has proven to be the trademark of RHVP, building credibility and opening many spaces for influence. This involved taking a stance on issues relatively early in debates, and being prepared to criticise organisations where necessary; having messages appropriately packaged (e.g. in the form of policy briefs, comments on the website) facilitated this.
- **Presence in-country:** In-country staff, used for the first half of RHVP but then dropped, seem to be an important ingredient in both monitoring and facilitating concrete policy change. Many of the programme's successes were at this level, and more sustained presence would have likely led to further influence. Related to this, it is crucial for DFID to facilitate these kinds of programmes by adequately preparing the ground with country offices and supporting their work in-country.
- **'Being available':** Many of the concrete policy changes to which RHVP directly contributed were thanks to the development of a series of good relationships with key audiences and champions in-country. The value of providing quality policy design services is clear, as is the need to 'be available' to provide this support when windows for influence arise.
- **Well-oriented capacity-building:** It was generally agreed that well-targeted training was one of RHVP's main assets, and evidence from workshop feedback

and follow-up shows that these exercises proved successful. Of particular note is the promise shown by the programme's work with parliamentarians.

- **Timescale and sustainability:** It is crucial for programmes set up with the level of ambition such as RHVP to allow an appropriate timescale for the achievement of their goals. Donors and those designing such programmes need to recognise that substantive shifts in debates and major policy changes in-country cannot easily be guaranteed from just two or three years of influencing-focused work. Related to this, it is important to consider ways of making changes sustainable and/or programmes institutionalised, and to be ready to look for a variety of different routes for achieving this.

Introduction and methodology

RHVP was designed in response to concerns that the problems underlying chronic food insecurity cannot be addressed satisfactorily simply by providing emergency food assistance in a region that is prone to drought and generally unable to secure commercial imports without severe budgetary consequences. RHVP has aimed to bring evidence and information on hunger and vulnerability, and on social protection responses, into policy spaces to inform a wider range of responses to hunger.

RHVP was implemented by a consortium led by MASDAR as managing consultants. The first phase was implemented between July 2005 and August 2008, with a second phase (followed by further extensions) taking it through to December 2011. The programme's purpose was "improved national and regional food security policy at national and regional levels in SADC". This was to be achieved through delivery of three outputs relating to improved capacity, increased evidence and effective advocacy – together contributing to enhanced policy within governments, donors, UN agencies, NGOs and other key stakeholders.

This report summarises the findings of a facilitated lesson-learning process which has attempted to assess the influence which the RHVP programme had on policy, and to capture the lessons learned from these experiences. This exercise was recommended in the programme completion review aide-memoire, which suggested that there was a case for small investment in order to ensure that lessons from RHVP's attempts to influence policy are captured.

The process was facilitated by the RAPID programme of the ODI, drawing on the RAPID Outcome Assessment methodology. This was developed from the Outcome Mapping approach, which focuses monitoring and evaluation activities for a programme around looking at behaviour changes in its 'boundary partners' (people, groups and organisations with whom the programme works directly). The aim of this exercise was to map the changes seen in key stakeholder groups with which the RHVP has directly worked, and then to judge where the programme had significant influence on these changes. The chosen stakeholder groups were: technical staff from government ministries, members of parliament, International Non-governmental Organisations (INGOs)/UN agencies, national CSOs (including VAC members), the media, and international development partners. For each of those groups, a broad understanding of 'policy change' was employed, including attitudinal change, discursive commitments, procedural change, policy content and behaviour change.

The process began with a '**homework**' exercise, where RHVP team members were each allotted a stakeholder group to collect evidence of the changes seen over the span of the programme. They listed significant changes in their stakeholder groups that related to the goals of RHVP and, provided evidence (documents, media reports, correspondence etc) for each change having happened, along with a description of any possible link between the change and RHVP activities (again, with supporting evidence). The results of this exercise can be found in appendix 1.

The 'homework' provided the grounding for an intensive **two-day workshop**, held in Johannesburg, South Africa on 15 and 16 July 2011. Participants were RHVP team members, with Michael Samson and Ingrid van Niekerk from the Economic Policy Research Institute (EPRI) also attending alongside a facilitator from the ODI. The workshop was structured as follows:

1. Mapping the changes observed: First, participants worked through each stakeholder group to get a collective understanding of what had changed over the course of the programme. Drawing on the homework exercise, for each group they discussed: *What was their behaviour at the start of RHVP? How had this changed by the end? What were the milestone changes along the way?* Behaviour changes were recorded on a timeline on the wall.
2. Assessing influences: With the overall behaviour changes mapped, the group then turned to looking at the causes of and influences on those changes. For each change recorded on the timeline the group discussed: *What contributed to this? What is the evidence? What influence did RHVP have? What else could explain it? What influence did this change have on other stakeholder groups?* Influences were recorded on the back of the cards, and lines of influence between two events or stakeholders were drawn on the wall chart using coloured wool.
3. Drawing lessons: Finally, participants took a step back in order to draw lessons from the changes and influences which had been charted. They discussed the following questions: *What patterns of influence do you see? Are there any key events which played a big role in the overall process? Where does RHVP seem to have been more or less influential? What lessons are there for programmes similar to RHVP in terms of successful and less successful strategies? What lessons should be drawn by DFID?*

The result of the first two sections of the workshop can be seen in figure 1 below. On the paper across the top are the activities of the RHVP programme set on a timeline from 2006 to 2010. Underneath, each row of orange and yellow cards represents the behaviour changes seen in each stakeholder group, again placed in rough chronological order according to the timeline at the top. The red cards at the

bottom of the RHVP timeline represent important changes and trends 'external' to RHVP, which influenced proceedings. Please zoom in on the photo for more detail:

Figure 1



After the workshop, participants completed a **write-up** for each stakeholder group. This attempted to provide a one-page narrative on the following three areas:

- 1) Describing the changes seen in the stakeholder group over the timeline, their pattern and timing.
- 2) Commenting on the factors, which contributed to those changes, and also how this stakeholder group influenced others, or the role it played in the broader change process.
- 3) Some thoughts about what went well and what didn't when RHVP interacted with and tried to influence this stakeholder.

The following six sections of this report constitute those write-ups, followed by a summary of the discussion from the final 'lesson learning' segment of the

workshop. Before elaborating on this one caveat is necessary with respect to the methodology: due to a number of reasons, the results cannot be considered to be a rigorous assessment or evaluation of RHVP's influence. Improvements to the methodology could have been made by carrying out the workshop with representatives from each stakeholder group, possibly a series of workshops to look at the influence on a country-by-country basis, and a more structured and systematic 'homework' phase. This was not possible due to time and resource constraints, but more importantly, the aim of this exercise was lesson-learning, and hence the appropriate level of rigour is lower than would have been needed for a formal evaluation.

International Development Partners

RHVP had a significant impact on international development partner (IDP) approaches to social protection over the six years of its existence, though the degree of impact and the pace of change remained much differentiated between IDPs.

At a philosophical level, RHVP identified very early on a number of key tenets around social protection, and was consistent in adhering to those tenets throughout its lifespan. Examples include:

- The supremacy of cash over food aid in most cases (e.g. Wahenga Comments in 2005; cash transfers workshop in 2006).
- The potential for innovation in delivery systems (e.g. "Upwardly Mobile" Brief and Comment in early-2006, before MPESA had even started; Lesotho Ladies' initiative and Briefs beginning in 2006 through to the end of the programme).
- The need to move away from piloting to supporting national programmes (e.g. "Stop Experimenting" Comment in mid-2006; Tanzania experimentation Comment in 2008).
- The deficiencies of public works programmes ("Public Works Don't" Comment in early-2007).
- The potential for direct transfers to individual households (e.g. "Direct Aid" Comment in early-2008, long before the 2010 book by Joseph Hanlon et al "Just Give Money to the Poor").
- The weaknesses of poverty targeting, especially in situations of significant poverty (e.g. "One out of Ten" and other poverty-targeting Comments in 2008; Frontiers of Social Protection (FoSP) Brief in 2009).
- The uncertain evidence on the benefits of imposing conditions, especially in Africa (e.g. "What's Wrong with Conditionality" Comment in 2006; Institute of Development Studies (IDS) article in 2007; "Sissy Teese" Comments in 2010).
- The potential for South-South learning (early contacts with International Poverty Centre; social protection (SP) study tours).
- The importance of building political will alongside technical capacity (e.g. "Institutional and Policy Context" Regional Evidence-Building Agenda (REBA) Briefs in 2008; SADC-PF initiative in 2008).

Many of these were controversial – even radical – ideas at the time they were first aired, and part of RHVP's visibility and impact has probably derived from its provocative (but unswerving) stance. These fundamental principles have since been enshrined in the 2010 Joint Statements with RHVP, IDS, ODI and University of East

Anglia (UEA) and have become accepted as the basis for IDP philosophies, as evidenced, for example, by the European Report on Development 2010, the UN's social protection floor initiative, AusAID's emerging policy on social protection, the AU's Social Policy Framework, and even the World Bank's Social Protection & Labor Strategy 2012-2022.

More specifically, RHVP's outspoken criticism of specific donor initiatives that transgressed any of the above principles can be demonstrated at worst to have been vindicated and at best to have been directly influential on subsequent in-country developments:

- *Malawi* – RHVP's critical Comment on the World Food Programme's (WFP) food aid response in Malawi in 2009 "caused a substantial rethink (even involving WFP headquarters) on the way the agency operated in Malawi"¹.
- *Zimbabwe* – RHVP contributed to a significantly increased emphasis on social transfers in phase two of the Protracted Relief Programme.
- *Swaziland and Lesotho* – In 2007, RHVP was highly critical of food-based responses to deficits in both countries, laying the foundation for cash-based responses and programmes in subsequent years.
- *Zambia* – RHVP's evidence-building and critical comments on the inappropriateness of pilots and poverty targeting contributed to the alternative testing of child grants, now favoured by government as the model to scale up.
- *Zimbabwe* – The mere threat of an RHVP Comment on another "10%" poverty-targeting approach led UNICEF to redesign the intervention as a "child-sensitive social transfer".

RHVP evidence-building and policy advice is therefore likely to have had a degree of indirect influence on the increased level of donor funding for social protection, especially in the wake of the food crisis and the G-20 commitments. And the Programme's contributions to training donor social protection staff, both directly, e.g. European Commission (EC), DFID, AusAID, and indirectly e.g. through EPRI, ODI, IDS, is likely to have resulted in further influence on their policy. RHVP's 'philosophy' will have contributed, at least to some degree, to the general evolution in donor thinking that occurred over the six years: from a focus on the availability of food to a focus on access to food; from annual emergency responses to long-term structural commitments; from 'safety nets' to social assistance; from food to cash (or at least to 'cash first' or 'cash plus'); from donor/INGO pilots to government-owned programmes; from public works to unconditional transfers; from poverty targeting to categorical targeting; from a focus on building technical

¹ Telecon with Ugo Gentilini, see table in appendix

capacity to recognising the importance of political will; and from the poor being seen as the problem to the poor being seen as the solution.

Many of the major INGOs (including HelpAge, Care, Concern, Oxfam, Save the Children, Plan and GUFFP) openly acknowledge their debt to RHVP, and its influence on their thinking around social protection. Several used RHVP's outputs as a basis for internal debate; RHVP provided training at a number of their regional workshops; many invited RHVP to partner them in specific studies and initiatives; some used wahenga.net as a vehicle for publicising and distributing their documents.

What worked well with this stakeholder group included the building of personal relationships with individuals from the main institutions, who would turn to RHVP for advice, and who often engaged RHVP staff in influencing activities outside of the programme itself. Presentations and inputs to training courses were also effective in disseminating and popularising the RHVP approach. wahenga.net was a powerful tool (probably more so with this stakeholder group than any other), both for distributing the evidence base derived from RHVP's research and for provoking debate and discussion. The controversial nature of the Wahenga Comments (many of which were openly critical of individual donors) may occasionally have overstepped the mark and caused offence, but were generally felt on balance to have drawn attention to key issues, and to have contributed to the debate.

Regional UN agencies and NGOs

The patterns of influence among regional stakeholders were similar to those around the international stakeholders. Although many regional stakeholders indicated that their policies and strategic directions are largely set and finalised at global (headquarter) level, they are often involved in the drafting process and have ample opportunity to influence policy outcomes.

Subsequently, when social protection debates at global level gained momentum around issues such as cash vs. food; piloting vs. support to national programmes; poverty and categorical targeting; conditional vs. unconditional transfers; the potential for South-South learning and the importance of building political will alongside technical capacity, these debates quickly filtered down to regional stakeholders and, simultaneously, have been supported with cutting-edge regional thinking on social protection.

There were notable shifts in 'start' and 'end' social protection policy status in the regional stakeholders, even before the birth of RHVP, beginning with the 2002/03 regional food security emergency and the emergence of the 'triple threat'² concept. However, despite these shifts in thinking, many regional stakeholders were still behaving traditionally³ at the time RHVP was launched. Towards the end of RHVP's lifespan, the regional stakeholders had moved across the continuum and included more social protection language and actions in their policy, programmes and projects⁴.

The direct influence of RHVP on these developments is difficult to determine, but all regional stakeholders have indicated that RHVP's timely – and often confrontational – participation in the debates, pushing sensitive issues with the backing of high quality experts and evidence and breaking out of existing comfort zones, has contributed to the policy shifts.

From analysis and discussion, the following have been identified as the major influencing factors on the policy behaviour of regional stakeholders:

- Increased availability and accessibility of research and evidence on social protection⁵ (the 'what').
- Increased awareness of good and promising social protection practices, mainly from REBA, the "Transfer out of poverty" DVD and study tours (the 'how').

² The triple threat refers to the situation in southern Africa characterised by chronic food insecurity, high HIV prevalence and weakened capacity for service delivery.

³ For example, FAO was focusing on livelihoods; UNICEF on child survival; and WFP on food assistance.

⁴ For example, FAO is comfortable with the concept of livelihood-based social protection; UNICEF is working from a child sensitive social protection approach; and WFP as a cash and voucher response option in many of its food assistance programmes and department focusing on "cash for change"

⁵ For example, the REBA case studies, UN and partners' Alliance Observatory case studies and the Joint Learning Initiative on Children and AIDS (JLICA)

- The REBA policy and thematic briefs, which have further strengthened changes in behaviour and shifts in attitudes on many controversial and much debated topics.
- The wahenga.net website, comments and mailing-list, which have played a noticeable role in influencing the behaviour of many regional stakeholders – even if it was through a ‘name and shame’ approach. The taboo-breaking nature of wahenga.net, coupled with the status and authority of the experts and the independence of the evidence, made the website a powerful strategic tool for policy influencing.
- The 2006 Livingstone meeting, which pushed social protection onto the political agenda of many governments in the region and subsequently demanded several regional stakeholders to become involved and support their government counterparts.
- The 2008 food price crisis and the global response and drive to commit to social protection responses whenever and wherever feasible.
- As a result of various intertwined processes mentioned above, increased funding for social protection policy work and programmes for several of the regional stakeholders, both internally allocated to social protection as well as funds raised with external donors for social protection programming.

One particular finding, on building political will, worth mentioning separately is the impact of RHVP’s work with SADC-PF; this successful collaboration has inspired other regional stakeholders to initiate a similar process. Many regional stakeholders have found it challenging to engage with Members of Parliament (MPs) and RHVP’s modus operandi through SADC-PF has broken through some of the difficulties in engaging MPs in policy work. It is unfortunate that RHVPs work in this area was cut short before this obviously successful approach could be harnessed, sustained and extended into other areas.

Strategies and factors that have not been that successful in influencing policy at regional level include:

- The limited approach to partnering, especially in the beginning of the programme with the creation of the Centre of Excellence.
- The missed opportunity for RHVP to do more analysis of the politics of social protection (at national level) and its practical implications for policy influencing.
- Some stakeholders have indicated they wanted to see more from RHVP on the practical front; in other words, while RHVP has contributed to the academic discussions, it failed to deliver on the practical options (not the ‘what must be done’, but ‘how must we do it’, upstream policy work that needs to be connected with downstream programmes).

However, there were also some highly successful RHVP strategies for regional UN and NGOs which have been identified through interviews and during the workshop:

- RHVP’s focused approach on social protection and ability to provide timely and topical inputs that continued to fuel the debates.

- Re-packaging of REBA evidence (briefs, comments, DVDs etc) and use of wahenga.net as a vehicle for dissemination.
- The balance between being strategic and being opportunistic, whilst keeping the messages consistent.
- The fact that RHVP was a 'programme' and not an institution or organisation meant that it could be controversial; and the controversy did not tarnish its reputation because of the quality of the work and the experts working for the programme.

National VACs and CSOs

Over the lifespan of RHVP, significant changes were noted in national VACs and CSOs concerned with the social protection agenda; RHVP played a variable role in effecting these changes, both directly and indirectly.

VACs began in southern Africa in 1999, and key driving forces behind their growth were identified to be the National VAC needs assessment and the role of two organisations, Save the Children and FAO, which pioneered the Household Economy Approach (HEA, a methodology that was adopted by many VACs to undertake national assessments). In the beginning, VACs were very ad hoc, however, by the end of the programme, RHVP had played a direct role in getting them institutionalised and moved into government, thus ensuring their sustainability. Increased awareness of hunger and vulnerability, which RHVP was instrumental in creating along with other stakeholders, was identified as a two way-relationship contributing to the trend of VACs being moved into government.

The setting-up of VACs within new governments was also a key outcome of RHVP. By the end of the programme, 10 of the 14 SADC countries had a VAC (Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe), with South Africa in the process of developing one. Although RHVP's direct advocacy and technical support was important, wider processes also played a role in supporting this process, such as the 2008 food price crisis. A consequence of the setting-up of new VACs was the growing commitment to training processes around hunger and vulnerability, in which RHVP was involved. A strong link from RHVP to this milestone was the training needs review, undertaken by component 1 of RHVP in phase 1, and added to by component 2 in phase 2. This identified gaps which catalysed the Regional VAC (RVAC) to develop a technical working group on capacity-building, facilitated by RHVP. A two-way link was noticed with the increasing availability of donor money for social protection, which enabled the availability of training.

Heightened CSO action around social protection at the end of RHVP was noticeable; something in which RHVP played a direct role. RHVP also was involved in the creation of the Africa Platform for Social Protection, contributing to two preparatory workshops held in Johannesburg and London by the Grow up Free from Poverty (GUFFP) coalition. The Livingstone declaration and the ongoing process of operationalisation, which occurred at the same time, also supported the setting-up of the APSP. Although the external influence of the food price crisis and the growing commitment to social protection from donors were key, it was generally acknowledged that RHVP and other NGOs, such as HelpAge International, were critical drivers.

Ministry technical staff

The rising prominence of social protection responses to extreme poverty and vulnerability that followed the Millennium Declaration was boosted in southern Africa by growing awareness (in the wake of the 2002-03 food crisis) of the need to move from reliance on emergency food aid to longer term measures to increase resilience to drought and other shocks. At the start of RHVP, which aimed to influence government policies in this direction, SADC countries fell broadly into two groups:

- A 'southern' group of better-off countries which had more comprehensive government-driven social protection involving categorical transfers (e.g. social pensions in Botswana, Mauritius, Namibia and South Africa, and, more recently, in Lesotho and Swaziland; and child support in Mauritius, Namibia and South Africa).
- Other SADC countries which saw a proliferation of donor-driven initiatives, from old-style safety nets based on social action funds and public works designed to offset poverty induced by structural adjustment policies (e.g. MASAF in Malawi, TASAF in Tanzania), to more recent poverty-targeted social cash transfer pilots (Kalomo SCT in Zambia, DECT/FACT in Malawi, Food Subsidy Programme in Mozambique). Some governments in this group (e.g. Malawi, Zambia) favoured farm input subsidies, which promised more tangible economic returns and political dividends than welfare 'handouts'.

By the end of RHVP, a growing awareness of potential roles for social protection was evidenced by:

- A broadening/deepening of government categorical transfers (e.g. real increase in pension levels, reduced age threshold for child support) and their policy underpinning in the 'southern' group.
- An expansion of donor-funded poverty-targeted SCT initiatives in other SADC countries (Malawi, Zambia, Mozambique), in some cases linked to health and education services, as governments engaged more and moved to establish national social protection policy frameworks and even consider categorical transfers (e.g. pensions in Malawi, child grants in Zambia) – but actual commitment of resources continued to prioritise expanding farm input subsidies over scaling-up SCT pilots.

Alongside RHVP and other donor-funded efforts, an important driver of government policy development on social protection was the AU's Livingstone Process⁶, supported by HelpAge and (from November 2008) the APSP. Meanwhile, SADC published its 2007 Code on Social Security⁷ which sets out member states' responsibilities in upholding the right of all citizens to social security. Assisted by APSP, civil society pressure, which included local NGOs such as JCTR in Zambia and

⁶ This began with a 2006 intergovernmental conference in Livingstone, at which 13 east and southern African governments recognised social security and social protection as a basic human right and pledged to put together costed social transfer plans and establish a biannual conference on social protection. It culminated in the October 2008 conference of social development ministers in Windhoek, which approved a Social Policy Framework for member states to adapt to national contexts.

⁷ SADC (2007) *Code on Social Security in the SADC*.
<http://www.ilo.org/qimi/gess/RessFileDownload.do?resourceId=10371>

Malawi and the local media, also played a role. Towards the end of the period, parliamentarians across the region became increasingly engaged through their participation in policy dialogue and training events.

Among technical ministry staff, a growing awareness of, and expertise in, social protection was promoted by a series of regional training events, while their increasing capacity to analyse and track vulnerability and design appropriate responses was boosted by the absorption into government of existing national VACs and by the creation of new VACs in Botswana, Namibia, Angola and South Africa, all supported by the SADC Secretariat.

These influences were underpinned by a rapidly developing research discourse and literature on social protection, informed by a growing body of experience and picked up by international development partners and CSOs, and, to some extent, directly by SADC governments.

The reluctance of some governments, especially in the second group of countries, to scale up pilot poverty-targeted initiatives or commit to categorical transfers owes much to conflicting donor agendas leading to policy paralysis, and a lack of corresponding donor commitment beyond projectised aid, as well as to domestic fiscal and political factors. Many pilots were implemented in partnership with government line ministry staff, but intensively supervised by INGOs and other external agencies, with questionable replicability following withdrawal of external support.

The context for ministry technical staff engagement in social protection was influenced by events during RHVP's life, in particular, the:

- Political and economic crisis in Zimbabwe, which led development partners to bypass government altogether;
- 2008-09 global food price crisis which increased vulnerability and immediate donor resources to address it, but reinforced a short-term perspective on social protection;
- Subsequent global financial crisis which tightened fiscal space in some SADC countries and may prove to have limited donor resources for social protection in the longer term.

RHVP's direct and indirect influence on ministry technical staff can be judged at a number of levels.

At the policy level:

- RHVP provided direct support for policy development on social protection in Botswana, Malawi, Mozambique, Zambia and (later) Zimbabwe. Apart from in Zambia, where its role in the Social Protection Sector Advisory Group was limited by the DFID country office, this enabled a direct and unambiguous influence on how policy evolved in those countries.
- RHVP provided indirect policy support through its evidence work (fast track studies, REBA, FoSP and related publications) which profiled and analysed regional experience for a wider audience, making a substantial contribution to the research discourse as shown by its update and citation record. The influence of the Wahenga Comments, videos, media work, and policy dialogues and conferences with MPS is evidenced by the lively feedback and

participation elicited from all stakeholder groups across the region, including ministry technical staff. Some Comments alienated some stakeholders, but these generally worked well in making RHVP perspectives on policy readily accessible.

At the programme and technical level:

- RHVP's direct technical support was instrumental in the institutionalisation and upgrading of national and regional VACs, through development of baseline data, methodologies and staff capacities as well as promoting support for VACs by SADC Secretariat, governments and donors.
- RHVP's training support provided through VAC training, collaboration in EPRI courses, study tours etc was popular and worked well apart from the failure to establish a viable regional Centre of Excellence on social protection. RHVP research fed successfully into training materials.

Parliamentarians

Despite being an integral component of government, the legislative has been largely neglected in targeting policy awareness and understanding, not just in relation to social protection, but across a broad range of policy issues. During the first phase of RHVP, national policy advocacy initiatives focused primarily on governments' executive arm and civil society. RHVP did not start to engage with parliamentarians until the end of phase 1, when a decision was taken to re-orient attention towards them. This decision was based partly on advice received from other stakeholders, notably Professor Richard Mkandawire, NEPAD Advisor on Agriculture, and partly as a result of disappointing performance of policy change initiatives focused on national civil society organisation. By the end of RHVP, a growing awareness of potential roles for social protection was evidenced by:

- SADC-PF Plenary Assembly's statement of endorsement of the importance of the role of social cash transfers in poverty reduction.
- SADC-PF's decision to partner with RHVP in establishing a programme to support awareness- and knowledge-building amongst parliamentarians and parliamentary staff.
- A positive shift in perceptions of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff towards the need for social transfers as a national instrument for more effective poverty reduction (as shown from results of pre- and post-workshop perception exercises).
- Individual parliamentarian initiatives in Malawi and Zambia to propose private members bills in support of the expansion of social transfer initiatives by the respective governments.
- SADC-PF recognition of importance of the continuation and expansion of parliamentary policy dialogue process on social transfers.
- Strong demand from parliamentarians for the continuation of policy awareness support on issues related to poverty reduction and the role of social transfers and SADC-PF's desire to seek donor funding for the continuation of support after the close of RHVP.

Efforts to foster capacity in policy awareness and understanding amongst parliamentarians in southern Africa are rare, yet the need and demand for these types of initiatives is strong, especially as democracy grows and the role and prominence of the legislative arm of government increases. Prominence given to the UN's MDG initiatives has clearly helped to highlight the importance of combating poverty, and evidence indicating that economic growth has not, as yet, been effective in reducing poverty rates in many southern African countries, provided an opportunity to look at new approaches such as social protection, and new instruments such as social transfers.

RHVP's approach to building awareness and understanding on social transfers policy was opportunistic rather than structured; but the initial opportunity arising from a

suggestion by Professor Mkandawire led to a subsequent introduction of RHVP to the SADC-PF Director General. The existence of SADC-PF offered an ideal point of access to parliaments and parliamentarians in the region and the Secretary General's commitment has been instrumental in ensuring this access.

Policy Dialogue workshops at national and regional level, as well as parliament-wide presentations, stimulated interest and engagement; however, the duration of the initiative (in effect about 18 months) was insufficient to have a lasting impact. An evaluation of the initiative by SADC-PF also highlighted the need for more direct and intensive engagement with parliaments and the need for a range of initiatives to strengthen the policy awareness, understanding and analysis of parliamentarians. The parliamentarian handbook, which was only completed at the end of phase 2, should have been given higher priority so that it could have been integrated into the policy awareness work.

The media

At the start of RHVP, there was both a poor and narrow analysis of poverty, hunger and underlying causes in the media, preoccupied mainly with seasonal fluctuations in food production. There was also limited technical knowledge and reporting on social protection. With the launch of the wahenga.net website in 2006, a platform for the sharing of information was created, and with it the opportunity to educate a wide audience involved in the larger, related issues of poverty and social protection – even if, at that stage, they may not have had a name to put to concepts like social protection, cash transfers and so forth. Initially, this audience was made up of the research and donor community, but over time, it grew to also include people reporting on these issues, be it in the media, civil society or within other stakeholder groups.

One of the biggest factors in the growth of this audience was the Wahenga Alerts; emails that were sent directly to a member list notifying them of new research, papers, programmes or anything else of pertinence. The list has continued to grow throughout the programme and now stands at a member count of over 1600.

In 2007, with the release of the Wahenga Brief on biofuels, an opportunity for greater engagement with the media arose. Various RHVP team members were interviewed on radio, TV and for internet-based news sources on issues related to biofuels, such as food security and social protection. There was a notable increase in interest in the media in these concepts and RHVP's influence was key in bringing them into the general public's lexicon.

The release of material (through the website and at events) like the REBA case studies and briefs, the "Transfer out of poverty" DVDs, "Ever Upwardly Mobile" brief and the FoSP briefs ensured the continuing growth in the increase of knowledge of social protection and many of these were packaged as stories in the media.

RHVP identified the need to do specific and targeted training of journalists in the SADC region to further increase the knowledge and understanding on covering poverty – and so increase reporting of it in the media – and so in 2009 and 2010, through FrayIntermedia, the programme embarked on journalist training. The aim was also to empower journalists to be able to fulfil an advocacy role through the power of the media. The training included a competition element to encourage journalists to write about the issues and it is clear from the high quality of the competition entries, the evaluation forms filled in by the journalists after the training, and the increased prevalence of social protection, cash transfers etc in news articles (most notably in Zambia, Namibia, Malawi and internationally), that

this training was successful and had a measurable impact in terms of RHVP's influence.

Another strategy that worked well was the inviting of members of the media to the High Level Policy Dialogue on Eradicating Extreme Poverty and Hunger in Southern Africa in September 2010. There was wide coverage of not only the event itself, but also the role of social protection as an element of a comprehensive poverty reduction strategy, through every form of media (print, internet, radio and TV). This turned out to be a highly effective way of influencing the media and should the programme have continued, it would have been a strategy that could have been rolled out even further.

Even so, RHVP's communications strategy did result in more robust, comprehensive reporting on poverty, social protection and cash transfers, and influenced a wide range of groups, from those in the field, to the media, and ultimately the wider public as well.

Lessons learned discussion

Patterns of RHVP influence

- On the one hand, RHVP was part of the wider landscape of drivers, one amongst many working on social protection. However, within the six-year lifespan of RHVP, its influence grew slowly at first and then picked up toward the end. However, in some cases, what was witnessed were small and subtle impacts and changes which, had the programme continued, might have culminated in some more significant changes further down the line (e.g. with parliamentarians).
- Some felt that these influences were most concrete and 'successful' at national level. For example, there were strong influences between the REBA briefs, targeted at southern Africa, and policy changes.
- The sustainability of RHVP had been premised on working with the SADC Secretariat and Regional Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis (RVAA) Programme, but this worked better for the more technical VAA components than for the evidence, advocacy and capacity-building components of the programme. Especially in the latter case, there were a number of instances where protocol, bureaucracy and micro-management got in the way of a more constructive relationship.
- Although it had been hoped for the VACs to link up with other stakeholders, there was felt to be a gap. Part of this was the gap between hunger and vulnerability ('the problem') and social protection ('the solution?'), with VACs focusing on the former and RHVP the latter. Some progress was achieved and there is potential for them to play a greater role, but the feeling was that the current institutional structure with regional gatekeepers will mean they may be impeded from doing this.

Lessons for similar programmes in the future

- There was a good deal of discussion around RHVP taking strong, sometimes controversial, stances on many issues. Some felt that a confrontational approach can be a catalyst for change and an important element in moving discussions forwards. Also, being prepared to be controversial was seen by some as a key ingredient in order to establish credibility and build the profile of the programme. This clearly did create some 'enemies', and for some in donor organisations this was 'rocking the boat' a little too much, and some reactions were angry or aggressive. However, RHVP's stance did seem to give power to those who agreed with them inside donor agencies (who could 'hide behind the skirts' of RHVP), and initial anger did often lead to changes further down the line (e.g. WFP holding a cash transfers workshop), even if it was a 'defensive' policy reaction. There was also a suggestion that RHVP's strong stance opened up more space 'inside the tent' for other actors to get

involved in more constructive work and dialogue on the issues which RHVP had taken up. Strong support from DFID was an important factor in allowing the programme to act in this way.

- This strong and consistent messaging was a key strength in terms of taking a strategic approach to policy influencing. It was commented, however, that in other ways, RHVP could have been more strategic; materials and consistent messages are a crucial element, but it is also important to make sure that these are used in the right context at the right time.
- There seemed to be a number of strong links to national level policy changes, and some team members felt that more could have been done to be strategic and engaged at this level. One difficulty here was a disjuncture between the DFID regional office and country offices, and a lack of groundwork being implemented with staff in-country. There was no directive to country offices on how to interact with RHVP and this meant that RHVP was sometimes perceived to have been 'treading on peoples toes'. Therefore, a crucial lesson for future programmes is to prepare the ground in countries where such a programme may work, as the national level may be the most promising avenue for securing concrete policy changes. Having coordinators based in-country for this is another lesson coming from RHVP's experience, as when they were dropped halfway through, it was felt the programme lost much of its ability both to monitor events and policy developments and to maintain an influential profile at the national level.
- With relation to the lack of success in establishing a SADC Centre of Excellence, the RHVP team felt that an important lesson was 'not to put all your eggs in one basket' in terms of partnering and institutional linkages.

Lessons for DFID

- Participants argued for the merits of DFID having a corporate position (supported by internal consensus) on issues such as social protection. On this topic there are often significant differences in approach and mindset from individual to individual. This meant that in some countries, key gatekeepers were set against RHVP's messages; while in others, staff turnover might lead to a complete change of direction.
- It seems very important to adopt an appropriate timeframe for this kind of project. Building up a body of tools and evidence and then using it to influence national, regional and international stakeholders takes a sustained and committed approach over many years.
- Some participants questioned whether RHVP should have been conceived by DFID as a regional institution instead of a programme. A regional institution might have been able to more sustainably create regional capacity to move

the social protection agenda forward, etc, and attract additional resources for getting it off the ground.

- There is also a question of ensuring that a single programme makes up a coherent package of parts. Conceived in part in reaction to the food crisis, this led to a focus on technical vulnerability assessment being combined with a much broader social protection element. The fact that DFID has been happy to continue support for the RVAA , but not with the other components, suggests that they may not have fully recognised the link between components.

Table 1: Successful strategies and the context for them working (* indicate level of importance)

| Successful strategies | Facilitating context |
|---|--|
| Offering a high quality service for policy design | In-country coordinators* |
| 'Being available' to react to demands and seize opportunities | Existing commitment to social protection (political level, country champions)*** |
| Well orientated capacity-building and training | Receptive DFID Country offices* |
| Managing and creating good relationships | The right bandwagon (e.g. food crisis /elections)** |
| Consistent messages and good communication (especially: a good website) | DFID headquarters commitment* |
| Appropriate packaging for materials – especially the '15-pager' | Broad national spending on SP** |
| Being prepared to be controversial | 'Sufficient' timeframe to facilitate good relationships |
| Cross-country learning | |

Appendix 1: Evidence for behaviour change in stakeholder groups

Stakeholder group: international development partners

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|-------------|------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2005-2011 | DFID, London | Clearer, more evidence-based policy analysis and decision-making in DFID London, especially in the need to move away from pilots and support national programmes. RHVP engaged continuously with the social protection debate in DFID, UK, and influenced their thinking at a policy level. | Specific examples include: (i) requests to RHVP for costing and impact information in preparations for London G20 meeting; (ii) extensive use of RHVP material, and sharing of experience, for the important DFID evidence paper on SP; and (iii) briefing to Alan Duncan (Minister of State) using RHVP FoSP Brief on dependency - "went very well"; (iv) dissemination of "analysis and reports that could readily be shared with partners or even DFID offices through our own internal newsletter". | Pers comm from Catherine Arnold. Emails from Paul Wafer; Dennis Pain (" <i>aware of much evaluation and policy work that you were undertaking</i> "); Rahul Malhotra (" <i>RHVP undoubtedly had an impact on DFID. During my time, we were at quite an early stage in the 'policy cycle' - collating evidence, making the case, debating pros and cons, giving some direction to a lot of quite splintered programming activity, influencing other policy areas ... as such, I think the work RHVP were doing at the same time, helped us a lot. We drew on your work to do all of this. Most of your work was seen as useful inputs into this, and some of it lit some fires which in fact fed in to healthy debate</i> "). |
| 2005-2011 | DFID, national offices | Increased, and more sophisticated, debate on social protection issues in DFID national offices, and more informed decision-making on their part, both inside the RHVP region and beyond. RHVP kept national | RHVP could provide an independent mouthpiece where DFID national offices were sometimes constrained by national imperatives. RHVP engaged in the debates, provided the regional perspective and | Multiple requests from DFID staff from outside the RHVP region "Why can't we have an RHVP too?!". Email from Isabelle Cardinal (ex-DFID-Rwanda) (" <i>Key stakeholders in Rwanda received Wahenga alerts and this ensured that we had a shared way of</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|--|---|---|
| | | offices on the "straight-and-narrow", e.g. moving DFID-Malawi towards cash responses; moving DFID-Zambia towards categorical targeting rather than poverty-targeting; persuading DFID-Mozambique of the benefits of electronic delivery systems; criticism of DFID emergency responses in Lesotho. | cross-country lesson-learning ... and could take the flak (in place of the DFID national office) if criticised. | <i>keeping on top of the debate - and took us beyond different institutional networks. Paper on SP learning [Joint Statement] in Africa last year was influential in providing a means to assess how SP in Rwanda was doing against the principles and where we needed to do more thinking The short SP briefing pack [Policy Briefs] were important key documents for my own learning and for others that I mentored in social protection").</i> |
| 2010 | DFID, Uganda | Influence on communications and media strategy for the SAGE cash transfer programme in Uganda. | Advice, contacts and media strategy sought by DFID-Uganda. | Email requests for assistance and technical support. |
| 2005-2010 | DFID, Malawi | Increased and more coherent DFID-Malawi engagement on SP policy in three areas: - establishing guiding principles for SP - forging a policy on older persons - engagement of civil society | <i>"The strong expertise of RHVP at country level enabled DFIDM representation on the donor committee on social protection". "RHVP provided technical expertise to support the policy dialogue and widen the debate on social pension". "With RHVP and DFIDM co-funding civil society social protection platform activities, the participation of civil society in the social protection policy debate became more visible and meaningful".</i> | Email from Mulle Chikoko (ex-DFID-Malawi ... and now social protection specialist with the African Development Bank - further extending RHVP influence!) |

| | | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|--|
| Nov 2010 | EC, Bruxelles/Zimbabwe | Decision not to support community-targeted UNICEF initiative in Zimbabwe | EC Bruxelles read critical Wahenga comments on community targeting in Malawi and Zambia; and requested further advice from RHVP (and subsequently commissioned a paper on targeting approaches). | Pers comm from Hjordis Ogendo, EC Bruxelles (" <i>I love Wahenga - the best resource on social protection on the net</i> ".) |
| 2010 | EC, Bruxelles | The European Report on Development 2010 ("Social Protection for Inclusive Development") echoed a number of key policy recommendations of RHVP. This document is likely in turn to have a significant impact on EC policy on social protection. | RHVP produced its Joint Statement (with ODI/IDS/OAE) at the same time as the redrafting of the ERD2010, which used a number of its key recommendations. | Email from Giorgia Giovannetti (principal author), pers comm from Rachel Sabates-Wheeler (from IDS and on drafting committee), and numerous citations in the Report itself |
| 2008-2011 | EC, Bruxelles | Development of clear EC policy on social transfers in the fight against hunger, very much adopting an RHVP "philosophy" on key issues such as targeting, conditionality, public works, etc. | Request to RHVP to facilitate the initial workshop on social transfers in Bruxelles; further facilitation by RHVP at regional workshops for EC advisers in Mozambique, Niamey, Dar-Es-Salaam, Dakar, Nairobi, Dhaka, and Vientiane; commissioning of RHVP staff to write first a Concept Note, and then a Reference Document for the Commission on social transfers. | Continuing demand for the involvement of RHVP and its staff throughout the process of drafting a key "how-to" manual for EC staff (in HQ and delegations). |
| 2008-2011 | EC Delegations (Ethiopia, Dhaka, Maseru, etc) | More informed debate and engagement in social transfers in EC delegations. RHVP materials and resources used extensively | Numerous requests for support, even from outside the RHVP geographical region, and usage of RHVP materials, reflected in EC | Requests for training/capacity support (Lesotho); emails from Carlo di Chiara (Ethiopia) (" <i>I have been following Wahenga notes, articles as part of the normal</i> ") |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--------|--|--|---|
| | | to bring EC Delegation staff up to speed on social transfers. | budget support to SP in Rwanda; increased funding of PSNP in Ethiopia. | <i>process of getting informed about what's going on in the sector, as well as getting inspiration") and Massimo Larosa (Bangladesh)("I used the services provided by the Wahenga website to stimulate the dialogue within the EU delegation. Most of the documents were specific on experiences related to African countries but in any case had an influence for our debate").</i> |
| 2007-2011 | AusAID | Introduction and subsequent broadening of the debate around social protection as a tool in AusAID's development armoury. RHVP philosophy and materials influenced the nascent AusAID approach to social protection. Many (often young) staff provided their first exposure to SP through RHVP materials. | RHVP "ten principles" used to assess new interventions in SP by AusAID. RHVP DVD documentary on social transfers used in a number of regional introductory training courses on SP to AusAID. RHVP materials extensively used as resource materials on AusAID intranet. | <i>Pers comm from principal SP trainer (Rachel Slater of IDS). Email from Bernie Wyler:"In my own work, I use Wahenga regularly to search for material on specific topics in social protection, and have used that to inform work in other areas, e.g. articles, opinion pieces etc. on for example targeting and informal social protection that have helped with the Pacific study, advising program areas: Bangladesh on different opportunities to support targeting pilots; Cambodia program as they struggle with the bank and other DPs on pilots and how to design them; Africa program generally; humanitarian area on cash transfer options; even G20 on how to handle the social protection floor"</i> |
| 2005-2011 | WFP | Transition from food aid to food assistance; from short-term emergency response to long term programme support; and | It would obviously be crazy to arrogate all of this change to RHVP's influence, but WFP itself accepts that RHVP played an "extremely | Telecon with Ugo Gentilini, who confirmed there were many Wahenga subscribers in WFP (attested by number of referrals to him after each Wahenga alert). |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|---|---|
| | | from food first to cash first. RHVP's lifespan coincided exactly with a period of "significant structural change" for WFP - from food aid to food assistance, and including a full embrace of cash transfers as part of its toolbox, to the extent that it is now introducing a "Cash for Change" programme. | formative" role in the process. WFP sees RHVP's cash transfer workshop in Oct 2006 as a key milestone; there are numerous references to RHVP papers and events in WFP's 2008 policy document; and RHVP's participation at WFP's global cash and vouchers workshop in late-2008 helped the transition from low-tech to high-tech delivery systems. | Invitations to present in WFP HQ; invitation to global cash and vouchers workshop; rapid responses to Wahenga comments; and use of Wahenga as " <i>a platform to screen and publicise knowledge, articles, events, etc from multiple sources</i> ", including WFP. Ugo suggested that RHVP's giving " <i>informative and entertaining</i> " prominence to references such as the WB studies on conditionality brought debates out into the open: he had used the Sissy Teese articles in a number of presentations. |
| Nov 2009 | WFP, Malawi | Modification of WFP response to seasonal food insecurity in Malawi, from traditional food distribution to cash-based responses. | Direct response to RHVP open letter (Wahenga comment). | Telecon with Ugo Gentilini confirmed that RHVP's letter had caused a substantial rethink (involving WFP HQ) on the way the agency operated in Malawi, by "helping the agency to be accountable". |
| 2009-2010 | World Bank | Enforced openness and debate about the issue of conditionality. | Stung into response by three Sissy Teese comments on Wahenga. | Immediate (in one case next day) and comprehensive responses to the two Wahenga comments. |
| 2011 | World Bank | Adoption of the "3Ps" framework (protection, prevention, promotion) as the basis for their future "Labour and SP Strategy"; and avoidance of the baggage-laden term "safety nets". | RHVP's ongoing criticism of "safety nets" established outside of Govt systems. And the Joint Statement's (with ODI/IDS/OAE) insistence on national visions and ownership. | Invitation from Arup Bannerji to join a specific meeting at ODI to discuss the Bank's strategy going forward. |
| 2007-2009 | Irish Aid, Zambia | General influence on IrishAid's thinking around SP. | Availability of RHVP research, materials, opinions " <i>at a moment when not so much was available from other</i> | Email from Julie Lawson-McDowall (" <i>Wahenga provided an invaluable source of briefing materials ... For quite a long time, I would always</i> |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <i>sources or what was available was much less accessible".</i> | <i>look first at the Wahenga site for information and for opinions").</i> |
| 2007-2011 | SIDA, Sweden | RHVP was unique in providing access to "in-country" rather than donor information on SP. Also adopted use of RHVP's Parliamentary Handbook for civil society advocacy in Sweden. | RHVP materials (in particular the Parliamentary Handbook) widely accessed. | Email from Göran Holmqvist |
| 2005-2011 | HelpAge | <i>"Important and lively discussions e.g. on targeting that would not have happened without the site". "Wahenga has provided research which has contributed to our thinking and advocacy. We have circulated, referenced and used many RHVP resources including REBA case studies." RHVP material has been especially useful at HelpAge country level offices.</i> | HelpAge has: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Sought to disseminate publications through Wahenga alerts as an effective tool to reach the key stakeholders in Social Protection Debate in Africa (and globally)</i> • <i>Sought to attend RHVP events in the region. They are regarded to be at the forefront of the debate on Social Protection in southern and wider Sub-Saharan Africa and attract influential stakeholders at the national level - RSA-RHVP workshop in October and</i> • <i>sought RHVP, as a credible research partner, to lead an impact evaluation of the OAG in Swaziland</i> • <i>Sought collaboration with RHVP on parliamentary</i> | Emails from Bethan Emmett (<i>"Where Next on Social Protection' by yourselves, ODI, IDS etc caused quite a few ripples in policy circles"</i>), Charles Know-Vydmanov (<i>"I think various comments have been really important to the debate, including the various ones "Sissy Tease" had with the World Bank on conditionality. I think the space for challenging discussion is really important"</i>), and Andie McPherson (<i>"I have personally shared the Ellis paper in a number of my in-country engagements in east Africa (both donor stakeholders and government) and we referenced it in a letter that we sent to Andrew Mitchell earlier this year"</i>). |

| | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | <i>training in SADC region</i> | |
| 2005-2011 | Save the Children | <i>"RHVP's work informed [Save the Children's] advocacy statements and publications promoting universal social protection RHVP were key in the AU and civil society consultations, in part through co-hosting a civil society conference in March 2007 (discussions on forming Africa Platform for SP) and played an important role in Livingstone Process".</i> | <i>"Save the Children colleagues have consistently found Wahenga to be an important resource on cash transfers Social Transfers series has been used in Save the Children's briefings, publications and internal policy discussion documents."</i> | Email from Nicola Hypher. |
| 2005-2011 | Concern Worldwide | <i>Concern feels that RHVP "incited wider interest in cash transfer programmes from the field, leading to development of an increasing number of proposals, and interest from technical and advocacy units in the merits of SP to support CW's objective of targeting the poorest and most vulnerable and alleviating extreme poverty. In 2008 CW decided to adopt SP as a core approach".</i> | <i>Concern accepts "that the [RHVP] site and the resources did have an impact on thinking and action in this area".</i> | Email from Gabrielle Smith (RHVP materials are <i>"informative and comprehensive and give all sides of the argument rather than pushing one particular instrument. I've found the Wahenga updates useful as well. "</i>). |
| 2005-2011 | Oxfam | Again, some likely influence on international policy and national activities within SADC countries. | Frequent contact and collaboration between RHVP and Oxfam, at international, regional and global levels. | The RHVP Joint Statement was mentioned very favourably on Duncan Green's blog http://www.oxfamblogs.org/fp2p/ . |

Stakeholder group: Regional UN and NGOs

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|---|--|--|
| Mainly between 2005 and 2010 | WFP – VAC collaboration | <p>More awareness around the feasibility of cash transfers as an alternative to food, although resistance from this specific WFP-arm remained quite great</p> <p>Greater debate internally on the benefits of food aid and cash transfers</p> | <p>RHVP worked with WFP at two levels: at VAC level and more at policy level (see below). The relationship between RHVP and WFP VAC focal point has been one marked by tension</p> <p>RHVP and WFP have been member of the RVAC and met regularly within this setting</p> | <p>WFP Quote: “I don't really think there has been much influence of RHVP at the regional level. Perhaps at individual country level there has been some influence. For WFP, we really follow our corporate guidance so something this local won't affect WFP interventions much. From this corporate approach, we are supposed to be aligning social protection programmes with government programmes and priorities so info/guidance from RHVP, unless focused on that aspect, won't really be influential in my opinion</p> |
| Nov 2009 | WFP – HIV and SP collaboration | <p>Change in attitude of WFP towards more openness in considering cash a preferred option to food in situation that are conducive to cash transfers</p> <p>More interest in working with MPs on certain topics</p> | <p>RHVP has been invited to present at a regional workshop of WFP advisers and participate in a “scripted” debate on the benefits of cash and food transfers</p> <p>RHVPs work and MoU with SADC-PF sparked a lot of interest among other organizations as most have been searching for a long time for a good way to make contact with and start working with MPs</p> | <p>Presentation given during the workshop resulted in several country teams including some reference to cash transfers in their workshop case study. The demand for RHVP “transfer out of poverty DVD” also increased after the workshop and several DVDs have been distributed to the different countries.</p> <p>RHVP has been asked to share lessons learned on their modus operandi with SADC-PF and to share insights and contacts within the PF with WFP, which has been done</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------|--------------|---|---|---|
| 2004/05 | WFP regional | Many players are entering the discussion around SP, WFP has done case studies linked to social welfare and the role of nutrition rehabilitation in the context of HIV | RHVP was one of the players in the early stages of the discussions around social protection. Steven Devereux's paper on the pillars of social protection helped to shape the thinking | WFP case studies Devereux paper with SP pillars |
| 2005 | WFP regional | WFP is linking the regional experience from the case studies to the global discussions on social protection | Unclear, but around the time that RHVP was set-up and gaining momentum | Kara's paper on social protection in the context of HIV and food assistance |
| 2006 | WFP HQ | WFP creates a livelihoods and food security team in HQ that focuses on social protection | Around the time that through wahenga.net posts were created about WFP's role and some of them had not been validated properly, this shocked WFP and "almost forced it into action" to defend itself and show the world that they are also doing SP and not only food aid, | Wahenga posts on Swaziland, Lesotho, Malawi etc |

| | | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|--|--|
| ?? (2009?) | WFP HQ | <p>Arrival of Ugo Gentillini as social protection adviser – creates more structure in WFP SP policy and approach</p> <p>WFP is using smart cards, swipe cards etc and becomes creative with delivery innovations</p> | <p>Unclear, but many discussions to balance the social protection debate and move away from the CT focus. Donors are pushing WFP to do more in the area of vouchers and cash-based programming</p> | Cash and voucher manual in WFP SP policy in WFP |
| 2010/2011 | WFP HQ | <p>Creation of a department “cash for change” in HQ</p> <p>Completion of an interactive learning strategy for WFP staff and partners on HIV and food assistance and including a module on cash and vouchers</p> | <p>Content of learning strategy developed by Josee with an RHVP background and discussions on food versus cash included in the strategy</p> | WFP Learning strategy |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--------------|--|---|--|
| 2005/2010 | WFP regional | WFP is pushed into action to "defend itself" against RHVP statements, discussion in SP becomes polarized | WFP one of the direct "targets" for RHVP in an attempt to move away from food aid and towards SP | Quote "there was a lack of trust between WFP and RHVP and an idea that WFP was only about food aid, which was not true, but no matter what was said and explained about how WFP works, this idea continued to exist in RHVP's mind. Various Wahenga posts have created havoc in WFP and forced the organisation at country, regional and HQ level into a defensive mode to prove itself as part of the SP move. It is unclear to me, if this has been the most effective way; the confrontational approach was certainly effective, but not constructive and created unnecessary tensions. RHVP has contributed to the academic discussions, but failed to deliver on the practical options; not the "what must be done", but "how must we do it", upstream policy work needs to be connected with downstream programmes. There was a need for RHVP to fill a gap around modelling and confidence building among government partners. WFP feels that the parties could have achieved the goals quicker if there was more depth in the dialogue and open communication between WFP and RHVP |
| Mainly between 2007 and 2010 | UNAIDS | Change at regional level towards using visuals (like short films and DVDs) to get a message across | Link not that clear, but within the RIACSO forum, both RHVP and UNAIDS participated intermittently. | Quote: "Well, to start with UNAIDS doesn't really do much 'social protection' work per se and therefore difficult to measure any influence by RHVP. However, personally in my professional interaction with RHVP and within the RIACSO set-up, RHVP has provided great insights and leadership in this agenda. I think the strength has been in the research that RHVP has done in this area, the link and support to SADC and engagement with other partners such as WFP and UNICEF in this agenda. I am not sure how helpful this is but this is all I can say from UNAIDS perspective. The RHVP DVD has been shown and distributed through this forum and afterwards UNAIDS has contacted RHVP to get advice on how to make DVD like the RHVP one, on different topics |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|---------|---|---|--|
| Mainly between 2005 and 2010 | RENEWAL | | | Quote: "Although RENEWAL developed a conceptual framework around social protection as well as built a small body of work on social protection, the programme was firmly influenced by the work of RHVP. I, for one, found the material immensely important and drew on it for papers and presentations. As you will recall, RHVP through yourself, presented at the capacity strengthening programme at UKZN (with Sheryl Hendriks) and your material was used by the national networks. I also continually forwarded the national coordinators your alerts and papers that I found relevant. Although not directly part of RENEWAL, the Sustainability Institute at Stellenbosch also drew on your work. I have lectured there these past three years and use the RHVP videos to stimulate a debate about social protection when considering the pervasive nature of hunger in southern Africa. |
| Mainly between 2006 and 2009 | FAO | FAO included SP as emerging area into its thinking around livelihood strengthening The result was that FAO spearheaded "UN & Partners' Alliance on Livelihood Based Social Protection" | Sparked by RHVP strong focus on social transfers, FAO was concerned with the livelihood component of SP as emerging concept | Various document on UN and partners Alliance, workshop reports and Lessons learned exercise |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|
| <p>Mainly between 2006 and 2010</p> | <p>UNICEF</p> | <p>UNICEF has become one of the greatest promoters of Social Protection and cash transfers to reduce child poverty and vulnerability</p> <p>However, RHVP did not manage to move UNICEF away completely from the pilot idea into nationally owned SP programmes</p> <p>After failed work with AWEPA (EU MPs for Africa) UNICEF learned from RHVPs lessons and engaged SADC-PF to stimulate their work with MPs</p> | <p>UNICEF's Children and AIDS Regional Initiative (CARI) and RHVP were in fact "brother and sister". These were the two regional programmes by DFID as a response to the SP needs in the region. One operated by UNICEF and the other by RHVP (Masdar). Throughout the life of both programmes, there should have been much more contact and in some countries (Malawi) the relationship has been tense.</p> <p>CARI has been evaluated on an annual basis and several of the Aide Memoire's give reference to RHVP and express the need for better linkages.</p> <p>UNICEF has made use quite a bit of the expertise and experience of Stephen Devereux to shape and form their thinking around social protection, which carried an inherent RHVP influence.</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluation of work with MPs 2. Workshop report with MPs on child sensitive social protection 3. Creation of the concept child sensitive social protection 4. Creation of the concept HIV sensitive social protection 5. Aide Memoires from CARI |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 2002/03 | FAO – regional emergency programme | Social protection and cash transfers arrive at the policy and programme agenda | Stephen Devereux evaluated the Kalomo cash transfer in mid-late 1990s | Quote “It is important to understand where RHVP appeared as part of a continuum of discussion on social protection. Earlier work on social protection in southern Africa which I am aware of includes GAPVU cash transfers (later became INAS) in Mozambique in the early 1990s. This was designed by the German (with GTZ support?) who then helped in the design of the pilot cash transfer programme in Kalomo, Zambia. Stephen Devereux evaluated GAPVU in the mid-late 1990s. FAO supported some work on including PLHIV in the criteria for INAS, in 2002-3. While not articulated as “social protection” cash transfers were also used as part of the disaster response for the 2000/1 floods in Moz |
| Mainly between 2005 and 2010 | FAO – regional emergency programme | Discussion becomes polarised | RHVP became part of the RVAC | Quote: “Was the UN a specific target group/audience of RHVP? Initially at least, RHVP established its presence outside of existing institutional mechanisms i.e. recruiting country focal points who had no institutional base. RHVP was part of the RVAC. To a certain extent the debate on social protection became polarized into positions on cash transfers vs. other types of support to reduce vulnerability to food insecurity” |
| 2005/2007 | FAO – regional emergency programme | Actors are reacting to the focus on cash transfers and trying to broaden the scope and understanding of social protection | Strong advocacy from RHVP side on CT, wahenga.net becomes a powerful platform | Quote: “The earlier phase of RHVP focused mainly on advocating for cash transfer mechanisms. This sidelined broader discussions on what types of social protection work under which conditions to benefit who. DfiD supported some NGOs to understand how cash transfers could work in different market contexts. One of the Wahenga briefs was on the use of vouchers for seed fairs, but this was recycling existing work.” |

| | | | | |
|-----------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|
| 2005/2010 | FAO – regional emergency programme | FAO tries to bring a livelihood perspective into the social protection debate | Both FAO and RHVP attended various meetings between each other to discuss and brainstorm different concepts | Quote: “FAO’s emergency work in southern Africa regarded the HIV and AIDS crisis as a contributory factor to the increasing vulnerability to chronic food and nutrition insecurity in the region. OVC were part of the manifestation of this crisis. Support to develop future livelihoods and life skills for OVC was considered an important intervention which could bridge emergency and development needs. Through UNICEF support (with DfiD funds) FAO led the development of the Alliance, which used a livelihood and rights based approach to analyze the type of support which OVC might need” |
|-----------|------------------------------------|---|---|--|

Stakeholder group: VACs and INGOs

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---------------|---|--|---|---|
| November 2009 | Introduction to Vulnerability Risk Assessment short professional courses (run by Wits University, Johannesburg, and endorsed as part of the SADC VAA core curriculum) | <p>Evidence for improved conceptual understanding of vulnerability assessment concepts and methodologies which was shared within the VAC and used to make recommendations for improvements in VAC processes</p> <p><i>Report from participant to his national VAC (Namibia)</i> "The Namibian disaster risk management department...needs to establish a national disaster management operational centre as is the case (observed on the course fieldtrip) in South Africa...the workshop..was an eye-opener because participants understand now what are the driving forces behind vulnerability to climate change...the focus should be on risk reduction....the NAMVAC team acknowledges and appreciates the way the training workshop was organised and conducted, in this case the University of the Witwatersrand in conjunction with the University of Namibia through SADC-NVAC should continue providing training and workshops of this nature so that we can build up strong capacity in disaster risk management/reduction in</p> | RHVP provided full bursaries for 12 VAC members | {Report to Namibia VAC by Timothy Shixungileni and Sylvia Kalimbo (will bring hard copy to workshop), follow up to Nov 2009 Wits Intro to VRA course} |

| | | | | |
|----------|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>Namibia...the Namibian team is encouraging SADC PMU to continue conducting training and invite other SADC member states so that we can strengthen good relationships between Namibia and other SADC member nations on issues relating to DRR”</p> <p><i>Feedback from participant (Tanzania VAC)</i> “The course has made positive impacts on my daily job activities: I am regularly involved in vulnerability assessments and better equipped to undertake vulnerability data analysis, interpret results, and apply concepts. I have a clear understanding and application of disaster management and climate change concepts. Tanzania VAC has managed to produce good and comprehensive vulnerability reports since 2010.”</p> | | |
| May 2010 | Introduction to Vulnerability Risk Assessment short professional courses (run by Wits University, Johannesburg, and endorsed as part of the SADC VAA core curriculum) | <p>Evidence for improved conceptual understandings and thus more active participation in the assessment process</p> <p><i>Feedback from participant (Malawi VAC)</i> “I’m glad to let you know that we have just finished doing the MVAC analysis for this year and that the VRA course has helped a great deal in this analysis. This was essentially because I knew exactly</p> | RHVP provided full bursaries for 7 VAC members | Follow up emails {Follow up to May 2010 Wits Intro to VRA course} |

| | | | | |
|---------------|--|---|--|---|
| | | <p>what I was doing after getting a better understanding of the VAA process unlike the last in year's (March 2010) assessment where I was so much relying on my colleagues. The only challenge I have had this year just like last year, was to link the numbers to the population (maps) to produce a complete report since the course didn't do much of VRA and GIS and I have not had any chance of attending such a programme. Based on my feedback, the Malawi's Disaster Act which mainly focuses on relief and response is being reviewed so that it tackles key issues in the pre-event as well as post-event."</p> | | |
| November 2010 | <p>Introduction to Vulnerability Risk Assessment short professional courses (run by Wits University, Johannesburg, and endorsed as part of the SADC VAA core curriculum)</p> | <p><i>Feedback from participant (Tanzania VAC)</i> "I personally feel that my understanding of VAA process has changed in a way because, right now I feel that I have the broader understanding of what I am doing and I am more comfortable even to explain the approach to others; I am being more involved in the vulnerability assessments in the field work for data collection and even data processing and report writing; unlike before when I did not know even why were other partners involved in the assessments, or may be all the processes within the Vulnerability risk assessment were not clear to</p> | <p>RHVP provided full bursaries for 12 VAC members</p> | <p>Follow up emails <i>{Follow up to November 2010 Wits Intro to VRA course}</i></p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| | | <p>me.</p> <p>All these things make me feel more comfortable with my work of food security assessment and crop production forecast as well as other follow ups on rainfall data and food prices.”</p> | | |
| <p>23 February 2009 – 25 February 2009</p> | <p>APSP Social Protection/ Training of Trainers workshop</p> <p>Nairobi, Kenya</p> <p>27 civil society members from east and southern Africa</p> | <p>Feedback and follow up indicated that participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learnt training, organisation and facilitation skills • Improved own understanding of social protection issues • Raised the profile of social protection within their organisations • Raised the profile of social protection among key decision makers within their countries • Actively contributed to policy development processes <p><i>Quotes from the workshop feedback:</i></p> <p>“... I as an individual have gained a lot of different techniques I can use during training sessions”</p> <p>“The workshop has energised all the CSOs to take up the social protection agenda”</p> <p>“... I am now able to use them</p> | <p>Organised and facilitated by RHVP (Katharine, Tracy and Josee)</p> | <p>Feedback from the workshop {<i>Evaluation Nairobi ACSP</i>}</p> <p>Follow up 3 months after workshop {<i>Follow up Nairobi ACSP</i>}</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>[facilitation skills] confidently”</p> <p><i>Quotes from the workshop follow up:</i></p> <p>“We are currently mobilising and sensitising CSOs on social protection. We are also in the process to set up a national platform”</p> <p>“... [the workshop] enhanced my advocacy skills and ability to engage stakeholders at community level to participate fully in issues of social protection... We have lobbied govt to make sure that the school feeding programme becomes universal and am glad to say that this seems to have received their nod.”</p> <p>“Social Protection is a relatively new term in the country and many organizations do not understand it although many of them are involved in activities that are social protection related. The meeting provided impetus for the formation of a Task Force of 12 people which was charged with the responsibility of scrutiny and input into both the Kenya Draft Policy and Strategy.”</p> <p>“Using some of those tips [from the workshop], I was able to organise a public dialogue on "the appropriateness and timeliness of the proposed contributory social</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>health insurance scheme in Uganda" I hosted over 200 participants!!! And I attribute this to a great extent, systematically following the skills you taught us!! I had done other public dialogues before, but had never got such turn up!! Furthermore, the concept of feedback. This was very helpful for staff at office level. There had been issues of too much criticism which was leading to high levels of demotivation. I worked with the human resource intern we had at office at that time to widen the discussion on giving feedback and practicing this as a team for at least a month. This aspect has now improved a lot at the office, even after the human resource intern has left."</p> | | |
| <p>11 March 2009 – 14 March 2009</p> | <p>APSP Social Protection/ Training of Trainers workshops</p> <p>Accra, Ghana</p> <p>24 civil society members from west Africa</p> | <p>Feedback and follow up indicated that participants:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learnt training, organisation and facilitation skills • Improved own understanding of social protection issues • Raised the profile of social protection within their organisations • Raised the profile of social protection among key decision makers within their countries • Actively contributed to policy development | <p>Organised and facilitated by RHVP (Katharine, Tracy and Josee)</p> | <p>Feedback from the workshop {<i>Evaluation Accra APSP</i>}</p> <p>Follow up 3 months after workshop {<i>Follow up Accra APSP</i>}</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p style="text-align: center;">processes</p> <p><i>Quotes from the workshop feedback:</i> “Thank you very much for partnering with us to ensure that the national platforms and regional coalitions that we are building in various countries and parts of Africa have capacity among themselves to be able to push this agenda forward. Talking to them on the sidelines I realized that a lot of demand was being created because of their sensitization activities at the grassroots because people are starting to understand and see social protection as an idea that can pull them out of recurrent vulnerability. Therefore nothing could have come in handy more than the knowledge that you have imparted on them.” – Edmond Odaba, APSP Co-ordinator/ commissioner of training</p> <p><i>Quotes from the workshop follow up:</i> “... I managed to update the people in the social protection cluster of the Ministry of Local Government and Social Affairs on the social protection initiatives in the region and also on this particular training. They were very glad and they pledged their support and collaboration.”</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | <p>“The training in Accra has helped to give more focus to our work. The training came just before we undertook our organizational development assessment and it was useful in designing our Social protection program so that both the children and grandmothers services now come under one administrative unit. This internal focus is making it easier to allocate resources for the SP program. We have also taken on the responsibility of anchoring a forum on SP for Nigeria. This is still in its early stages; the Accra training gave us the confidence and knowledge to undertake this responsibility”</p> <p>“[We] facilitated a workshop for other civil society organization in Ghana. We now have an interim board for Ghana Civil Society Platform for social protection. It was a great experience to be part of the workshop.”</p> <p>“... [in our office] we have improved on facilitation/ presentation skills, advocacy and how to involve Community members and Government to make life better for its citizens.”</p> <p>“I am also involved in Advocacy and lobbying to see that the newly drafted Policy on SP be passed in to a bill in parliament, which we will</p> | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|----------------------------|--|
| | | achieve.” | | |
| April 2009 | RVAC (Regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee of the SADC VAA PMU) | Facilitating the establishment of a technical working group to focus on VAA training and capacity building | Facilitated by Component 2 | {Follow up on training discussed at the RVAC meeting} |
| May 2009 – continuing? | NVAC members from the following countries: Angola Botswana Lesotho Malawi Mozambique Namibia South Africa Swaziland Tanzania Zambia Zimbabwe, held at Leriba Lodge, Centurion | Providing a forum for the first time for NVAC members to contribute to discussion on the content and structure of a training curriculum for NVAC members. "Leriba Lodge" meeting 6 – 7 July 2009: "... in the sense that as a VAC member our skills and capacity building needs have been articulated in the draft curriculum." <i>From the Strategic Plan for the SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessment Committee (RVAC) Technical Working Group on Vulnerability Assessment and Analysis Capacity Building:</i> "At the TWG VAA CB workshop on 6th - 7th July it was decided that NVACs should also be represented on this technical working group." | Facilitated by Component 2 | {July 2009 SADC RVAC TWGT CB Workshop Evaluation Summary} {3 November 2009 REVISED SADC RVAC TWG VAA CB Strategic Plan} |
| 2010 | NVACs (National Vulnerability Assessment Committee) | Facilitated and drove the process of establishing a co-ordinated training curriculum as mandated by the TWG | Component 2 | {VAC Training and Capacity Building Prospectus 2011} |

| | | | | |
|-------------|---|--|--|--|
| May 2010 | Bunda College, Malawi – training course on HIV and nutrition endorsed as part of the SADC core curriculum | Provided the model and impetus for other tertiary education organisations to conduct short professional training courses | Component 2 | {RHVP VRA brochure (for NVACs)} {HIV and AIDS Livelihoods and Nutrition Course Brochure_Bunda_May 2010} |
| 2006 - 2010 | Lesotho Ladies – women-led farming cooperative who were provided with 10 cellphones in 2006 as part of an RHVP initiative to debunk the myth that rural, illiterate people could not deal with cellphone technology – as part of a wider interest in more effective ways of delivering cash transfers | Women-led farming co-operative empowered to (further) improve livelihoods based on access to communications and its support to economic growth and social development <i>Selected comments from cooperative members (as reported in various publications, e.g. Wahenga briefs, conference papers and academic papers)</i> “mobiles have enlightened us” “we turned mobiles into a business” “we want to buy more mobiles in order to communicate...we are vulnerable, in order to be strong we need to communicate” | Initial 10 cellphones provided by RHVP | {return visits by RHVP staff to the Lesotho Ladies acting as longitudinal M&E, in July 2007, January 2009, and July 2010 and widely reported by the media} {IRIN Lesotho Ladies} {Soul Beat Africa – Lesotho Ladies} {Eldis – Lesotho Ladies} |

Stakeholder group: Technical staff from government ministries

Updated: 17-Jul-11

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|--------|-------------|--|---|---|
| 2004- | Lesotho | <p>Programme design change. Progressive shift from WFP to GoL resourcing of universal School Feeding Programme under Ministry of Education & Training Free Primary Education (FPE) policy, starting with lowland areas. Feeding contracted out to school level caterers who procure locally. Under School Self Reliance Project (SSRP), school farms and gardens set up to provide home-grown supplies, though with only partial success.</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. Subject of RHVP-commissioned case study, contributing to body of evidence on conditions under which school feeding can serve both education and social protection objectives.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHVP REBA Case Study No. 19, Nov-07, 'School-feeding, Lesotho' • REBA Book (Ellis, Devereux & White, 2009: <i>Social Protection in Africa</i>, Edward Elgar) |
| Nov-04 | Lesotho | <p>Programme initiation. Old Age Pension initiated under MoF leadership and funding, providing monthly transfer to all over-70s. Scheme enacted into law with passing of Old Age Pension Act in Jan-05, with amendments in 2007.</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. An important example, detailed in RHVP-commissioned case study and much cited in RHVP policy work, of how a very poor country can afford, implement and legally entrench a universal pension, despite contrary advice from DPs and with very positive social protection outcomes for both older citizens and their families.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHVP Case Study No. 3, Nov-07 • REBA Book |
| Oct-06 | Lesotho | <p>Policy Commitment. Policy Thabo Bosiu Commitment on Social Protection: Chieftainesses commit</p> | <p>RHVP initiation. Commitment made at 26-Oct-06 workshop initiated,</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stephen Devereux REBA trip report 31-Oct-06 [Lesotho - REBA Trip Report (SD Oct-06).doc] |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|--------|-------------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>to:</p> <p>1) "Allocate one piece of our personal land to be farmed communally for the benefit of the most vulnerable. We will do this in time for the planting of the next winter crop.</p> <p>2) Work with local government to ensure that idle arable land is redistributed to those in our communities without land.</p> <p>3) Mobilise our communities to improve collective security and protect assets to encourage investment in our villages."</p> <p>[Not technical ministry staff but perhaps not covered elsewhere]</p> | <p>facilitated and chaired by RHVP Country Coordinator, and led by the Queen and President of the Senate, with the aim to "develop an action plan that will involve the chieftaincy, the community and various levels of government in refining a home-grown social protection system".</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chaka Ntsane email 5-Oct-06 |
| Oct-06 | Lesotho | <p>Rhetorical commitment. Director of Social Welfare calls for faster progress on treatment and social grants for HIV+ children and on National Policy for OVC. Only 857 of about 22,000 HIV+ children have access to treatment. 'Know Your Status' campaign for universal free HIV testing launched early 2006 yet to get off ground.</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. RHVP collaboration with UN OVC Alliance and its Observatory initiative, with Lesotho as one of 4 case studies.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRIN: 'OVC situation needs urgent action' (11-Oct-06); 'Testing campaign struggles to get off the ground' (20-Oct-06) |
| Jan-07 | Lesotho | <p>Policy development. GoL approves OVC policy, complementing Child Protection and Welfare Bill to be enacted early 2007.</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. RHVP collaboration with UN OVC Alliance and its Observatory initiative, with Lesotho as one of 4 case studies.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRIN, 'New policy to help orphans and vulnerable children' (3-Jan-07) |
| Feb-07 | Lesotho | <p>Programme design change. Political crisis as mass defection</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. Follow-up to</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHVP Institutional & Policy Context study, Dec-07 |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|--------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | | from ruling Lesotho Congress for Democracy (LCD) to new All Basotho Convention (ABC) opposition precipitates snap general election, returning LCD to power but disputed by members of former military junta in BNP. Old Age Pension programme a prominent election issue, with ABC pledging to increase pension level and lower eligibility age, and counter-pledges by winning LCD which increased monthly level from M150 to M200 in wake of election. | RHVP-commissioned case study on OAP by NUL finds pledges on pension a major influence in voting behaviour. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHVP OAP Case Study, Nov-07, http://www.wahenga.net/node/218 • REBA book • IRIN, 'A small country whose volatile elections have caused big problems' (13-Feb-07); 'Former military junta threatens protest over election results' (17-Feb-07); |
| Jun-07 | Lesotho | Rhetorical commitment. Improved coordination and innovation in social protection pledged in National Social Protection Conference, attended by senior government staff including Minister of Finance, and other stakeholders. | Direct RHVP support. Conference organized by RHVP and included presentations by SD and RHVP-commissioned NUL researchers, featuring interim findings of REBA studies. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conference report, Chaka Ntsane email, 3-Jul-07. |
| Jul-07 | Lesotho | Programme initiation. Prime Minister declares food security emergency due to drought, noting that poor, women, orphans, HIV-infected and under 5s will need urgent safety nets and calling on DPs to help. But stated GoL response limited to longer term food security measures: increasing agricultural productivity through input subsidies, drought resistant crops, block farming, conservation farming and range management areas. M45m of agricultural input | Lack of RHVP influence (!). Suggests RHVP messages on shifting from ad hoc emergency food aid to cash-based responses complementing broader, predictable social protection measures (e.g. OAP) had so far had limited impact on GoL and DP policy in food crisis context. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report of Chaka Ntsane meeting with new PS Agric & Food Security • Wahenga comment "Cash instead of food to address hunger?", Jun-07 |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|------------|-------------|--|---|--|
| | | subsidies announced as part of M220m Famine Relief Fund, unrelated to immediate problems of vulnerability. Appeal for international response mostly limited to food aid. | | |
| May/Nov-08 | Lesotho | Media event. Thabo Thulo, Commissioner of Pensions, explains Old Age Pension scheme on documentary films on <i>Social protection in practice - evidence from southern Africa</i> and on <i>A Transfer out of Poverty</i> . His involvement with the filming, in conjunction with his (RHVP funded) participation on the EPRI course, and participation (RHVP funded) in the Swaziland Old Age Grant delivery conference in May 2007 led to discussions in Lesotho around the use of innovative delivery mechanisms, which were pioneered by Lesotho PostBank. | RHVP initiation. Films commissioned and overseen by RHVP, featuring contributions from RHVP personnel. RHVP asked by Lesotho PostBank to contribute to discussions on the implementing a card-based payment system. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • http://www.wahenga.net/videos • Lesotho PostBank email to Katharine Vincent, 29-Apr-09) |
| Apr-09 | Lesotho | Programme initiation. GoL Child Grants Programme inaugurated by Director of Social Welfare with EC funding and UNICEF technical support. Initially M360 quarterly for 5000 needy children identified by Village Verification Committees, with eventual target of 60,000 children. | Probable indirect influence. According to UNICEF, decision to opt for cash instead of food parcels motivated by 'global experience' as well as 2008 World Vision pilot. RHVP studies and policy work likely to have contributed in some measure. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRIN, 'Cash for kids' (8-Apr-09), 'A little money goes a long way' (28-Sep-09) |
| 2007- | Lesotho | Institutional capacity development. GoL sets up and | Direct RHVP support. RHVP funded update and | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHVP quarterly reports |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|-----------------|-------------|---|---|--|
| | | funds LVAC Secretariat and uses LVAC assessments in policy decisions on subsidies in support of vulnerable populations. | improvement of livelihood baselines and helped LVAC establish regular monitoring systems. | |
| Nov-09 – May-10 | Botswana | <p>Policy development. GoB, with UNICEF Botswana support, commissions situation analysis of social development in Botswana, followed by elaboration of policy framework for social development, with purpose “<i>to assist the Department of Social Services to develop a coherent Social Development Policy Framework and Implementation Plan that meets the needs of the most vulnerable members of society, as well as building a caring, compassionate nation by 2016</i>”. While this work in progress, GoB initiates transfer of able-bodied beneficiaries of destitute programme to public works to reduce ‘dependency on handouts’ and encourage labour force participation.</p> | <p>Direct RHVP support. Work undertaken by RHVP team with Botswana Institute for Development and Policy Analysis, benefiting from RHVP regional experience and feeding into RHVP research and policy work. Fears about ‘dependency’ and capacity of public works to promote sustainable livelihoods questioned. Recommendations made for changes in institutional architecture for social development, improvements in operation of existing programmes, consideration of a child support grant and possible basic income grant, and management information and M&E systems.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unpublished study reports: Turner, S., Ellis, F., Freeland, N., Ntseane, D., Seleka, T. and White, P., ‘A Social Development Policy Framework for Botswana. Phase I: Situation Analysis’, 26-May-10; and Turner, S., Devereux, S., Ellis, F., Freeland, N., Ntseane, D., Seeley, J., Seleka, T. and White, P., ‘A Social Development Policy Framework for Botswana. Phase II: Framework and Strategy’, 26 May 2010. • FoSP Brief No. 9, Mar-11: ‘Social Protection in Botswana - a model for Africa?’ http://www.wahenga.net/node/2102 • Turner, S., White, P., Devereux, S., and Freeland, N. ‘A Child Support Grant for Botswana?’, <i>Thari Ya Bana – Reflections on Children in Botswana 2011</i>, UNICEF-Botswana and University of Botswana, 2011 |
| 2007- | Botswana | <p>Institutional capacity development. GoB establishes new NVAC under MEPD and provides 65% of funding.</p> | <p>Direct RHVP support. RHVP, working through SADC 5-year RVAA Programme, instrumental in supporting NVAC establishment and organizing training for its staff.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RHVP Project Completion Report 16-Feb-11 |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|----------|-------------|--|--|---|
| 2005/06- | Malawi | <p>Programme initiation. GoM establishes near-universal Farm Input Subsidy Programme (FISP) following termination of donor-funded Targeted Inputs Programme and poor 2004/05 crop season. FISP credited with doubling of maize output from 1st to 2nd half of 2000s. Cost averages 12.9% of govt. expenditure and 3.3% of GDP to date, peaking at 18.8% and 6.0% respectively in 2008/09.</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. RHVP study compares FISP with social cash transfers on range of criteria, questions accuracy of official maize output claims, and makes case for a more even expenditure balance between two. RHVP video on FISP features GoM officials responsible for FISP implementation</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FoSP Brief No.1, 2009: 'Fertiliser subsidies and social cash transfers' http://www.wahenga.net/node/759 • REBA book • Ellis, F. & Maliro, D. (forthcoming), 'Fertilizer subsidies and social cash transfers as complementary or competing instruments for reducing vulnerability to hunger: Malawi case-study'. |
| Feb-06 | Malawi | <p>Programme initiation. GoM, with EC support, launches new phase of Income Generating Public Works Programme, alongside ongoing WB-funded Malawi Social Action Fund public works.</p> | <p>Profiled for wider audience. RHVP study on public works in Malawi highlights their putative strengths and observed weaknesses. Wahenga comment explores why public works in Malawi and elsewhere have failed to bring expected benefits.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REBA Case Study No. 11, Nov-07: 'Public works programmes, Malawi' • REBA book • wahenga.comment, 26-Apr-07: 'Public Works Don't!', http://www.wahenga.net/node/1026 |
| 2006- | Malawi | <p>Institutional capacity development. Malawi VAC establishes dedicated Secretariat, with two dedicated technical staff, one GoM funded administrator and one VAA technical advisor housed in MEPD M&E Unit. Redevelops RiskMap software for analytical and modelling purposes and establishes 3 year strategic plan. Use of MVAC information for disaster planning and social support policy.</p> | <p>Direct RHVP support. All work benefits from RHVP funding and technical support.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QPR_2006Q2, Annual Review Prism report Mar-07, PCR 16-Feb-11 and other project reports |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---------|-------------|---|---|--|
| 2006- | Malawi | <p>Programme initiation. GoM establishes social cash transfer pilots with UNICEF support, starting in Mchinji District and later extended to six other districts. Scheme modelled on Zambia Kalomo SCT pilot, with targeting by community committees to 'ultra-poor labour constrained' households, and poverty ranking and 10% cut-off applied within each community.</p> | <p>Direct policy engagement. RHVP interaction with implementing team includes scheme visits and initiation of public debate, involving GoM Director of Social Protection, around merits and drawbacks of discretionary poverty targeting approach to social transfers.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ellis, F. "We are all poor here": economic difference, social divisiveness, and targeting cash transfers in sub-Saharan Africa', conference paper, Social Protection for the Poorest in Africa: Learning from Experience, Uganda , Sep-08 http://www.wahenga.net/sites/default/files/We are all poor here Ellis.pdf • Wahenga.comment, 20-Nov-08 'One Out of Ten: Social Cash Transfer Pilots in Malawi and Zambia' http://www.wahenga.net/node/1010 • 'Malawi's Director of Social Protection responds to "One out of ten" Comment', http://www.wahenga.net/node/1015 • wahenga.comment, 8-Dec-08, 'Five out of ten!' http://www.wahenga.net/node/1014 • FoSP Brief No.2, 2009, 'Poverty targeting – new evidence on spatial and distributional impacts' http://www.wahenga.net/node/1231 |
| 2007 | Malawi | <p>Policy development. National Social Protection Steering Committee adopts a Social Protection Framework setting out principles and guidelines for developing a National Social Protection Policy and Programme.</p> | <p>Direct RHVP support. RHVP team drafts Framework and contributes to 'virtual panel' guiding development of Social Protection Policy and Programme.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malawi Social Protection Framework 19Apr07.doc. • Mulle Chikoko email 14-Feb-07. • Social Protection Policy, Malawi, "Social Protection: a Right for All", (Fourth Draft, 21 February 2008). |
| 2007-08 | Malawi | <p>Policy development. Growing strength of lobby within and outside GoM for old age pension. Ministry of the Elderly requests OAP feasibility study.</p> | <p>Direct RHVP support. RHVP and DFID Malawi discuss case for old age pension following participation on EPRI course. RHVP invited to participate in workshop on</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Workshop report, Katharine Vincent, 31-Oct-07 |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---------|-------------|--|--|--|
| | | | draft National Policy for the Elderly in Oct-07, then undertakes feasibility study with EPRI and HelpAge. | |
| 2009/10 | Malawi | Policy development. GoM develops policy on use of cash transfers in emergency responses | Direct RHVP support. Guidelines developed for GoM by RHVP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QPR 2010 Q2 |
| 2003- | Mozambique | Programme initiation. With FAO support, Ministry of Agriculture establishes annual coupon-based Input Trade Fairs (ITFs) following pilots in wake of 2000-01 floods, aimed at reducing ongoing dependence on emergency programmes, promoting farm-based livelihoods and boosting rural markets. | Profiled for wider audience. RHVP presents draft study of ITFs to MinAg and FAO May-07, highlighting their capacity to boost input sales beyond coupon value and provide sites for achieving other social goals, but noting their limitations as one-off events, with unknown impacts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FE/PW visit report 17-May-07 • REBA Case Study No. 4, Nov-09, http://www.wahenga.net/node/219 |
| 2006- | Mozambique | Programme design change. GoM expands Food Subsidy Programme (PSA), actually a cash transfer, into rural areas and subsequently, with DFID/Dutch support (hitherto entirely GoM-funded), increases both coverage and level of transfer. | Profiled for wider audience. RHVP commissions case study and video of PSA. Case study applauds wide geographical spread and system of community agents (<i>Permanentes</i>), while noting value of transfer low relative to delivery costs. Minister and Director of Women & Social Action, and Director of National Institute for Social Action, provide video commentary. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REBA Case Study No. 7, Nov-09, http://www.wahenga.net/node/224 • REBA book • 'Mozambique Food Subsidy Programme', May-08, RHVP DVD series: <i>Social protection in practice - evidence from southern Africa</i>, http://www.wahenga.net/node/1138 |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---------|-------------|--|--|--|
| 2007-08 | Mozambique | Policy development. GoM seeks to develop national policy on social protection, linking PSA with other initiatives and improving cost-efficiency of latter. | Direct RHVP support. RHVP signs MoU with Ministry of Women & Social Affairs for delivery of policy support on social protection. This follows Minister's attendance (in full!) at Aug-07 RHVP-ILO workshop on social protection, at which RHVP advocacy briefs presented. MoU includes evaluation of PSA delivery system, which recommends ways to improve cost-efficiency. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MoU (Memorando de Entendimento), A.Mabota email 22-Nov-07 • Walker, D. et al. 'Evaluating options to improve the delivery of the Food Subsidy Programme in Mozambique', INAS/RHVP, 1-Aug-08 |
| 2008 | Mozambique | Programme design change. GoM considers electronic delivery systems for its expanded PSA | Direct RHVP support. RHVP requested to undertake feasibility study | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feasibility study report |
| 2007 | Mozambique | Institutional capacity development. NVAC Secretariat established in MinAg Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition (SETSAN) | Direct RHVP support. RHVP instrumental in arranging support for NVAC and establishing its Secretariat | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Annual Review Prism report Mar-07. |
| 2009/10 | Namibia | Institutional capacity development. GoN establishes and funds new NVAC under Office of Prime Minister. NVAC undertakes livelihood zoning and socioeconomic baselines, and engages in high level policy dialogue on VAA assessments. | Direct RHVP support. RHVP, through SADC RVAA PMU, instrumental in NVAC establishment and staff training, and provides dedicated Adviser to support this work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCR, 16-Feb-10, Annual Review 2009 and QPRs |
| 2005- | Swaziland | Programme initiation. GoS establishes and funds Old Age Grant (OAG) for over-60s, coordinated by Ministry of Health & Social Welfare, and scales up to | Profiled for wider audience. RHVP commissions case study of OAG in 2007, noting its capacity to limit hunger & | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REBA Case Study No. 6, Nov-07, http://www.wahenga.net/node/221 • SwaziOAG_Impact_Assessment_Report_final-Nov.pdf |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---------|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | near universal levels by 2007. | vulnerability among recipients and families and suggesting implementation improvements. RHVP sponsors OAG evaluation in 2009/10, confirming positive impacts especially on food security, vulnerability, health, livelihoods and social status. | |
| 2007-09 | Swaziland | Programme design change. GoS interest in electronic delivery systems for Old Age Grant | Direct RHVP support. Request for RHVP technical assistance to interim working group on delivery options. RHVP later requested by Dept. of Social Welfare to undertake impact assessment to provide evidence on case for further support to OAG. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email, John Rook to Lutfo Dlamini, 15-Mar-07; Patricia Musi report on meeting with Dlamini, 16-Mar-07) • Task team minutes • (alas no written communications from Eric Maziya about the impact evaluation – it was all done over the phone) |
| 2007- | Swaziland | Institutional capacity development. New NVAC established under multi-institutional National Disaster Taskforce (NDF), chaired by MinAg and coordinated by CSO. | Direct RHVP support. Through SADC RVAA PMU, RHVP instrumental in NVAC establishment and support. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCR, 2-Feb-11 |
| 2006- | Swaziland | Programme initiation. Under National Plan of Action for OVC, GoS collaborates with National Emergency Council on HIV/AIDS, UNICEF, WFP and NGOs to introduce programmes for OVC and child-headed households, comprising Neighbourhood Care | Profiled for wider audience. RHVP case studies on programmes identify strengths and weaknesses of each, noting challenges in terms of clarity of objectives, élite capture, overestimation of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REBA Case Studies Nos. 14, 15, 16 & 17, Nov-07, http://www.wahenga.net/briefs/case_study • REBA book • 'Swaziland – Initiatives to assist orphans and vulnerable children (OVC)', RHVP DVD series: <i>Social protection in practice</i> - |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|-------|-------------|---|---|--|
| | | Points, School Bursaries, Chief's Fields and Farm Inputs. | community contributions and limited imprint. Scheme officials contribute to RHVP video on programmes. | <i>evidence from southern Africa</i> , May-08 http://www.wahenga.net/node/1140 |
| 2006- | Zambia | Policy development. GoZ establishes Social Protection Sector Advisory Group (SP-SAG), chaired by PS of Ministry of Community Development & Social Services (MCDSS), to guide establishment of National SP Strategy and policymaking. | Direct RHVP support. RHVP represented as member of SP-SAG Technical Working Group on Advocacy. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • QPR 2007-Q4 |
| 2006- | Zambia | Programme initiation. Programme With DFID funding and CARE support, MCDSS oversees expansion of pilot social cash transfer programmes from Kalomo to Monze, Kazungula, Chipata and Katete Districts. | Profiled for wider audience. RHVP case study of Kazungula and Chipata pilots provides lessons on administrative feasibility, targeting accuracy, and cash delivery and expenditure patterns, identifying challenges to replication at scale. MCDSS PS contributes to RHVP video based on case study. At request of SP-SAG, RHVP provides funds and technical assistance for retrospective impact study on Chipata, Kalomo and Kazungula SCTs, and undertakes baseline survey for prospective impact analysis of Monze SCT. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • REBA Case Study No. 2, Nov-07, http://www.wahenga.net/node/217 • REBA book • 'Zambia – Zambia Social Cash Transfers', RHVP DVD series: <i>Social protection in practice - evidence from southern Africa</i>, May-08 http://www.wahenga.net/node/1141 • Tembo, G., <i>Poverty and Social Transfers in Zambia</i>, paper for SADC Parliamentary Forum Workshop, Johannesburg, Nov-09 • Impact study reports |
| 2007 | Zambia | Institutional capacity development. Zambia VAC NVAC | Direct RHVP support. RHVP support to | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCR, 2-Feb-11 |

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---------|-------------|--|--|---|
| | | firmly established with dedicated secretariat, housed and chaired by Disaster Management and Mitigation Unit, under Office of the President, and provided with increasing GoZ budgetary allocation. | institutional sustainability and technical effectiveness of NVAC through SADC RVAA PMU. | |
| 2005 | Zimbabwe | Institutional capacity development. Zim VAC established under Min. of Science and Technology, chaired by Food & Nutrition Council. | Direct RHVP support. RHVP assists NVAC to update livelihood zoning & baselines, and adopt improved VAA methods. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCR, 2-Feb-11 |
| 2009-10 | Zimbabwe | Institutional capacity development. Re-emergence from extremities of political and economic crisis, and prospect of renewed donor support, provides GoZ with opportunities to reinstate dormant social protection programmes. | Direct RHVP support. RHVP collaborates with Dept of Social Services & Multi-Donor Trust Fund to support capacity building initiative for social transfers. This follows RHVP engagement in integrating social protection into DFID-funded Protracted Relief Programme (involving mainly NGOs but also some local government staff), and RHVP workshops on status and potential for social protection. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept Note – Priority capacity building support to the Department of Social Services, 14-Dec-09 |
| 2010-11 | Zimbabwe | Policy development. GoZ develops policy framework for social protection. | Direct RHVP support. Assistance provided to Dept. of Social Services to develop policy framework. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PCR, Feb-11 • TWI reports |

Stakeholder group: Parliamentarians

| Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|-----------------|---|--|--|---|
| July, 2007 | SADC Parliamentary Forum Plenary Assembly, Arusha, Tanzania | SADC-PF Plenary Assembly endorses statement on the importance of the role of social cash transfers in poverty reduction | RHVP invited to show 'A TRANSFER OUT OF POVERTY' documentary and give keynote presentation to the role of cash transfers in poverty reduction at Plenary Assembly meeting. | SADC-PF Plenary Assembly communiqué. |
| November , 2007 | SADC-PF | SADC-PF initiates programme to support awareness and knowledge building amongst parliamentarians and parliamentary staff | RHVP invited to collaborate with SADC-PF in the delivery of the programme and to provide the technical content of policy dialogue events | SADC-PF/RHVP Memorandum of Understanding |
| 2008 - 2010 | Policy dialogue | Positive shift in perceptions of parliamentarians and parliamentary staff towards the need for social transfers as a national instrument for more effective poverty reduction | RHVP collaboration with SADC-PF delivered a total of 10 policy dialogue events to 300 parliamentarians from 10 SADC countries. | <input type="checkbox"/> Workshop reports <input type="checkbox"/> Pre/post workshop perception exercises. <input type="checkbox"/> Two MPs - from Malawi and Zambia - prepared and presented Private Members Motions on issues related to cash transfers |
| November , 2008 | African Union | Adoption of AU 'Social Development Policy Framework for Africa' at first meeting of Ministers responsible for Social Development. Significantly, the adopted draft - version 4 - incorporated social protection as an underlying theme and social transfers as a key instrument for national social development. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. RHVP & Help Age International facilitated 3 Regional Expert Meeting (Maputo, Cairo & Senegal) before Windhoek "ratification" meeting. 2. RHVP invited to participate in final 'Experts Meeting' to review and finalise draft before adopted/ratified by ministers. | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reports of Regional Experts Meetings. 2. AU Social Development Policy Framework document. 3. AU Communiqué of the meeting. |

| | | | | |
|---------------|---------|--|---|---|
| October, 2010 | SADC-PF | SADC-PF recognition of importance of the continuation and expansion of parliamentary policy dialogue process on social transfers | RHVP support to SADC-PF to prepare detail project proposal for submission to donors, including DFID (who had informally indicated interest in continuing support to this process) | 1. SADC-PF Evaluation Report 2. SADC-PF Project Proposal |
|---------------|---------|--|---|---|

Stakeholder group: Media

| What | Date | Who, where? | Change observed | Link to RHVP | Support or evidence for change |
|---|--------------------|--|---|---|---|
| Wahenga Alerts | Ongoing | Wahenga Alerts mailing list - 1632 members | Growing numbers of members; responses on websites (comments); further dissemination of information to colleagues; more traffic to website | Email alerts sent directly to member list notifying them of new papers, programmes or anything else of pertinence | Growing number of members Peaks in website traffic recorded on Google Analytics |
| www.wahenga.net | Ongoing | Global | Consistent traffic to the site over the lifespan of RHVP – feedback from users over time have attested to the site's value | RHVP's website | Google Analytics Email responses from users |
| Twitter | Ongoing | Global | Re-tweeting of stories and growing followers | RHVP/Wahenga twitter account | List of followers and notification of re-tweets |
| "Ever Upwardly Mobile": How do cellphones benefit vulnerable people? - Lessons from | Feb 2009 – ongoing | Global | The "Ever Upwardly Mobile" story was picked up by several websites and news sources all over the world | Report authored by Katharine Vincent, Tracy Cull and Nicholas Freeland | Available on a wide variety of websites and blogs including (but not limited to): IRIN; Eldis; Zunia; ICT Update; EcoChic Magazine; Soul Beat Africa; International Social Security Association (ISSA); MobileActive.org; |

| | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| farming cooperatives in Lesotho | | | | | |
| Training of journalists and communicators by FrayIntermedia | November 2009 to January 2010 | 55 mainstream and community journalists and communicators in Zambia (6 journalists, 8 communicators); Tanzania (5 journalists, 4 communicators); Botswana (15 journalists); Malawi (9 journalists, 3 communicators); and South Africa (5 journalists) | <p>Increased knowledge and understanding on covering poverty, especially in the programme's three main areas of focus: 1) social protection (grants to the poor); 2) vulnerability analysis (who needs assistance); and 3) poverty in general.</p> <p>The training helped journalists:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Spot sound stories on poverty and poverty alleviation in their country • Determine what the big poverty issues of the day are and how to monitor their development • Know how to source such stories, and how to back them up with documentation and expert knowledge • Know how to plan and write stories according to a logical writing | RHVP sponsored the training of these journalists | The evaluation forms filled in by participating journalists and communicators demonstrated that true skills and knowledge transfer took place during the training workshops – and the quality of the stories submitted for adjudication, especially from Malawi, demonstrated this in practice. The facilitators of the workshops were very satisfied with the outcomes, particularly the demonstrable increase in the knowledge of the participants. |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | <p>cycle that is goal-directed</p> <p>The training also helped create local poverty experts/communicators who:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understand their country's media environment and the differences between what each media carries • How to break down complex statistics and studies into concrete stories that are readily accessible to journalists • Know how to conduct interviews with the media • Know which journalists to contact to get a vital message across in the media. <p>Several journalists entered the competition for the best story produced in their country within one month of the</p> | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>training, for which they were awarded a cash prize. The following writers and their media houses were awarded prizes after due adjudication:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zambia: Nebert Mulenga for his feature entitled "Social cash transfer: Passage out of Poverty?" (Times of Zambia, 9 December 2009); • Tanzania: Simon Mkhina for his article "Agricultural revolution, a politicised campaign in Tanzania" (www.tanzaniasnews.net, 21 January 2010); • Botswana: Alvin Ntibinyane for a set of four February 2010 stories entitled "Abject Poverty" (The Midweek Sun), "Helpless mother cries out" (Ghetto Metro), "Paralysed | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | | |
|--|------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>Motsamai pleading for wheelchair” (Ghetto Metro), and “The painful experiences of a former miner” (Southern Extra); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malawi: Michael Kaiyatsa for his feature entitled “Cash Transfers Giving Hope to Vulnerable Women” (Sunday Times, 31 January 2010). • A regional award went to Chipiliro Kansilanga from Malawi for her story “Transferring Cash to Reduce Poverty” (Daily Times, Malawi, 1 March 2010). | | |
| High level policy dialogue: Eradicating extreme poverty & hunger in southern Africa: the role of social protection - | 16 - 17 September 2010 | | Journalists from around the SADC region including Mail & Guardian, IPS, IRIN, Daily Times (print), SABC Channel Africa (radio) and e.tv (television) | Journalists learnt more about the role of social protection as an element of a comprehensive poverty reduction strategy and provided wide coverage of the issues through their various | Media coverage for the event included a large paid for supplement in the Mail & Guardian; a live broadcast from the event by SABC Channel Africa, including interviews with several participants and presenters; a recorded broadcast by e.tv, including interviews with several participants and presenters; and several written online/print articles including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “SOUTHERN AFRICA: Social |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|--|
| | | | | organisations | <p>transfers reduce poverty” by Jaspreet Kindra for IRIN (http://www.irinnews.org/Report.aspx?Reportid=90514)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Social Protection, a Human Right” by Busani Bafana for Inter Press Service (IPS)(http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:ltSEQ-pACyEJ:ipsnews.net/news.asp%3Fidnews%3D52879+SOUTHERN+AFRICA:+Social+Protection,+a+Human+Right&cd=1&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=za&source=www.google.co.za) • “Paying for Social Protection” by Mantoe Phakathi for IPS (http://www.ips.org/africa/2010/09/southern-africa-paying-for-social-protection/) • “No money for social transfers?” by RHVP’s Josee Koch and John Rook for IPS (http://www.ips.org/africa/2011/04/no-money-for-social-transfers/) • “Small Amounts of Cash Make a Big Difference” by Busani Bafana for IPS (http://www.ips.org/africa/2010/09/southern-africa-small-amounts-of-cash-make-a-big-difference/) |
|--|--|--|--|---------------|--|