Key takeaways from the gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection experts' workshop

FILLING THE GAPS TO ACHIEVE GENDER EQUALITY

Final Report
Monday 6th May 2019

© UNICEF/UN0272797/Herwig

Acronyms

CO	Country Office
CVA	Cash and voucher assistance
DFID	United Kingdom's Department for International Development
EC	European Commission
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GAGE	Gender and Adolescence: Global Evidence
GRASSP	Gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection, a research programme by UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti
GSP	Gender Social Protection programme, funded by DFID
IDS	Institute of Development Studies
ILO	International Labor Organization
IPC-IG	International Policy Center for Inclusive Growth
LMICs	Low- and middle-income countries
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SPIAC-B	Social Protection Inter-Agency Cooperation Board
SSN	social safety net
UCL	University College London
UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Empowerment of Women
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
VaW	Violence against Women

Contents

Background and overview

There is an untapped potential for social protection to influence gender equality. International attention on social protection is increasing with more than 3 billion people globally accessing at least one social protection benefit[1] (ILO, 2017). Despite an increase in the number of social protection programmes around the world, including in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), the impact of such programmes on gender dynamics and on adapting their design and implementation in order to achieve gender equality goals is not well explored or understood. Concurrently, our understanding of how social protection addresses risks and vulnerabilities throughout the life course, particularly at critical transitions and turning points, is limited. For instance, adolescence is a critical period in the life course that is increasingly recognised as an opportune time during which social change can be catalysed and life trajectories influenced, yet how best to design and implement social protection programmes in this period is unclear. Despite the importance of both gender and age in social protection programming for positive social change, there is little evidence on how social protection systems and programmes can be more responsive to gender dynamics and sensitive to the specific risks and vulnerabilities of different age groups.

To identify and address these knowledge gaps, 35 experts from academia, practice, and programming working in the fields of gender and social protection (see the workshop's agenda) convened at the UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti (hereafter UNICEF - Innocenti) in Florence, Italy on 6 May 2019. This experts' workshop was part of the inception work on the gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection (GRASSP) research programme funded by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). The workshop had the following objectives:

(1) Identify where the evidence base is robust and where there are evidence gaps that need investments;
(2) Present and discuss a think piece series on gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection and identify potential venues for dissemination;
(3) Build and strengthen a community of researchers and practitioners on gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection, including to advise the GRASSP research programme going forward.

The Experts' workshop included four panel discussions, which covered the state of the evidence on: 1) adolescence and the importance of a life course lens for social protection programming, 2) integrating gender considerations into social protection strategies and programmes, 3) design and implementation issues related to gender-responsive social protection, 4) context-specific issues in gender-responsive social protection in humanitarian, climate change, and complex crises. The workshop also sought to canvas upcoming research on gender and social protection and suggested future research avenues.

---

[1] International Labour organization (ILO) (2017), World Social Protection Report 2017/19: Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. Geneva: ILO.

Filling the Gaps to Achieve Gender Equality: Key takeaways from the gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection experts' workshop

Introduction and keynote address

Achieving gender equality by investing in social protection systems and programmes and in social norm change is a key element of meeting SDG 1 (ending poverty in all its forms) and SDG 5 (gender equality). To do so, building the evidence base to better understand the best levers and mechanisms for gender-responsive social protection across the life course is indispensable.

Dr. Charlotte Watts, Chief Scientific Adviser at DFID delivered a keynote opening address and set a challenge for participants to identify where the evidence base is robust and where the evidence gaps lie, with a focus on 'what works'. Dr. Watts stressed that social protection is a core component of UK aid delivery and, increasingly, cash is a go-to programming option in emergencies. However, this is not an area without political controversy. Cash to vulnerable households receives a mixed response from national constituents in the UK and other donor countries. For example, evidence is needed to create counter-narratives to discourse and myths around dependency and related concerns. As in the case of other sensitive topics, such as investments in the prevention of violence against women (VaW), evidence and research are required to help justify initiative selection and the government's approach.

Dr. Watts raised a series of critical questions that have so far remained unanswered:

➢ What is the long-term exit plan when delivering social protection?
➢ How should partnership arrangements with national governments work?
➢ Who should be receiving the transfer? What difference does it make depending on who it goes to?
➢ How much can we generalise across different contexts?
➢ DFID is very interested in the best size of transfers and in effects and risks of cash vs other transfers (e.g. food vouchers vs cash). What is the value of conditionality or incentives? Are there trade-offs? What are the nuances between the value (politically) of a certain intervention versus its actual impact on outcomes? Is cash alone enough for social and economic empowerment or must it be accompanied by gender components in the design?
➢ How much does it cost to implement and deliver these programmes? Costing and cost-effectiveness are under-researched with limited data available, but not unimportant in terms of value for money.
➢ How to think about flexibility of social protection delivery? For example, what about insurance-based systems that can be expanded or rolled out during shocks and be scaled up or down as necessary?

The four expert panels

The four panels explored a range of conceptual and empirical issues that have implications on the thinking around gender and social protection. Panel 1 discussed the importance of adopting a life course lens when conceptualising and implementing gender-responsive social protection programming. Panel 2 presented conceptual and empirical research on how a gender analysis can be embedded in social protection strategies and programmes. Panel 3 discussed the evidence base on the design and delivery features that are most important for gender-responsive social protection programmes. Case studies also presented country-specific examples of how social

protection programmes have succeeded or failed to appropriately mainstream gender into social protection design and delivery. Panel 4 discussed the complexity of translating programmes and assumptions across different contexts, including emergency settings.

The panels drew from a series of think pieces commissioned by UNICEF - Innocenti from selected academics, practitioners, donors, and international organizations working in the fields of gender and social protection. The rich discussions served to share knowledge and thinking, and to create linkages between the evidence base and evidence gaps, as well as policy and programming. The discussions at the experts' workshop formed the foundation for the GRASSP research programme and provided the basis for informed deliberations during the GRASSP Inception workshop, including on the conceptual framework for the DFID-funded programme on gender-responsive social protection (GSP programme), which was held the following day on 7 May 2019 at UNICEF - Innocenti.

The four panels are outlined below, and links to presentations are available in Annex II.

The first panel discussed the importance of adopting a life course lens when conceptualising and implementing gender-responsive social protection programming. Case studies grounded the discussion with practical examples of how this has or can be done in different country contexts. The panel was moderated by Shreyasi Jha (UNICEF) who stressed that gender inequality manifests throughout the life course but in different ways depending on the life course period and its specific risks and vulnerabilities.

Adolescents: policy opportunities and challenges
Professor Maxine Molyneux (University College London) presented the think piece on what a life course lens means for adolescence, the risks and vulnerabilities that adolescents might face or experience, and how social protection can respond to these.

- Adolescence is minimally reflected in the SDGs, research, and policy. Adolescents' rights are either ignored, subsumed into either children or adults' categories, or exclusively perceived as socially threatening and irresponsible. Yet adolescents face specific risks and vulnerabilities, including (but not limited to): poverty; school drop-out and poor education; high unemployment rates; preventable diseases; sexual and reproductive health problems; mental health issues; early marriage and childbearing; and long-term impacts of austerity policies.
- On the other hand, adolescence is a period of rapid biological change in which young people experience puberty, their brains change rapidly, gender differences emerge, and gender divisions and roles deepen with gender socialization processes. It also has the potential for long-term durable positive social change. Adolescents are a growing demographic group, with the global population of adolescents and young people expected to reach two billion by 2030.
- Social protection can be an essential building block in the range of policies needed for adolescents. These must be based on human rights frameworks and should include quality education, health service provision, a robust justice system, and safe spaces. Within social protection, cash transfer programmes have had positive effects on children and their households, including reducing child labour and malnutrition and increasing schooling and health service use. They can also reduce exclusion and enhance self-esteem. There is little evidence that cash transfers can impact intra-household decision-making, gender roles, gender inequality, or power relations. However, where such programmes have clear equality goals and are accompanied by relevant services, the chance of more significant changes, especially for those most vulnerable (girls, women, disabled, sexual, ethnic and religious minorities), is greater.
- Design features of social protection programmes are key in promoting positive norm changes. Examples include: females being the recipients of transfers rather than males; sharing the burden of meeting the conditionalities among others in the household; specifying gender outcomes, such as girls' schooling as social protection objectives; and affordable or free childcare. However, design features of social protection programmes could also reinforce unequal gender roles and harmful gender stereotypes, for instance by treating mothers and daughters as exclusively responsible for care and domestic work, imposing heavy conditionalities, or excluding fathers from parenting sessions.
- While social protection can contribute to positive norm change, it is a complex process and is often accompanied by larger structural socio-economic processes, such as urbanization, secularization, education/skills training, and legal norm change. Moreover, gender norm change is relational, impacting on different individuals and their relations between each other, and women adapt to norm change more and more easily than men. Where individuals close to women can see the benefit from norm change, the process is likely to be less risky for women and girls. Importantly, erosion of harmful norms must be substituted with new positive norms.

- Policies and programmes should include adolescents within existing services where possible, giving them due voice and representation in policy processes and projects. Policies and programmes should also be gender-focused, 'pro-equality', and prioritized based on context-specific needs. Given the multidimensional risks and vulnerabilities affecting adolescents, policies and programmes must be 'joined up'.
- Any data collected must be disaggregated by sex and age. Although research should be context-based, efforts should be made to conduct comparative analysis across contexts.

The transformative potential of social protection public works to empower adolescent girls and young women
Roopa Hinton (DFID) presented the think piece written by Emmeline Skinner and Benjamin Zeitlyn (both DFID Mozambique at the time of writing the think piece). The piece discussed a new public works programme in Mozambique which focuses on facilitating adolescent transition to a safe, healthy, and productive adulthood.

- While the Government of Mozambique has put social protection as a central pillar in its poverty reduction strategy, existing programmes reach a limited share of the poor population. Moreover, existing public works programmes have been gender-blind insofar as they rarely consider needs and opportunities for adolescents. They also rarely create decent work or skills-building opportunities for young people.
- The Government of Mozambique is piloting the MUVA programme, with funding from DFID, to target adolescent girls and young women from poor households and provide skills-building and apprenticeship opportunities. In doing so, the programme seeks to focus on the delivery of services, rather than on building assets.
- As the programme is in its pilot phase, some key challenges still need to be addressed, including managing complex partnerships, enhancing the quality of services delivered, and ensuring safeguarding issues are addressed.

Enhancing adolescents' capabilities through adolescent- & gender-responsive social protection
Tia Palermo (UNICEF – Innocenti, now University at Buffalo) presented the think piece on adolescent capabilities and adolescent- and gender-responsive social protection (co-author Maja Gavrilovic, UNICEF -Innocenti).

- Gender inequalities need to be addressed to achieve sustainable poverty reduction. Structural constraints impede access to productive, physical, social, and human capital assets for women and girls. Adolescence is a period during the life course where gender socialization intensifies. Poverty drives adverse coping strategies at the individual and household level, which can result in adverse outcomes, for example on girls' sexual and reproductive health. This is compounded by barriers to access to appropriate healthcare due to harmful social norms.
- In sub-Saharan Africa, social protection programmes targeting adolescents have rarely used a gender lens to understand exposure to risk and vulnerabilities or to inform social protection design.
- It is important to ask how social protection can mitigate adverse secondary outcomes and promote gender equality outcomes, such as empowerment, prevention of violence, early marriage and pregnancy, and redistribution of unpaid care work. Answering this question can contribute to increasing feasibility, relevance, and sustainability of social protection programmes. Other questions to be addressed include:

    1) What is the potential of social protection to enhance adolescents' capabilities across multiple domains?

2) How do gender norms and other barriers moderate or impede the impacts of social protection programmes on these outcomes?
3) Is there a path for social protection to change these moderators?

Evidence has shown positive impacts across multiple domains, particularly in school enrolment. In most studies, cash transfer programmes were found to reduce child labour (except in three countries) and delay early marriage and pregnancy (except in four countries). Limited evidence was found on positive impacts on mental health, HIV reduction, and some sexually transmitted infections. While many of these effects were short-term, some studies (for example on Latin American conditional cash transfers) have found sustained positive effects on labour market outcomes.

Positive effects of cash transfer programmes are moderated by gender norms, roles and expectations, quality and accessibility of schools and health facilities, and access to markets. While social protection cannot fully address gender inequality, it needs to be cognizant of gender dynamics and promote gender equality outcomes.

Evidence gaps remain in terms of: 1) understanding relative impacts of different design features of social protection programmes and how they can be leveraged for gender equality outcomes; 2) how different programmes can be integrated with additional services to address demand and supply-side barriers and multidimensional poverty and vulnerabilities; 3) understanding the role that gender norms and other barriers play in moderating the impact of social protection programmes.

Child marriage and social protection
Ellen Travers (Girls not Brides) presented evidence on the linkages between child marriage and social protection.

- The evidence base on the effectiveness of social protection programmes (compared to other types of interventions) for decreasing the proportion of girls married early or increasing the age at marriage is mixed. There are positive findings for some types of economic programmes, such as incentives to remain in school and payment of school fees, and mixed findings for conditional and unconditional cash transfers.
- The evidence base also varies by age. Multicomponent programmes in three countries in Africa found that the impact of different social protection programmes varies by age of adolescents.
- Moreover, qualitative research on a conditional cash transfer in India found some households might have misinterpreted the objectives of the programme and assumed that the cash transfer was intended to be used to cover the girls' dowry.
- In humanitarian settings, the evidence base is also mixed with some cash transfer programmes found to deter early marriage during crises without changing the underlying attitudes and beliefs that normalise it.
- In conclusion, while there is some evidence that cash transfer programmes can help delay marriage, the longer-term impact on social norms and attitudes is unclear. Social protection alone is not enough and can have unintended impacts if not combined with approaches that address all drivers of child marriage and challenge the root causes of gender inequality and social norms. The impact of cash transfer programmes on girls' expectations and aspirations over the long-term is also unclear.

Outcome 1. The importance of adolescence within the life course

- Applying a life course lens to social protection is important and adolescence is a critical stage that requires more attention. While there are many ways to apply an 'age-sensitive' lens, more impactful returns on investment are gained when focusing on adolescence, which is a critical period for preventing the perpetuation of inequality. More needs to be known about programmes that engage youth age groups from a systems perspective. There is also an evidence gap on the benefits of considering multiple life stages to unpack longer-term impacts of social protection.
- While adolescence is a critical stage in the life course, investments in this period should not be at the expense of other age groups. An example is how programme targeting affects the mothers and grandmothers of adolescents. While vulnerabilities are cumulative along the life course, the converse is also the case, i.e. building protection is also cumulative. To date, most social protection spending in LMICs has focused on older age groups at the expense of youth who have less political power, partly because they do not formally participate in the decision-making process through voting in elections. More research is needed on social protection programmes that work for adolescents (such as cash transfer for girls' empowerment, delaying early marriage, and increased education) and across the life course.

Outcome 2. Understanding gender norms

- The evidence on how to best make a dent in gender norms is still scant. The role and focus of social protection programmes to contribute to this is even more unclear.
- Given the mixed results of cash transfers on child marriage and the absence of results related to shifts in attitudes, to what extent should social protection be dealing with behavioural change versus other sectors?
- The inclusion of women in social protection programmes can affect gender norms, for example through enhancing education outcomes.
- More research is needed to understand how to shift harmful gender norms.
- The role of the labour market and specific policies and programmes is an area that needs strengthening in order to understand how it can contribute to shifting gender norms.

Outcome 3. The political economy of social protection

- The role of the political economy matters in the programme design phase to ensure sustained gains. While having a gender-sensitive or responsive design is critical, the implementation phase does not always follow through. The challenge to achieving outcomes in some settings is the capacity for programme implementation and follow-up.
- The role of governments and social protection programmes, such as public works schemes and school-to-work programmes, and their relationship to responsive or unresponsive job markets raises important supply and demand questions in most economies given the burgeoning youth population. The role of the private sector in shifting norms around women's work vis-à-vis the public sector is also a critical element in the analysis of the political economy of social protection. How to balance soft and hard public works for women needs unpacking, drawing on lessons from other initiatives, such as the strengthened guidance for public works for women in Ethiopia.

Outcome 4.   Child and youth participation and co-creation
- Youth participation during research and programme design is consistently overlooked despite some examples, such as youth-led organisations working on child marriage, which have shifted power imbalances and enhanced outcomes. Meaningful participation of youth in the research design and throughout the research cycle are key aspects in need of further exploration and development.

The second panel presented research on how a gender analysis can be embedded into social protection strategies and programmes. The panel first discussed how gender can be conceptually integrated into social protection programmes. It then focused on how this has been done in national social protection strategies and programmes, including in design, implementation, and Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E).

Potential for systematically integrating gender into social protection: conceptual reflections on the 'why' and 'how' and implications for research
Maja Gavrilovic (UNICEF - Innocenti) presented[2] on why social protection needs to consider gender, how to respond to gender dimensions of poverty and vulnerability, and how gender can be integrated into the programming cycle.

- Evidence shows that poverty and vulnerability are gendered. Gender gaps in access and uptake of social protection benefits remain, in part due to structural disadvantages in the labour market which constrain women's ability to contribute to social security. In addition, lack of attention to gender may lead to adverse outcomes and unintended consequences for gender relations.
- The *gender integration continuum* is a diagnostic tool to understand how gender can be integrated into programming. It refers to the degree to which a gender perspective is integrated into a programme. It ranges from gender-discriminatory, gender-blind or neutral, gender-sensitive, gender-responsive, to gender-transformative.
- In practice, most social protection programmes sit between gender-sensitive and gender-responsive. Moreover, while programmes can be gender-sensitive or responsive in design, there is often a discrepancy in the implementation stage. There is also no agreement on whether and to what degree programmes should explicitly work towards transformative outcomes or how best to do it.
- A second tool is the *gender marker*, which categorizes programmes based on whether 1) they address gender only in some poverty dimensions (gender-sensitive), 2) they address gender in a systematic way, but gender equality is not a primary objective (gender-responsive), and 3) they address gender equality and women's empowerment as its main focus (gender-transformative).
- *Gender mainstreaming* is a long-term strategy to ensure that gender equality is systematically considered in all stages of the policy/programme cycle.
- The following evidence gaps remain: 1) gender norms - how they are measured, how they affect the exposure to and experience of poverty and risks, and how social protection can take masculinity and gender norms into account; 2) how different social protection programmes are gender-sensitive, responsive, or transformative, and the relative performance in achieving outcomes; and 3) the political economy of social protection (whether mainstreaming gender is always desirable, realistic, and feasible, and what factors influence, facilitate, or constrain the adoption of gender-aware programmes).

How gender-responsive are national social protection strategies? A global review
Silke Staab (UN Women) presented the preliminary findings of a global review of national social protection strategies conducted by UN Women.

---

[2] The presentation draws from three toolkits published by FAO in 2018 that provided technical support to policymakers to enhance their knowledge of and skills in gender-sensitive social protection programmes, with specific focus on cash transfers and public works. FAO (2018), Promoting gender-sensitive social protection programmes to combat rural poverty and hunger. Rome, Italy.

- A methodological framework was developed to assess the extent to which social protection strategies are gender-sensitive across: 1) Overarching strategic framework; 2) Gender-specific vulnerabilities / structural inequalities; 3) Policy and programme design; and 4) Governance, monitoring, and evaluation. 72 national social protection strategies were identified across seven regions. It was noted that this is a limited sample and might become outdated over time as new strategies are implemented. A second limitation is the absence of a global repository of national social protection strategies, which could facilitate comparative research.
- The preliminary findings for 22 strategies suggest a huge variation in terms of gender-sensitivity across countries. Starting with the overarching strategic framework, it was found that most countries consider the life course approach to social protection, half include gender equality and women's empowerment as a goal, and few refer to the issue of gender gaps in social protection coverage. Secondly, very few countries explicitly recognise early and child marriage as a risk. Barriers to education and teen pregnancy also seem to receive mixed recognition. Thirdly, there is a limited recognition of specific actions to close gender gaps. Lastly, very few countries include gender-specific indicators in M&E.

A gender analysis of social protection programmes in low- and middle-income countries: preliminary findings
Elena Camilletti (UNICEF Innocenti)[3] presented preliminary findings of a mapping and gender analysis of social protection programmes in LMICs.

- National social protection programmes[4] can integrate gender in their design, implementation, governance, and M&E, so that their features can be categorised as gender-sensitive, responsive, or transformative. A sample of LMICs was selected matching UN Women's sample and the same methodological framework was used (with some adaptations related to social protection programmes). The four dimensions of the methodological framework are 1) Overarching legal and policy framework; 2) Gendered risks and structural inequalities; 3) Design and delivery; 4) M&E and grievance, feedback and complaint mechanisms.
- Preliminary findings for 19 programmes across seven regions show that most programmes are at best gender-sensitive, with few that could be regarded as gender-responsive and even fewer as gender-transformative. While most social protection programmes are enshrined in national legal frameworks, few are supported by national strategies with gender equality and women's empowerment at their core. Less than half consider child rights in their objectives and only two involved the gender ministry in the programme design and implementation. Among the programmes that include child rights among the objectives, most refer to enrolment or attendance gaps as gendered risks and vulnerabilities. Only two programmes recognised unpaid care and domestic work as a structural inequality. Further, around half of the programmes specifically targeted women or girls in poverty. Of the four programmes with conditionalities, only one led to sanctions. Only two programmes have integrated gender considerations in capacity-building toolkits or operational manuals for implementers. Finally, there was very little recognition of the importance of gender in relation to the M&E framework, either in sex disaggregation and even less in gender-specific indicators.

---

[3] Research assistance provided by Abha Saxena, independent consultant.
[4] Social protection programmes are categorized as per ISPA CODI as: 1) non-contributory or social assistance, 2) contributory or social insurance; 3) labour market programmes; 4) social care services, and 5) general subsidies.

Gender and social protection in South Asia: an assessment of non-contributory programmes' design

Charlotte Bilo (co-author Raquel Tebaldi, both IPC-IG) presented the preliminary findings of a gender analysis of non-contributory social protection programmes in South Asia (commissioned by UNICEF South Asia) to understand how these programmes are gender-sensitive.

- 51 non-contributory programmes were reviewed. The methodological framework draws from UN Women's methodological framework (see above), FAO 2018 toolkit, and ODI and UNICEF studies on the topic.
- Preliminary findings show that for most of the analysed programmes it was not possible to identify whether gender vulnerability assessments had been conducted or had informed programme design. Programme objectives related to gender equality and women's empowerment were found in about half of the programmes, the most common being barriers to education, maternal health, income risks, widowhood or single parents, and barriers to the labour market. However, little evidence was found on the mechanisms to monitor these objectives.
- Most programmes either target or prioritize women or specific groups of women, while few programmes (mostly scholarships) target adolescent girls. When linked to complementary services, these are in most cases focused on nutrition and health, but some also provide trainings on financial literacy, asset creation, and skills development. Most child-related complementary services are targeted at women, with fathers rarely being included.
- Finally, most programmes provide sex-disaggregated information on beneficiaries, but few were evaluated regarding their impacts on gender outcomes. Less than half use some form of community monitoring or social audits.
- While social protection programmes alone will not change discriminatory gender norms, they can help address gender- and age-based vulnerabilities and risks if these are considered throughout the programme cycle.

Discussion and key outcomes

Outcome 1.   What level of gender 'ambition' for what social protection programme and features?
- How and why gender matters for social protection programmes is linked to understanding how poverty and vulnerability are gendered. Gender gaps also create barriers to access and uptake of social protection. Much research has shown how a lack of attention to gender may lead to adverse outcomes. Moreover, how gender is integrated into social protection will depend on the category of social protection programmes: contributory/social insurance, non-contributory/social assistance, labour market programmes, social care services, and subsidies.

Outcome 2.   Human rights and legal frameworks
- Social protection programmes do not work in isolation but are generally embedded in human rights and legal frameworks. Understanding the role of law-making and enforcement as part of the strategy for rights holders to contest and appeal access to benefits is critical to investigate their gendered aspects. Women, particularly in rural areas, tend to have barriers, such as literacy or lack of knowledge of entitlements, which can limit their capacity to make claims and hold states accountable, with implications for their access to social protection benefits.

Outcome 3.   Social protection beyond cash transfer and poverty reduction
- While many evidence generation efforts focus on non-contributory programmes, the objectives of social protection go beyond poverty reduction, including risk pooling and

consumption smoothing across the life course. More research is needed that considers integrating gender into these social protection programmes.

Outcome 4.   Beyond social protection: what else is needed?
- While social protection can contribute to gender equality, it cannot achieve gender equality alone, but instead needs to be embedded in a system of policies, programmes, and instruments. Moreover, social protection does not operate in a vacuum, rather it is embedded into other policy systems that have considerable influence on social protection and moderate its potential to achieve outcomes. For instance, inequalities and tax transfers systems may have a gender bias.
- Future research should explore the appropriate methodologies and approaches to tackle these broader important questions and draw from multi-disciplinary perspectives together to tackle research questions.

Outcome 5.   Research and knowledge gaps
- It is critical that the much-needed evidence that will be generated – both research and data – is available and accessible to everyone, including researchers and individuals. Comparative research and knowledge sharing can be facilitated through global online repositories of legal and policy documents of national social protection strategies and programmes.

Gender in design and implementation of social protection: A case study of India's MGNREGA
Deepta Chopra (IDS) presented her think piece discussing India's MGNREGA, a public works programme that guarantees 100 days of paid employment in rural areas, and how it integrates gender into its design and implementation.

- The assessment of the design features suggests some are more gender-transformative than others. For instance, the 100 days of paid employment on community-prioritized public works projects to each rural family that wants and is able to work, leaves open the possibility of household-level bargaining, reflecting the false assumption that women can get social protection through their family structures. On the other hand, the features like a crèche, a child carer on the worksite, and assigning work closer to home recognise women's role as care-providers and as having gender-related constraints. Yet, the implementation does not follow through. For example, women work if they have to, but they drop-out if they can because of the lack of childcare facilities and infrastructure.
- Design features must incorporate a life-cycle approach considering gendered risks and vulnerabilities arising from women's roles as unpaid caregivers, workers, and decision-makers in the household and beyond. Participation in public works programmes is not free in terms of time and energy, so returns must be substantial and not tokenistic, with links to infrastructure and services. Women must be considered within their social milieu so that benefits are spread across generations in a sustainable way. Finally, implementers must be trained on gender issues, and M&E systems must be strong and monitor the impact of gender and non-gendered provisions on outcomes.

Towards gender equality: Social Safety Nets, evidence gaps and priority research questions
Amber Peterman (UNICEF - Innocenti) presented a think piece (co-authors Neha Kumar, Audrey Pereira, and Dan Gilligan, IFPRI) that seeks to respond to three questions: Are social safety nets increasing women's well-being along key domains in Africa? If so (or if not), do we know what design features matter? What evidence commitments are needed to get us to be able to meet aspirational goals?

- Findings show that few evaluations unpack design features. Of these, the evidence on the importance of the recipient's gender, conditionalities, and behavioural features is inconclusive. Some evidence exists on the importance of payment size, delivery mechanisms, and integration with other services and programmes.
- The following data and research gaps remain: 1) many indicators are still collected at the household level, masking individual-level outcomes; 2) many evaluations only consider women's outcomes without concurrently examining men's and women's outcomes; and 3) a direct measure of empowerment is lacking.
- Additional gaps include: the need for more evidence or evidence synthesis on sub-Saharan Africa compared to other regions; studies of cost-effectiveness and value for money; and research on critical issues that lack evidence, including social protection in humanitarian and fragile settings, and the use of technology in social protection.

Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment through Social Protection: Lessons from Tanzania
Flora Myamba (Social protection and gender specialist and TRANSFORM trainer) presented her think piece on Tanzania's Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) programme and the implications for women's economic empowerment.

- Social protection in low-income countries in Africa is generally not designed with a gender lens despite some positive effects, including enabling women's access to productive assets, promoting access to credit, increased economic gains by investing in economic assets, and increased women's decision-making power and choices.
- In Tanzania, major constraints to women's economic empowerment include: limited access to financial services; time use due to unpaid care and domestic work; high fertility rates due to unmet needs for contraception and sexual and reproductive health services; constrained decision-making; and intimate partner violence.
- Social protection programmes in Africa and beyond have sought to address women's economic empowerment, including Ethiopia's PSNP and Tanzania's PSSN. The PSSN has around 1.1 million beneficiary households, of which over 51 per cent are female-headed. 83 per cent of the recipients are women. Studies have demonstrated the acceptance of women and girls as transfer beneficiaries, the positive effects of the programme on women's savings, assets and livelihoods, and the increased contraceptive knowledge among females (but not males). However, some adverse outcomes were also found, particularly the risk of gender-based violence and increased workload for women. Strong cultural norms and gender stereotypes persist.
- The programme thus designed and implemented a *Gender Action Plan* that sought to 1) create a competent and functional Gender Team, 2) implement gender training for PSSN at all levels, 3) integrate gender equality/women's economic empowerment in the design and implementation of cash transfers, public works, and livelihoods, 4) strategic integration of Digitize, Direct & Design--D3 for women principles into PSSN, 5) enhance women's rights, control over household resources, and decision-making, and 6) establish a grievance reporting system that responds to women's needs.
- If their outcomes are to be achieved, social protection programmes such as the PSSN must integrate a gender lens into the design, ensure capacity strengthening at all levels, and provide community education activities related to gender equality or women's economic empowerment for both men and women.

Discussion and key outcomes and questions

Outcome 1. Understanding gender norms and empowerment
- Social and gender norms underpin individuals' expectations and behaviours and interact with other factors influencing the exposure and experience of poverty, risks and vulnerabilities. It is still unknown how social protection interacts with norms. Do social and gender norms moderate the outcomes?
- The evidence on whether social protection can affect gender norms is still scant. What is the right entry point or lever in social protection programming for gender norm change? How can social protection adopt a gender norms lens into its design?
- Methodological advancements and measurement efforts are needed to monitor change. How can social and gender norms be measured in rapidly evolving population groups such as children and adolescents? How can empowerment be measured rigorously for these population groups? How can it be done both at the individual and system level?

Outcome 2. Investigating design features for gender equality
- Design elements are important, but it is still unclear which ones matter most. While there are some examples on the types of design and implementation features, evidence gaps remain on systematically understanding the variations of the social protection benefit value, its recipient, and other design features across contexts, and to unpack how they influence outcomes.

Moreover, a conceptual and theoretical gap remains regarding what different social protection programmes can do and for which (gender) outcomes.

Outcome 3.   Cost-effectiveness and value for money
- Little is known about the cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness of specific social protection programmes in relation to specific gender outcomes. Future research is needed comparing social protection programmes and their relative performance in relation to gender equality.
- It is also crucial that future research closely scrutinizes the financing of social protection programmes to understand not only how much a social protection programme can cost and what it can achieve, but also how it can be financed.

Outcome 4.   Beyond design and implementation: M&E matters
- Gender is often considered in design and implementation, but not captured, bolstered, or considered during data collection or M&E. This is a critical programming and knowledge/evidence gap. More needs to be done to strengthen M&E systems and measurements, especially considering the political economy around both gender and social protection which can impose 'stubborn' politics and ideological barriers to gender analysis from within governments.

Gender, Social Protection, and Resilience
Elizabeth Koechlein and Mari Kangasniemi (FAO) presented their think piece that positions resilience at the centre of social protection and gender.

- Resilience is a critical concept given the socio-economic processes shaping poverty, risks, and vulnerabilities. Food security and hunger are increasing in many parts of the world, in part due to climate-related shocks and disaster losses in the agricultural sector. Women and girls living in rural areas face unique challenges, risks, and vulnerabilities, particularly related to informality, invisibility, lack of services, and the pervasiveness of discriminatory norms and practices. These impact their capacities to prepare for, cope with, and recover from shocks compared to men and boys.
- Following the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, social protection has been more strongly recognised as a means to contribute to disaster risk reduction and humanitarian response. Increasing investments have been made in humanitarian settings through cash transfer and voucher programmes, and on building shock-responsiveness into 'mature' social protection systems.
- Evidence gaps remain on how best to integrate gender into social protection to address covariate shocks. The most critical gaps are: 1) conceptualizing and measuring gender from a social protection systems perspective, including empowerment and voice; and 2) measuring resilience by applying a gender lens.
- The *Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI)* measures the empowerment, agency and inclusion of women in the agricultural sector, with an aim to improve understanding of the connections between women's empowerment, food security, and agricultural growth.
- An example of a social protection programme that responds to shocks by understanding resilience and women's empowerment is Lesotho's response to El Niño-induced crisis which was incorporated into the existing Child Grant Programme. Prior to the crisis, the country had considerable gender inequalities, with women being heads of the households in a patriarchal system, and with women in limited leadership positions. The Child Grant Programme was scaled up in response to the drought and food crisis. In addition, the Sustainable Poverty Reduction through Income, Nutrition and Access to Government Services (SPRINGS) pilot project was implemented. This provided support in the form of community-based savings and lending groups, together with financial education, homestead gardening, nutrition training, market clubs for training on market access, and one-stop-shop citizen services outreach days. Recent and ongoing evaluations of the Child Grant Programme and the SPRINGS project using the WEAI approach will help inform if and how social protection can boost resilience by integrating gender.

Social protection in humanitarian contexts: How can programming respond to adolescent- and gender-specific vulnerabilities and promote young people's resilience?
Nicola Jones, Director of Gender and Adolescence: Global Evidence (GAGE) – consortium hosted by the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) presented her think piece on the role of social protection in humanitarian settings and how it can promote young people's resilience by responding to adolescent-specific and gender-specific vulnerabilities.

- Approaching social protection through an adolescent and gender lens is critical in humanitarian contexts. Despite significant investments in cash transfer programming, amounting to US$ 2.8 billion (CaLP, 2018), there has been limited focus on addressing the intersection of age and gender vulnerabilities. Moreover, studies have found that young people under the age of 20 are disproportionately affected by humanitarian crises. CaLP states

that there is a need to strengthen the evidence on cash transfer programmes and gender equality, specifically on sub-populations of concern, which may also help to bridge gaps in protection evidence.

- For those studies that have considered adolescents and young people, the evidence is primarily focused on education and health outcomes, while gaps remain in other adolescent vulnerabilities, such as violence, psychosocial vulnerabilities, and economic empowerment. Moreover, gender influences the vulnerabilities that adolescents and young people experience. For instance, girls are at a heightened risk of child marriage and school drop-out, while boys of child labour.

- Examples of social protection programmes that consider gender and adolescence in humanitarian contexts are few. The first set of examples are labelled *cash transfer programmes for education outcomes*, such as: 1) UNICEF's cash transfer programme targeting refugee children in Lebanon, with adolescents receiving higher stipends and support services for truant children; 2) UNICEF's Hajati cash transfer programme in Jordan targeting refugee and host community children, with adolescent centres identifying and referring out of school children and offering educational mentoring, life skills, psychosocial support, and child protection referrals; 3) Turkey's conditional cash transfer for education providing cash to offset education costs and higher stipends for secondary enrolment and girls; and 4) South Sudan's girls' education cash transfer.

- The second set of examples of social protection programmes that consider gender and adolescence in humanitarian contexts are *protection-related cash-plus initiatives*. An example is the IRC's cash-plus gender-based violence (GBV) programme in Jordan, which provides cash unconditionally in addition to case management support to victims of intimate partner violence (IPV) and gender discussion groups for peer support.

- The third category is *national cash transfer programmes evaluated through an adolescent and gender lens*. For instance, the Palestinian National Cash Transfer programme in Gaza and the West Bank is targeted using proxy means testing and categorical targeting for people with disabilities and chronic illnesses. Another example is a cash transfer programme provided by UNHCR and UNICEF to Syrian refugee households using a vulnerability index, which was found to improve adolescent well-being by enabling access to more and better food, school supplies, clothes, and school transport.

- More research is needed on social protection programmes in humanitarian contexts. Firstly, it is critical that these programmes include a rigorous M&E system that collects gender- and age-disaggregated data to maximize learning from household-targeted and adolescent-focused social protection. Secondly, it is critical to ensure programme design considers crisis characteristics and stages, and embeds a longer-term development perspective from the outset. Thirdly, policymakers, implementers, and donors must embed an analysis of adolescents' multidimensional vulnerabilities into programme design from the outset, including consideration of labelled cash transfers to delay marriage and tertiary education. Finally, programme design should support linkages and referrals to complementary programme modalities. These include a) safe spaces where adolescents can meet peers from refugee and host communities; b) child protection prevention and response services given heightened vulnerability to abuse; c) informal education for out of school adolescents; d) investment in gender-sensitive WASH services (separate toilets, menstruation dignity kits); and e) tailored outreach and inclusive services for adolescents with disabilities.

Social protection in humanitarian settings
Jacobus de Hoop (UNICEF Innocenti) presented evidence on social protection for child and adolescent well-being in humanitarian settings.

- The push for using cash transfers in humanitarian aid has been enshrined in the Grand Bargain[5], and motivated by a three-fold rationale to enhance cost-efficiency, boost local markets, and ensure flexibility and agency. Yet the evidence base on social protection programmes in humanitarian settings is lacking, including on the relative performance of cash transfer modalities. Different studies have identified the need to build such a research agenda given that the effects of cash transfer programmes on people's well-being might differ from those in stable settings. Moreover, humanitarian settings might include constraints to local capacity, as well as complex challenges, such as trauma and volatile funding.
- UNICEF Lebanon's No Lost Generation is an example of a cash transfer programme that has an explicit age or gender-lens. It is based on the enrolment in second shift public schools and the receipt of the Min Ila cash transfer, with the objective of alleviating burdens to increase school attendance. The impact evaluation of the programme has found positive effects on child well-being, including food security and child health. However, considerations must be made on the capacity constraints to deliver such programmes and on benchmarking against multi-purpose cash.

Understanding access to social protection for forcibly displaced populations
Rachel Sabates-Wheeler (IDS) presented evidence on social protection in contexts of displacement.

- The number of refugees and internally displaced people (IDPs) is likely to continue to grow given the recurrence of disasters and political conflicts. At the same time, there is an increasing concern about the financial and institutional capacity of 'receiving' locations. Moreover, the current evidence base leaves little space for examining the rights and needs of people on the move.
- Together with many other socioeconomic factors in the country/setting of origin, the lack of access to social protection and to basic services can represent one factor behind the decision to migrate. It can also be a driver of the decision to return.
- To understand access to social protection in contexts of displacement, a set of factors must be considered, including the institutional and democratic deficits, the state versus non-state provision, humanitarian principles, the need to coordinate response, and bridging short- and long-term provisions.
- Decisions to move are gendered, significantly impacting family and gendered patterns of care. In certain contexts, the informal provision of social protection may serve needs better if there are transnational care networks.
- Social protection provision in contexts of displacement is constrained by several factors. First, the rise of the far-right movement in many settings is closing the space for thinking about rights and needs of people on the move. Secondly, the economic slowdown has put additional financial constraints on social protection provision. Thirdly, there is a deep-rooted notion that the needs of the displaced can only be met through humanitarian assistance. Fourthly, the multi-stakeholder coordination in contexts of displacement must be examined in its political economy, considering local, national, and international actors, each with their own interests, priorities, and set ups.
- Opportunities exist for designing social protection systems to accommodate displaced populations. International frameworks such as the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (2016) have also contributed to the social protection debates. There is increasing interest in linking humanitarian response to social protection systems, such as through harmonising targeting, payment and delivery systems, and through single registries. Some positive examples exist in the field of shock-responsive social protection, such as integrating

---

[5] The Grand Bargain is an agreement between over 30 of the biggest donors and aid providers aiming to improve the working practices of donors and aid organisations to deliver an extra billion dollars over five years for people in need of humanitarian aid.

refugees in long-term social protection provisions, for instance in Egypt, Eastern Sudan, and Jordan. However, gaps remain on how to strengthen informal provision at home and transnationally.

Outcome 1.   Differences with non-humanitarian settings
- Despite global commitments to 'leave no one behind', challenges of providing assistance in humanitarian settings remain, despite an increase in the work linking humanitarian response with social protection in these settings. This includes attention to gender concerns, for instance in the field of cash and voucher assistance (CVA).
- Currently, evidence on the impacts of social protection on gender equality outcomes (in addition to other well-being outcomes) from stable settings is being applied to humanitarian contexts. This is problematic because it is assumed that programmes work in the same way in humanitarian settings as in non-humanitarian ones. Existing studies show that mental health and psychosocial well-being issues are affecting all young people in all settings but are heightened in refugee and IDP contexts.
- Developing an evidence generation agenda in humanitarian settings to rigorously investigate the gender dynamics and impacts that programmes have on gender equality outcomes is much needed but complicated by time constraints and the fast pace of humanitarian response.

Outcome 2.   Selecting the appropriate social protection programmes and identifying the right design features in humanitarian settings
- More needs to be known about which social protection programmes have the biggest impact on which vulnerabilities, especially those relating to gender norms and dynamics.
- Research is also needed on how such programmes should be designed in humanitarian settings. Linking programmes with and referring beneficiaries to complementary services is critical to address multiple dimensions of vulnerabilities.
- The future research agenda should continue to build the evidence base on multicomponent programming and referral systems to improve the design of programmes so that systems are better able to respond to different shocks.

Outcome 3.   Engaging adolescents in evidence generation, policy, and programming
- Given the volume of UNICEF investment and the number of adolescents affected, the need to engage them directly in solutions and research is critical. First, the cost of missed opportunities for education of youth is enormous. Second, the different gendered experiences and coping mechanisms in humanitarian settings must be systematically examined. For example, adolescent boys and child labour in these settings are under-researched.

Outcome 4.   Understanding the political economy of social protection in humanitarian contexts
- The role of evidence in advocating for social assistance to women and refugee or internally displaced populations is an issue in the context of politicized incentives for government investment, including social cohesion goals, adhering to neoliberal policy narratives, and concerns of insecurity within adolescent populations.
- Displaced populations can be unaware of their rights to access services. Moreover, they often face camp-related violence, in addition to gender-biased resettlement policies. For refugees, displaced populations, and people on the move there is also the uncertainty regarding who is accountable for ensuring rights are upheld.

- Non-government-led schemes need to be explored when humanitarian principles are in play, including when a state is party to the conflict. Fragmented systems require active linkages, establishing referral pathways and strong coordination – a key research gap area related to implementation and M&E of programmes in these settings.
- Gaps remain on the democratic deficit and state willingness to expand social protection programmes, particularly when, how, and why the latter materializes in some humanitarian settings. The social protection area is a contested one and providing social protection to refugee and displaced populations might lead to pushback when it does not align with government policy or political agenda. This raises the issue of when refugee and displaced populations should be included in domestic programmes or in parallel systems.

Summary and next steps
What have we learnt? What do we know?

- A life course lens on social protection is critical as interventions in one stage have a huge impact in the long term and vulnerabilities are cumulative.
- Adolescence within the life course approach is an important period due to the unique risks, vulnerabilities, opportunities, and trajectories.
- The role of gender norms is not understood: how they are measured, how they affect social protection, how individuals and households respond, and what else is required beyond social protection if social norms are not to be addressed through social protection alone.
- Effectiveness and evaluation: more and better data and research on cost-effectiveness and comparison across different types of programmes need to be built into evaluations of social protection programmes.
- Design features are important, but we still do not know enough about the 'how' and 'why', which features can have the biggest impacts, or what the trade-offs are between the complexity of the programmes and their effectiveness.
- There is a huge gap in evidence in humanitarian settings. This is an opportunity to integrate gender in the social protection humanitarian response, but it will require dismantling the assumption that what works in stable contexts is applicable in humanitarian ones, and rather generate new evidence and test approaches.

What was missing from the discussion? What remains unknown?

- While non-contributory programmes are important, others type of social protection programmes were somewhat missing from the workshop discussions, for instance contributory employer-worker programmes.
- The prevailing emphasis during the workshop discussions was on poverty reduction as the primary objective of social protection, but poverty reduction is not the only objective. Redistribution and risk pooling, both horizontal and vertical, are and should be key objectives of social protection.
- Gender bias is explicit and implicit in socio-economic systems. Experts encourage looking at the wider context: how much can realistically be expected of social protection, considering other potential instruments that might be better suited to achieve gender equality, for example labour market policies.
- Design and implementation: key evidence gaps were identified but many aspects that are known have not been fully discussed. For example, we have information on the importance of who the recipients are, as well as the size or the value of the transfer.
- Even social protection programmes that incorporate gender objectives do not always capture change due to weak data and M&E, but also political factors such as the potential push back from governments and donors. Even if gender equality is not the specific objective, social protection programmes should still be evaluated to understand any unintended adverse effects on gender equality outcomes.
- Shock-responsive social protection from a gender lens remains relatively unexplored, especially in terms of how to respond to different shocks with different programmes.
- It is important to understand the problems that need to be addressed from the outset and design social protection programmes accordingly.
- Stimulating demand for evidence on how policies work will be critical.

Next steps

- Consultations and discussions have been informing the final stages of the GRASSP programme inception phase, strategic programme design, and the conceptual framework for the programme.
- The experts were invited to contribute additional or revised think pieces on the topic of gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection[6].
- The experts were also invited to remain connected and continue to be part of this community of practice and research to collectively build a research agenda on gender-responsive age-sensitive social protection.

Post-workshop evaluation

Evaluation forms were handed out at the end of the Experts' workshop. A total of 15 of the 35 attendees filled in the evaluation forms. Among those who did, positive responses were recorded, with average scores of 8.9 for organisation (out of a score of 10) and 8.5 for content (out of a score of 10).

---

[6] All presentations and think pieces that contributed to the workshop discussion will be available on the dedicated UNICEF Innocenti website forthcoming here: https://www.unicef-irc.org/grassp

Annexes:
Annex I.   Presentations

Panel	Presenters	Presentations
Panel 1: Adolescence and life course lenses in social protection programming	Maxine Molyneux	'Adolescence: policy opportunities and challenges'
	Tia Palermo (co-author Maja Gavrilovic)	'Enhancing adolescents' capabilities through adolescent- & gender-responsive social protection'
	Roopa Hinton (on behalf of Emmeline Skinner and Benjamin Zeitlan)	'The transformative potential of social protection public works to empower adolescent girls and young women'
	Ellen Travers	'Child marriage and social protection'
Panel 2: From Strategies to Programmes – Gendered Analysis of Social Protection	Maja Gavrilovic	'Potential for systematically integrating gender into social protection'
	Silke Staab (Skype)	'How gender-responsive are national social protection strategies? A global review'
	Elena Camilletti (with Abha Saxena)	'A gender analysis of social protection programmes in low- and middle-income countries: preliminary findings'
	Charlotte Bilo (with Raquel Tebaldi)	'Gender and Social Protection in South Asia: an assessment of non-contributory programmes' design'
Panel 3: Design and Implementation considerations in Gender Responsive Social Protection	Deepta Chopra (Skype)	'Gendering the design and implementation of social protection programmes – a think piece'
	Amber Peterman	'Towards Gender Equality: Social protection evidence gaps and priority research questions'
	Flora Myamba	'Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment through Social Protection: Lessons from the Productive Social Safety Net Program in Tanzania'
Panel 4: Social Protection in Context: Humanitarian, Climate Change and Complex Crises	Elizabeth Koechlein and Mari Kangasniemi	'Gender, social protection and resilience'
	Nicola Jones	'Social protection in humanitarian contexts: how can programming respond to adolescent- and gender-specific vulnerabilities and promote young people's resilience?'
	Jacobus de Hoop	'Social protection in humanitarian settings'
	Rachel Sabates Wheeler	'Understanding access to social protection for forcibly displaced populations'

Annex II.   Think piece series

Think pieces on gender and social protection within the life course from leading experts – academics, practitioners, development partners and donors were commissioned by UNICEF - Innocenti as part of the GRASSP programme inception phase. The series aims to stimulate thinking and discussion on key research questions and programming issues related to the linkages between social protection and gender in LMICs.

Nine think pieces were received ahead of the Experts' workshop, with two additional think pieces received after the workshop. The full series is available online on the UNICEF - Innocenti website. An overview of the think piece series is provided below.

Think piece	Author (s)	Affiliation
Setting a clear ambition: A first step towards gender-responsive social protection	Siraj Mazhar	DFID
Adolescence: Policy Opportunities and Challenges	Maxine Molyneux	University College London (UCL)
The transformative potential of social protection public works to empower adolescent girls and young women	Emmeline Skinner and Benjamin Zeitlan	DFID Mozambique
Towards Gender Equality in Social protection: evidence gaps and priority research questions	Amber Peterman, Neha Kumar, Audrey Pereira and Daniel O. Gilligan	UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)
Enhancing adolescents' capabilities through adolescent- and gender-responsive social protection	Tia Palermo and Maja Gavrilovic	UNICEF Office of Research – Innocenti
Promoting Women's Economic Empowerment through Social Protection: Lessons from the Productive Social Safety Net Program in Tanzania	Flora Myamba	Social Protection & Gender Specialist/TRANSFORM Trainer
Gender, Social Protection and Resilience	Elizabeth Koechlein and Mari Kangasniemi	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Social protection in humanitarian contexts: how can programming respond to adolescent- and gender-specific vulnerabilities and promote young people's resilience?	Nicola Jones	ODI and GAGE
Gendering the design and implementation of MGNREGA	Deepta Chopra	IDS