



Social Protection in Asia (SPA) policy-research and network-building

SPA Research Workshop 2009 Meeting Notes

Workshop held at the Fortuna Hotel, Hanoi, Vietnam, on the 3rd and 4th of June 2009, with participants from the SPA Research Projects and selected discussants (also participants in the Social Protection in Asia Policy Conference, 1st and 2nd June 2009)

13.6.09

*These notes are intended to briefly summarise the presentations and discussions – for more detail on the projects please see the full presentations available on the SPA website at www.socialprotectionasia.org

Contents

Introduction to the SPA Research Workshop	1
Migration and Social Protection in China and Vietnam	1
Livelihoods, Employment and Social Protection	3
Social Support for the Aged	5
Social Protection and Shelter Security	6
Achieving Policy Influence through Research	7
Social protection interventions: design and evaluation	8
Protecting the most vulnerable	10

Introduction to the SPA Research Workshop

Dr Sarah Cook, Director, SPA, IDS, Sussex

The thirteen projects underway within the SPA programme, including ten research projects and three policy briefs projects, cover a wide range of issues in the field of social protection. Sarah introduced the aims of the two day research workshop – for SPA researchers to present the progress and initial findings from their projects, to gain feedback from their peers, and for discussants to help put the research in wider context and to comment on methodological issues, as well as considering possibilities for policy impact, dissemination and advocacy.

Migration and Social Protection in China and Vietnam

Chair: Prof. Amitabh Kundu, Jawharlal Nehru University, India

Discussants: Dr Dewen Wang, Chinese Academy of Social Sciences

Dr Miguel A Salazar, Beijing Normal University

Amitabh briefly introduced the future of South and East Asia alike as a story of urbanisation, demographic changes, and transition from primary to secondary sector employment. One of the primary challenges for growth is the significant increase in urban population – would current urban populations resent the extension of social protection to new arrivals and uphold an urban elite bias?

Presentation by Dr Le Bach Duong, Institute for Social Development Studies (ISDS), Hanoi, Vietnam

Project title: Social protection for rural-urban migrants in an era of increasing population mobility and socioeconomic transformation: the experiences of China and Vietnam compared.

Duong discussed the context and motivation behind the project, then went on to highlight the legal framework – rights for migrants – and barriers at lower levels – barriers for rural-urban migrants to realise their rights. The research plan is to conduct a migration survey to be completed in March 2010, and to hold a regional workshop after that in July.

Presentation by Dr Yu Zhu, Centre for Population and Development Research, Fujian University, China

Project title: Social protection for rural-urban migrants in an era of increasing population mobility and socioeconomic transformation: the experiences of China and Vietnam compared.

Yu Zhu noted that the projects were not yet at the stage of comparison. Again, the role of the household registration system (*hukou*) was emphasised, as well as the different needs of migrants – e.g. low income, unstable employment, family members at origin. Research so far has consisted of surveys and interviews. Regarding policy influence, there is a possibility to submit reports to government departments.

Discussion:

Dewen Wang suggested there may be more to investigate regarding gender difference. Also it might be important to take account of recent policy progress in relation to the global financial crisis, and to suggest recommendations for policy formation. Some questions: what radical reform is possible? What is the priority for social protection programmes? What are the differences in employment and wages between migrant and local workers?

Miguel Salazar highlighted the enormous importance of the household registration system. Why has the system survived so long, as a legacy of central planning and control (in fact *hukou* is a word from imperial times)? Is there an elite bias and cultural discrimination, whereby the rural-urban distinction is like a 'caste' distinction? In functional terms, Miguel noted, rural-urban migration is an efficient method to fuel development. However the government answers to the urban population and my fear rural population power. It is clear that portability is important, so that systems are no longer attached to locale. However, getting rid of the *hukou* system may result in rural areas being swamped. Perhaps it is a matter of simple institutional inertia? Some questions: what can be learned from heterogeneous solutions, various ways of dealing with migrants in different local authorities? How does this migration resemble international migration? Are there parallels with other migration flows? What are the positive effects of migration (e.g. avoiding effects of financial crisis)?

Questions and comments from the floor:

- Help us to understand what made a difference – why is China more responsive?
- What changes have there been in the last 6 months?
- What parallels with India? Delhi has been asking for a registration system (that is suggested China and Vietnam should give up)
- What about homeless migrants?
- Suggestions for Vietnam research: rights and access, how to monitor this? What other ways of providing registration would be less controlling?
- Who are the stakeholders? Ministries and police need to be taken into account
- What will I know that is new after this research? Or does the data confirm what we know already?
- Migration links people and places – this is an important feature and is not taken into account
- What is the macro perspective? How does it fit into a model of accumulation?
- What's the conflict between social protection for migrants and low cost production? Where is the leverage for policy here?
- What is the regional connection? How have migrants contributed to longer term improvements for families and households in the regions?
- What about urban rural migration now? Returning workers difficulties accessing employment and land. What social protection is needed now? Are these the most vulnerable people now?

- How to enumerate migrants? There is a gap in our understanding because moving people are not represented in national statistics
- How to understand further migrants as a heterogeneous group?
- There is a need to unpack assumptions and ask what are the needs rather than assuming them
- What are the specific issues involved in designing mobile social protection systems?
- How to contrast and compare with south Asia, where the state has less of a role?
- The *hukou* system is historically and institutionally a form of social protection – there are deeper issues for reform, including the question of reforming the land ownership system
- It is worth bearing in mind that social protection coverage for local urban workers is still low
- Could id cards replace the registration system?
- The government doesn't have enough information. Policy is based on assumptions rather than data. The scope of migration is not realised. Evidence of impact is also required
- Someone commented: East Asia promotes migration and the state has a big role – South Asia has programmes to reduce migration and civil society has a big role. Comparing these regions could be an area for research, perhaps with a quantitative analysis and macro perspective for one area and a micro perspective and qualitative analysis for the other.

Livelihoods, Employment and Social Protection

Chair: Dr Valerie Kozel, the World Bank, Vietnam

Discussants: Ms Boonsom Namsomboon, Foundation for Labour and Employment Promotion, Bangkok, Thailand

Dr Sujata Prasad, Director, Institute for Government Accounts and Finance, Ministry of Finance, India

Presentation by Mr C Upendranadh, Institute for Human Development (IHD), New Delhi, India

Project title: Institutional and governance challenges in social protection: the right to work programme in India

Upendranadh drew attention to the key aspects of the NREG programme, as differentiated from a CT programme. He highlighted the crucial role of local government, and the capacity required to plan and implement at a local level. There is a vast literature and debate on NREG, most of it concerning issues of employment creation and the problem of delays in payments. What is missing is an analysis of resource generation and local governance, and the planning and design to provision for administration cost and technical support, as well as assistance from professional and civil society organisations.

Presentation by Ms Ratna Sudarshan, Institute of Social Studies Trust (ISST), New Delhi, India

Project title: Examining the NREGA: Women's participation and impacts in Himachal Pradesh, Rajasthan and Kerala

Ratna introduced the issues of women's participation in the NREGA programme – for example wages for women are higher than the market wage, but not for men, so there is higher women's participation. There is interest in the research findings at a local level more than at a national level, but there is a question – key messages should be targeted at whom?

Discussion:

Boonsom Namsomboon said it was difficult to find the main points in the second NREGA project. For her it was important that there was a gender analysis displayed here (lacking in the

previous conference discussions), but for her a further analysis of cultural gender discrimination would be helpful. She noted that just the number of women participating may not prove equality, and the negative impacts should also be brought out. A comparison between the provinces may be helpful, as would more information as to what criteria were used to select groups. She also suggested that a policy workshop may not be enough – the government should be pushed further.

Sujata Prasad brought out several issues: types of work as barriers to women's access and participation; the fact that often only one bank account is held by the male member of the family, so women have no financial independence; women's role in the care economy and the impact on girls' education, which is often interrupted to look after younger siblings. It was suggested that better efforts at social mobilisation could challenge patriarchal traditional role barriers.

Questions and comments from the floor:

- Could there be a single policy bullet point?
- How many households are dependent on NREGA in different areas?
- Could male and female participation be compared?
- Wages are a critical point – the relationship between wage rates and the targeting mechanism
- The issue of childcare should be more prominent
- The number of women is assessed, but what about the types of work and work effort? Also what kinds of women are working?
- Could there be cross-talk between these two projects?
- What is the different institutional structure and implementation across the states? What's the relationship between the strength of local government and the success of the programmes?
- What about the issue of local governance and the participation of women and low castes?
- What comes after the NREGA programme? What will happen to people as they move out of the scheme? Is there a capacity building process?

Responses:

Prof. D. N. Reddy:

- Women's self help groups play a role in the implementation of the programmes – the role of civil society organisations is crucial
- The way out of the programme – the work is to improve public resources to enable other livelihoods

Ratna Sudarshan:

- Key message: the programme has to be differentiated according to local context
- Crèche is very important, but this crèche is extremely minimal (for example just a swing provided to place children, no care provided)
- Women are a little older at worksites, perhaps because the work is not compatible with looking after young children.
- Sometimes the programme is seen more as a cash transfer, and work effort is not an issue
- There is the state level and the panchayat level (ref NCR Delhi study on rural governance and public goods)

Social Support for the Aged

Chair: Prof. D. N. Reddy, IHD, New Delhi, India

Discussant: Dr Marissa L. San Jose, Senior Occupational Health Officer, the Philippines

Presentation by Prof. Xiaomei Pei, Tsinghua University, China

Project title: Social support for the aged in rural china: the role of local communities

Xiaomei Pei's observations including the following: how and who makes decision regarding the distribution of services seems to be more important than resources; with these programmes, relations between generations have been transformed; self-organised community effort is led to contributions to local economic development. She described examples of programmes such as old age person apartments and associations for the aged, as well as unorganised self-support such as reclaiming no cost land.

Discussion:

Marissa referred to a paper on older workers in the Philippines, a physically demanding population with severe health issues. They present new occupational hazards and risk more stress. Older workers face multiple challenges at work and in society at large.

Questions and comments from the floor:

- Older people in poorer communities are not retiring and face even harder work if there is no family to provide for them
- Pensions retain dignity even if older people are staying within families
- Assistance depends on the will of local communities – how to build this into the political agenda?
- Old age support is very general – what are the qualities of different provision?
- In Vietnam people over 85 qualify for social protection, so numbers are very small. There are over 300 self-help clubs for older people, with grants to manage and invest, as social protection schemes.
- What are the problems of the rural elderly in particular? Are areas really rural? What's the effect of migration and changing links between urban and rural areas?
- What are the implications for the rest of China?
- What about the funding for these schemes – how is responsibility shared between public and private initiatives?
- South Asia has a family based system. There is high over 70s and 80s workforce participation
- What state intervention is required and what should be done at community level?
- It would be helpful to have an idea of numbers and the social and economic profiles of the communities studied
- What about the timeline – from the pre-reform period when work after 65 was voluntary
- Limiting the length of working life has been the norm until recently, this is being eroded
- What are the rights of the aged?

Responses:

- To clarify needs – there is a basic necessities focus
- All groups had community resources, it's just a question of different forms of organisation
- Regarding the age norm for retirement – all groups were engaged in productive labour. They want to participate and not be a burden for families.

- We need to rethink the definition of the elderly – those that are healthy can be contributing to development

Social Protection and Shelter Security

Chair: Prof. D. N. Reddy, IHD, New Delhi, India

Discussants: Dr Rosalinda Pineda Ofreneo, HomeNet Southeast Asia, the Philippines
Prof. Atul Sarma, member, Finance Commission, India

Presentation by Dr Darshini Mahadevia, Faculty of Planning and Public Policy, CEPT University, SEWA Bank and Mahila Housing Trust, Ahmedabad, India

Project title: Inclusive urbanisation: social protection for slum and pavement dwellers in India
Darshini's work focuses on Gujarat. She has found that access to land defines citizenship, and there are shades of tenure security. To put her work in context, Darshini described the urban situation in India – 40% of people have no house, 15% live in slums (in Mumbai 61% live in slums and occupy 8% of the land). Urban planning processes exclude the poor all over South Asia. Rural-urban migration is high, there is jobless growth, and there is hostility and resistance to migrants. Urban policies across the developing world have discouraged migration. There is legal and de facto land tenure, and there has been a process of legalising slums. It remains that land tenure is the key.

Presentation by Haris Gazdar, Collective for Social Science Research, Pakistan

Project title: Residential land as social protection: local mobilisation in Pakistan
Haris described how looking at policy openings helped form the research agenda. Redistributive land reforms have lost potential but is there evidence of enfranchisement through residential security? From engagement with policy makers, it is clear that they are only impressed by numbers and relatively little effort is required to provide this service. Haris is interested in transformative social protection, moments of change, everyday issues of power (including patriarchy), and the critical issue of citizenship. (There is an administrative requirement of a fixed abode for social protection services.) He is intending to have more contact with policy makers and community organisations.

Discussion:

Rosalinda thought that this transformative social protection approach was cutting edge, and the reclaiming of citizenship rights is obviously crucial. She asked how has collective action progressed? What are the facilitating and constraining factors? She also noted that, in her experience, a face behind a story is important for policy advocacy. There could be more detail on hierarchies and how they interact, a subsectoral analysis with links to livelihood security. What makes it possible for some women to assert their claims and others not? Suggestions to show processes of urban planning, low caste women and migrants focus, conversation with multiple stakeholders, more advocacy to move forward.

Questions and comments from the floor:

- Different forms of social protection – this relates to institutional reform and is a complicated issue
- Indian state has favoured the middle class
- Moments of change is an important concept – this could be built up into a theory of change
- Darshini could have a stronger gender analysis
- For policy intervention – it's important to raise the issue of joint security – papers must not be written only in the name of the male

- The project to ‘beautify’ urban spaces, and competition between cities, has changed attitudes towards the poor

Achieving Policy Influence through Research

Chair: Mr Harsh Mander, Special Commissioner on the Right to Food, Supreme Court of India

What is it that would make our research most useful and effective to influence policy?

Presentation by Dr Rosalinda Pineda Offreneo, HomeNet Southeast Asia, the Philippines

Facilitating factors for the advocacy agenda have been research capability and experience, networking within academia, within institution and with other institutions, joining forces with others, e.g. human rights groups, trade unions and labour lawyers, allies in agencies and policy making bodies. Attractive layout and presentation of materials is important, for example HomeNet have produced policy briefs with cartoons and stories, held a launch event, and solicited responses from concerned government agencies and other leaders. Rosalinda stressed that research is the foundation, and a multi-stakeholder approach, using local advocacy and networks is important.

The chair:

- What are the gaps in knowledge?
- What research and how?
- How to keep people’s rights and voices central to the process?
- What are the ethical dilemmas?

Darshini:

Planning has been disconnected from realities. There is also the funding agencies agenda to take into account. It might be wise to start with a maximalist agenda and end up with a minimalist agenda. Look for potential allies, information useful for the state, creating spaces for debate.

Xiaomei Pei:

Xiaomei Pei invited help to influence policy makers in China. There is a draft proposal to produce briefings for ministry officials

Questions and comments from the floor:

- There are political processes and institutional processes
- Findings can get diluted
- Maximise the objective function of policy makers
- Should methodology be compromised to influence policy?
- Pamphlets and brochures
- Don’t compromise the quality of research
- Strive to influence discourse of the day
- There are multiple ways to influence, e.g. through the media, activists, dinner parties ...
- Never compromise on rigour of evidence
- Still you don’t have to be boring – talk in many different languages, in many ways with different products
- It is still good to produce knowledge for the sake of it
- We should position ourselves right – we are not making policies for them
- How does the policy brief reach the top table?

- Always be facts based (don't 'cook it'), put ideas in a prospective manner, be timely (waiting for a paper to be published may be too late), use simple language (no sophisticated econometrics), try to involve policy makers at different levels and at every stage of research, finally be patient.
- Research and public relations – SPA could help build this for dissemination
- High level political networking, engage from the beginning
- Disseminating one pagers – digested research has positive feedback
- Large mailing list important
- Strong links with the media
- Different audiences, different languages
- Link research to policies already working
- Experience from other countries makes a good case, comparisons with neighbouring countries
- Who are 'we'? different perspectives and interests
- Keep focused – formulate focus points and priorities
- To inform but not change should be focus? Investigating truth.

Social protection interventions: design and evaluation

Chair: Dr Satish Mishra, Managing Director, Strategic Asia

Discussant: Dr Melissa Andrade, IPC-IG Brasilia

Presentation by Dr Widjajanti Suharyo, SMERU, Indonesia

Project title: The dynamics of intra-household decision making processes in Indonesia's conditional cash transfer programmes

Widjajanti introduced the PKH and described the context of women in Indonesian culture and development

Presentation by Dr Linxiu Zhang, CCAP, China

Project title: Caring for one billion – assessing the new health protection programmes in rural China

Linxiu Zhang related Good News and Bad News from the NCMS programme. There is basically not enough funding and there are questions about the 'one size fits all' approach. One policy implication is that reforms of the healthcare system are required. Policy briefs (internal) and publications are planned for this project.

Discussion:

Melissa recommended, for Linxiu Zhang's project, looking more at differences at county level and institutional differences affecting delivery. There is an issue that people want catastrophic illness taken into account. What is the relationship between the beneficiaries and the state? What about preventative health care and the links with health insurance? Are there household visits? What mechanisms are in place to target those that cannot afford the premium?

Regarding the PKH project, Melissa noted that there are lots of assumptions in place in CCTs. CCTs and women – arguments vary widely, are they empowering or disempowering? Usually there is less of a gender objective, usually the focus is on reaching children. Specific investments are needed if gender empowerment is an objective, with complementary policies. A gender approach would need to be upfront to have a positive effect. Other demands on women need to be considered, for example the care burden (children and relatives). The impact of CCTs is not necessarily to do with enforcement of conditionalities – it is assumed that money should be spent on the children, for food and school materials. Lack of access to the health

system and schools is an issue due to the nature of the system and traditional practices (the example of fines for absenteeism).

Dr Rudy Prawiradinata (BAPPENAS, Indonesia) is responsible for monitoring the PKH programmes. Samples need to be representative, since cultural conditions vary across areas. More samples may be needed.

Questions and comments from the floor:

- What is the relation between the health insurance and the cost of health care?
- Are there problems of registration and residence for health insurance scheme?
- Are there problems of increased expenditure and increased use of services?
- Re: PKH – do procedures make a difference for women? What are the barriers to access? Quality, distance, or other reasons?
- Re: NCMS – what's the difference between the rural and urban systems? The urban system is much better. Do we need to challenge the division in policy? Is it a universal scheme? Should it be, should we forget about the cost of raising small contributions?
- Re: PKH – advice to carry on conversation with BAPPENAS
- Re: NCMS – attitudes seem to be positive, the main problem seems to be money. What would be the effect of catastrophic illness and accumulative spending – findings would be dramatic in the longer term.
- Re: PKH – one finding is that many people are not aware of the programme. This is a supply side issue – insufficient institutional preparation.
- Re: NCMS – there is a rural-urban problem. Also the money is there, the problem is to mobilise resources.
- Re: PKH – improvement in gender discrimination – positive effects from which programme? How does this project help?
- Re: NCMS – would be useful to see data that would indicate are the insured people the only beneficiaries of the programme? Good regulation and service assessment is needed to assess how much money is needed and how it should be distributed.

Responses:

Linxiu Zhang

- Beneficiaries are also the service providers
- One next task is to translate the Chinese reports into English
- Acknowledgement to Hongmei Yi, the associate researcher

Widjajanti

- Is advocating for gender mainstreaming
- Women were specifically invited to take part in this scheme, not whole households, so gender is indeed a major aspect of the programme
- Programmes should be made more sensitive to gender issues
- The aim was to investigate what is actually happening in a household? That is why a small sample was chosen.
- Access to education expenses, e.g. transport, was a factor – the demand side also needs support and advocacy work
- The labour market for girls is much better than that for boys, who need higher qualifications.
- Indonesia has id card registration, and there is no restriction here for mobility

Protecting the most vulnerable

Chair: Prof. Alakh N Sharma, director, IHD, New Delhi, India

Discussant: Dr Rudy Prawiradinata, BAPPENAS, Indonesia

Presentation by Karishma Huda, BRAC

Project title: Building pathways for the poorest: operationalising the concept of graduation

Karishma gave the background to the project and outlined the poverty traps of the extreme poor. Is the programme trying to create an archetype of success? Plan to follow individual pathways, trace moments of change and determinants of success. Life histories will be created, followed by a workshop and reports.

Presentation by Dr Miguel A Salazar, SSDPP, Beijing Normal University, China

Project title: The impact of natural disaster on the social protection system: lessons from the Wenchuan Earthquake

Miguel Salazar related the project framework and basic questions. Regarding the household survey, he invited suggestions – what should we be asking? Plans for dissemination include contact with government at all levels, workshops, and a workshop in July in Beijing.

Discussion:

Rudy Prawiradinata presented the case of Indonesia in terms of protecting the most vulnerable. Regarding the BRAC project, he asked who are the most vulnerable? Could the BRAC model be compared with the gradual improvement model in Indonesia (see presentation)? Regarding the SSDPP project, Rudy asked what was the social protection system before the earthquake? Could the effects of the earthquake be compared with the effects of the Tsunami in 2004? There could be more about how to manage multi-sector responses. What happens after reconstruction, after the bubble of investment stops? What is the role for assistance and social protection – community empowerment, micro and small scale enterprise empowerment?

Questions and comments from the floor:

- Perspective from Thailand re: SSDPP work – disaster and the problem of psychological impact
- Re: BRAC – interesting model, but is pathway too narrow? What are the moments of change? think about timelines and the longer term perspective. What are the constraints of programmes with specific demands? Are there too many implicit assumptions in the research?
- Re: SSDPP – existing social protection systems are a source of resilience and institutional capacity is a factor. Similar experiences in Pakistan. Knowledge of populations and their needs helps with responses to disasters.
- Re: research design – longitudinal studies would be helpful, but perhaps difficult to follow the subjects
- What kinds of institutional infrastructure are necessary for graduation programmes? Microfinance for example?
- What about the gender analysis in the research – there is a large literature on gender and disaster
- There are a large number of disappearances from the survey – why?
- Psychological factors are interesting
- Re: BRAC – what is the targeting process? When doing life histories, how is the subjectivity of the researcher taken into account? Is there a danger that they are trying to confirm the model?

- Who are the buyers of the research project? BRAC only? There is a huge amount of implementation required for these programmes – is it relevant beyond BRAC?

Responses:

Karishma

- Are 25 life histories sufficient? It's not a matter of numbers, more a matter of quality
- Training and transfer of skills is an important element of the programme

Miguel

- Invites Haris to share data on Pakistan
- A big blind spot that has been identified is gender, the chains of effect and the burden of care
- Cell phones are useful to track and locate people

SPA: An agenda for research policy advocacy in Asia – where do we go now?

Chair: Prof. Huck Ju Kwon

Discussants: Prof. Ashwani Saith
Prof. Naila Kabeer

Huck Ju's comments:

What theoretical conclusions can be drawn? What are the policy implications? What are the differences between South East Asia, South Asia, and China, for example? It's also noted how diverse the research projects are.

Naila's comments:

- What regional agendas are emerging?
- What lessons can be learned from the last crisis (which the inception of this programme responded to), and how have the responses cushioned the impact of the current crisis?
- What are the cross-cutting issues?
- The question of informality has not been specifically addressed
- An uneven question across the projects is gender – it's there to be brought out more
- These studies could repeat what's been done before, so there's an imperative to bring something new to the analysis of social exclusion.
- Models of change and responses need to be questioned, including explicitly the role of different actors, e.g. the role of employers, who have benefited from cheap labour markets – what are their responsibilities? What do we expect from the state? And what role for NGOs and civil society? There should be more pressure put on the state for integrated programmes.
- It is very important that as SPA we have formulated it as – what are the barriers to social protection? More questions need to be asked to dig deeper. Researchers should keep this in mind – there is an implicit concern with inclusive forms of social protection.

Ashwani's comments:

- Employers and service providers need to be considered – the state sector and the private sector, linked with the inclusion/exclusion issue.
- Can you define social protection? Is it left over from bad growth processes? Wider issues are involved if social protection is picking up after these failures. It's these underlying processes that need to be addressed so that we are not constantly picking up the pieces.

- Now more people in wider society are asking these wider macro questions – there is a moment or conjunction and opportunity to raise the profile of the social protection agenda
- Vast exclusion trends, democratic demands, global shocks, food, terror – have been accompanied in Asia by high growth
- Political instability is a concern
- Social profiling of fiscal stimulus packages – we need to address these macro issues. What are we doing differently? Should there be a different approach?
- Projects are moving towards a universal and national approach – we've already got to that point. How to make it work is a bigger question, and it's good that the research is addressing this.
- What's missing in the SPA programme – disability and the informal economy are central areas of concern.
- More employment focus is also missing – the problem of jobless growth.
- There is too much household and state focus, not enough attention on other sectors. Perhaps there could be a separate complementary initiative to the programme?

Comments from the floor:

- More cross-country and subregional level analysis would be helpful
- Macro overview documents could be produced?
- How will the structure of the network go beyond the life of the programme?
- A regular overview of social protection in Asia would be valuable
- Rights based approaches are something we have in common
- The role of the private sector should be highlighted
- The role of communities also features highly
- Organisers of the programme should think about consolidating resources from the researchers
- We could share models and approaches in order to draw comparisons
- How to synthesise at a higher level? Strengthening areas where we can talk to each other (despite differences between regions)
- The rural-urban theme and rights based approaches are useful framings.

To close: many thanks to everyone for their valuable contributions.