**FFP Strategy Consultations**

**Social Protection and Safety Nets**

**Group Exercise**

**For each model, below, identify appropriate roles/interventions to promote social protection within FFP programs and write them on post-it notes. Think about obstacles and factors for success in each context for discussion in plenary.**

**1. The Constrained model**

The constrained model describes those situations where encroaching political interests limit humanitarian space in a variety of ways. At a basic level, all humanitarian aid relies on having humanitarian space, which guarantees aid agencies both safety and access to populations in need.

In constrained settings, humanitarian space is limited by the actions of different parties –by violations creating crises, by deliberate limitations of access or, in many cases, by both. For example, as in Syria, states or governing parties may be actively involved in creating humanitarian needs through acts of violence against citizens. Warring parties and the level of insecurity ongoing conflicts generate may limit access to populations, as in Somalia. Violence against aid workers – prominent in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan – is another means of constraining the space for response and possibilities for assistance. In these locations, this latter may be as much to do with perceptions of aid agencies being aligned with foreign powers.

In **constrained** settings, the sector needs to think and act politically, both in relation to the crisis context, and the actions of the wider international community. It needs to be more realistic about what it, as a relatively small player, can actually do in settings where humanitarianism is actively and purposefully limited by much more powerful actors. And more concerted action would also help here – in such settings the sector must try to be united even if it is not uniform.

**2. The Comprehensive model**

The comprehensive model of humanitarian response is what typical in situations where needs are so great, and local capacities so overwhelmed, that international humanitarian agencies typically take the lead in response management and oversight.

This model is common in lower income countries, where many in the crisis-affected population are extremely vulnerable, and where the potential for state or domestic assistance is either limited or overwhelmed by the sheer scale of the disaster. The culture and practices of the international humanitarian system are arguably developed with this comprehensive model of external assistance in mind: for direct, large-scale delivery in conditions where the state and national bodies have little or no capacity. As such, this model can be said to underpin much of the humanitarian system’s operational, policy and analytical work.

In relation to **comprehensive** responses, which will no doubt continue to be required in many settings, the sector must get better at the things it has long been pushed to do: pay attention to context, be more coordinated and less wasteful, be accountable to and shaped by recipients, and be connected to the longer term perspective.

**3. The Collaborative model**

The collaborative model is one of the more recently emerging models of assistance. It is commonly found in newly middle-income and lower-middle-income countries where there is already some capacity and resource for domestic responses, and where the national and local actors may be unwilling to hand over leadership of responses wholesale to international actors. In some settings, national or subnational actors may seek to play a leadership role on issues such as coordination and oversight.

In the collaborative model, the role of international response should be to support, enhance and work alongside these existing domestic response capacities. As such, the international system ideally needs to work hand-in-hand with domestic and national capacities. Recent examples here include the Indonesian earthquake and flood responses, the Philippines typhoon and the various Mozambique cyclone responses.

In the **collaborative** settings, the sector needs to get much better at getting out of the way, of working in partnership, of being a facilitator rather than a deliverer of assistance. This will require modifications in the structure of aid arrangements, and a more open attitude to working with different actors, new principles, new boundaries, new values, and ways of working. It means moving from humanitarian assistance to humanitarian cooperation.