Overseas Development Institute

social protection

Linking Agriculture and Social Protection: Conceptual framework[1]

Executive summary

Social protection (SP) is defined here as: "the public actions taken in response to levels of vulnerability, risk and deprivation which are deemed socially unacceptable within a given polity or society," and is mandated either by the state or by organisations such as NGOs claiming to pursue the public interest, and implemented by public or private organisations. In some contexts, there are also traditional, often informal, social protection measures in place.

This paper sets out concepts, approaches and contexts in respect of how SP and agriculture relate to each other. Concepts of SP are broadening away from social assistance to embrace ways in which it can reduce shocks and stresses in both domestic and productive environments. It is doing so in ways which seek to ***prevent*** *the onset of shocks or stresses,* ***mitigate*** *their impact through e.g. insurances of various kinds, enhance the resilience of households and individuals, through e.g. asset-building strategies, so that they are better able to* ***cope*** *with the impacts, and, for the longer term, work in* ***transformative*** *ways by addressing the vulnerabilities arising from social inequities and exclusion. In relation to the agriculture production environment, well-managed SP will seek to reduce both actual shocks and stresses, and agriculturists' and labourers'* ***perceptions*** *of likely shocks and stresses. In this way they would both reduce the loss of productive assets, and encourage farmers' engagement in new, potentially more productive, enterprises, by reducing the levels of risk they perceive in these.*

There are various ways in which SP can relate to agriculture. Social protection can be ***generated by*** *agriculture, as when, for instance, agricultural growth leads to lower and more stable food prices. Socially protecting measures can also be* ***for*** *agricultural growth, such as those intended to reduce risks associated with fluctuations in production (e.g. via insurance against shocks caused by adverse weather), or fluctuations in price caused by market conditions (e.g. commodity price stabilisation funds), or to increase resilience through the creation of assets whether at individual levels (such as improved grain storage) or more widely (such as improved infrastructure). But the effects of SP are not limited to the supply side: when SP is* ***independent of*** *agriculture in its design, such as with transfers to various categories of the poor, it is likely to boost local market demand for staple products. The net effect of this on producers is likely to be positive, as it will be on consumers, unless it proves to be inflationary. These categories are not entirely*

[1] Written by John Farrington, Rebecca Holmes and Rachel Slater

watertight – public works programmes, for instance, provide wage employment which is largely independent of agriculture, but may generate assets geared in some measure for agricultural growth.

In operational terms, SP measures relevant to agriculture can be introduced at different levels (via international conventions, national level legislation, regulation and public investment, and agriculture sector strategies, and at community and individual levels). Nor does all SP relevant to agriculture have to focus only on producers: some interventions such as cash transfers can impact on the poor as consumers; others (such as health and safety regulations) impact primarily on labourers.

Broad definitions of SP of the kind used here may encroach on the whole of social policy – many aspects of health and education can, for instance, be socially protecting. We have dealt with this potential problem in two ways: one by imposing restrictions on the aspects of these broader categories with which we are concerned – for instance, individual insurances against sickness, injury and death, but not the broader provision of health services; the other by imposing time limits – e.g. the provision of short courses to build capacity in various ways, but not the broader provision of education, whether for children or adults.

Numerous contextual factors will have to be taken into account in the design and implementation of measures both within and outside agriculture. These include the current developmental status and prospects of agriculture, the non-farm economy and related markets, the current status of social protection mechanisms, both formal and non-formal, the extent to which farmers, labourers and other categories of the rural poor are registered in self-help groups, unions or other organisations, the availability of resources for SP, and the capacity to implement new policies in respect of both SP and agriculture. Attention can then turn to identification of potential beneficiaries, level of intervention, and type of transfer and resource commitments and questions of whether and how targeting and/or conditionality should be introduced.

In principle, the range of interventions through which SP and agriculture can complement each other is very wide. In practice, funding and implementation capacity are likely to be major constraints in most countries, so that only a small subset of this range will be relevant to each. To identify the most appropriate in each case will require considerable both familiarity with the strengths and weaknesses of this range of possibilities, as well as detailed local knowledge.

Background

This paper sets out a working definition of social protection (SP) in the context of the study. It then reviews a range of alternative interpretations of the concept of social protection and how it might be operationalised. We then select from this range of possibilities a sub-set which is coherent, robust, and relevant to the purpose of the study, namely to examine the interface between social protection and the productive sectors, specifically agriculture.

Defining and operationalising social protection

We adopt here the definition of SP proposed by Norton et al (2001), namely: “Social protection refers to the public actions taken in response to levels of vulnerability, risk and deprivation which are deemed socially unacceptable within a given polity or society." This is similar to the definition subsequently adopted by DFID[2] namely that social protection encompasses a set of public actions – carried out by the state or privately – that address risk, vulnerability and chronic poverty. We interpret "public" to mean not only actions undertaken by the state, but also those undertaken by others claiming to operate in the public interest, such as NGOs, and those mandated by the state but undertaken by others, including the private sector. We also recognise the existence of traditional, often informal, social protection mechanisms. Dorward et al (2006c) suggest that much of the recent interest in SP originated in the perceived need to protect the livelihoods of those affected by structural adjustment programmes, although some of the components of SP, such as social assistance (see below) long pre-date the introduction of structural adjustment.

The World Bank incorporates SP within its Social Risk Management (SRM) Framework (World Bank, 2001), which it sees as repositioning the traditional areas of social protection (labour market intervention, social insurance and social safety nets) in a framework that includes three strategies to deal with risk (prevention, mitigation and coping), three levels of formality of risk management (informal, market-based, publicly-mandated) and many actors (individuals, households, communities, NGOs, governments at various levels and international organisations) against the background of asymmetric information and different types of risk. This view of social protection emphasizes the double role of risk management instruments in protecting basic livelihoods as well as promoting risk taking. It focuses specifically on the poor since they are the most vulnerable to risk and typically lack appropriate risk management instruments, which constrains them from engaging in riskier but also higher return activities and hence gradually moving out of chronic poverty[3]. In brief, the SRM framework sees social protection both as a "trampoline" capable of helping those who might (for whatever reason) temporarily drop out of productive activity to "bounce back", and as a means of support to the critically vulnerable, though many would argue (see below) that the former of these two perspectives has been dominant.

The World Bank argues that improved SRM is important in a *static* sense since it can contribute to reduced vulnerability; enhanced consumption smoothing; and improved equity. In a *dynamic* sense, it can enhance income and consumption smoothing; the effectiveness of informal provisions, and the cost-effectiveness of public provision.

Implementation of the SRM is expected to contribute to poverty reduction by:

- reducing transitory (consumption) poverty;
- preventing declines into deeper poverty and destitution; and
- supporting upward trajectories out of poverty through its support for entrepreneurial risk-taking.

Public (government and donor) support for SRM is justified on the grounds that it has to substitute for widespread market failure, or get markets working. This applies to several types of market:

- first, markets for insurance are highly imperfect – knowledge is often imperfect, information asymmetric, and transaction costs high – so that many types of risk are in effect uninsurable;

[2] Draft Social Protection Strategy Paper, Social Protection Team, DFID
[3] Adapted from Holzmann. and Jørgensen (2000)

- second, asymmetries in information and power act as barriers to entry in other markets (for products, labour and credit, for instance);
- third, some are excluded on social, ethnic or religious grounds from markets which are *segmented*, and in other cases, the poor attempt to avoid risk by entering relations with patrons that often result in *interlocked* markets.

The poor will always face difficulties of these kinds in entering markets; the provision of new forms of social protection will not guarantee that such barriers can be broken, but may provide a platform so that some, at least, can enter new markets.

The SRM's emphasis on risk tends to associate it more with shocks than stresses (such as the payment of marriage expenses). One way of meeting stresses is to draw on assets, since they are not insurable in the way that certain shocks are. Perhaps the neglect of stresses also leads the SRM to underemphasize the role that asset building can play in reducing vulnerability in the face of both shocks and stresses.

DFID*[4]*, expanding on its definition of social protection, divides it into three operational components:

> *Social insurance* involves individuals pooling resources by paying contributions to the state or a private provider so that, if they suffer a "shock" or permanent change in their circumstances, they are able to receive financial support (eg. unemployment insurance, contributory pensions and health insurance)[5].
>
> *Social assistance* involves non-contributory transfers to those deemed eligible by society on the basis of their vulnerability or poverty. Examples include social transfers but also initiatives such as fee waivers for education and health and school feeding.
>
> *Standards*: setting and enforcing minimum standards to protect citizens within the workplace, although this is difficult to achieve within the informal economy.

The DFID definition corresponds closely with that of the World Bank. One notable limitation of the DFID definition is that it restricts the setting of standards to the workplace. This appears to rule out protection against wider forms of discrimination or exclusion such as those based on class, caste, ethnicity, creed or gender. This illustrates a constant dilemma with attempts to define social protection: a broad definition implies that virtually all aspects of social policy (including aspects of health and education, and policies against discrimination or social exclusion) have some "socially protecting" component, which indeed they may well have. But the difficulty with broad definitions of this kind is that policy towards social protection becomes virtually indistinguishable from social policy more generally. We have dealt with this potential problem in two ways: one by imposing restrictions on the aspects of these broader categories with which we are concerned – for instance, individual insurances against sickness, injury and death, but not the broader provision of health services;

---

[4] Draft Social Protection Strategy Paper, Social Protection Team, DFID

[5] DFID suggest that social insurance is, in general, only appropriate for better-off individuals in helping to prevent them from dropping into poverty. This is somewhat at odds with growing evidence that microinsurance is of interest and value to the poor (SEWA(200???); Examples from India (see later section) include insurance to protect tendu leaf collectors during poor harvest years.

the other by imposing time limits – e.g. the provision of short courses to build capacity in various ways, but not the broader provision of education, whether for children or adults.

Further contributions to the literature are along two axes: one is concerned with distinguishing between immediate (response to shocks) and broader (poverty reducing) dimensions of social protection, the other is concerned with gender dimensions. The first of these is the focus of ***Barrientos*** et al. (2005), who also distinguish between chronic and transient poverty, and argue that whilst the chronically poor face significant risk and vulnerability, factors behind chronic poverty extend beyond this. A fuller understanding of the determinants of chronic poverty needs to take account of structural factors and stresses as well.

Taking further these broader dimensions, ***Hickey*** (2005) focuses on the links between politics and social protection, arguing that politics influence the processes and implementation of social protection, and conversely, politics itself is influenced by social protection. He focuses on three forms of politics, viz: systemic (e.g. political institutions); societal (e.g. public attitudes); and institutional (e.g. historically embedded ‘rules of the game’). In addition, there is a global politics to social protection that cuts across these inter-related dimensions, within which donors and related international policy discourses are particularly relevant.

Also in the context of these broader dimensions, ***Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler*** (2004) introduce the concept of “transformative” social protection, by extending the traditional view of social protection which addresses economic vulnerability to encompass social vulnerability. The premise of transformative SP is that it recognises the need for social equity as well as protection against livelihood risks.

The paper critiques current definitions of social protection (including the SRM framework) as being too narrow, and in particular, emphasises the need for:

i. problem identification to include “social risks”
ii. problem prioritisation to encompass vulnerability associated with “being poor” and “becoming poor” – thus understanding chronic poverty and the transitional nature of poverty
iii. social protection providers to include formal public and private providers, as well as informal mechanisms

The transformative social protection framework aims to address “social vulnerability” through “the delivery of social services and through measures to modify or regulate behaviour towards socially vulnerable groups”.

In a working definition, transformative social protection is: “the set of all initiatives, both formal and informal, that provide: *social assistance* to extremely poor individuals and households; *social services* to groups who need special care or would otherwise be denied access to basic services; *social insurance* to protect people against the risks and consequences of livelihood shocks; and *social equity* to protect people against social risks such as discrimination or abuse.”

Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler distinguish between different spheres for transformative policies:

- those that relate to power imbalances in society: e.g. support to Trade Unions; sensitisation and awareness campaigns

- and those which recognise the intra-household division of resource ownership, access and use. Here, for instance, SP policies would be designed so that e.g education programmes help to make power relations more balanced as between men and women.

They also emphasise that there are many overlaps and links between the protective, preventive, promotive and transformative approaches to social protection thus identifying powerful synergies between the “economic” and “social” roles performed by social protection measures.

In sum, the authors argue that a comprehensive and coherent package of social protection measures can support a development trajectory that maximises the reduction of both poverty and inequity, at an affordable fiscal price.

Also focusing on the broader dimensions of social protection, ***Moser*** (2006) presents an “asset-based social policy” approach to poverty reduction, which builds on existing sustainable livelihoods and asset building frameworks. She argues that social protection policies have prioritised income/consumption protection of the poor at the expense of creating opportunities. In this respect, the asset-based social policy approach focuses on first and second generation asset creation for the poor, emphasising the importance of long-term asset accumulation for poverty reduction and empowerment. It also develops the asset-institutions-opportunities nexus, which recognises the process of how the accumulation potential of assets depends on the interrelationship between a household’s original investment asset portfolio, the broader context at both life-cycle and politico-economic levels that provides the opportunity structure, as well as the wider institutional environment.

‘First’ generation asset-based policy provides social and economic infrastructure essential for assets such as human capital, physical capital (such as housing) and financial capital (durable goods). These are a necessary but not sufficient condition for individuals and households to further accumulate on their own and move out of poverty. ‘Second generation’ asset-based policy is intended to strengthen accumulated assets and to ensure their further consolidation and prevent erosion.

Given the traditional micro-level focus on assets, this approach is argued to be particularly important in the dramatically globalising institutional context. It is argued that strategies need to go beyond issues of welfare and poverty reduction to address a range of concerns relating to citizen rights and security, governance and the accountability of institutions. Actions in support of this strategy could include: strengthening social justice through the judicial system, including a broader range of preventative and punitive interventions; empowering local communities to access information about legal, economic and social rights; identifying appropriate institutional structures for strengthening the financial capital of households that have got out of poverty, but are still highly vulnerable; and developing city-level employment strategies to better ensure that the gains in human capital are not eroded.

The second dimension of those mentioned above, namely gender, is the focus of ***Sabates-Wheeler and Kabeer*** (2004). They take a gendered approach to understanding vulnerability, and examine how social protection interventions can be made more gender-sensitive. The starting point for this is the disadvantaged position of women in relation to work opportunities in comparison to men from equivalent social groups, in the context of an increasing feminisation of informal labour markets. From this, Kabeer and Sabates-Wheeler argue that women are more likely than men to be excluded from social protection strategies.

Their framework postulates three types of gender constraint:

- *Gender specific constraints* to the participation of women in the labour market and household livelihood activities. For women, this reflects their biological role in reproduction as well as social role of caring, which reduces women's availability for paid employment
- *Gender intensified constraints* come from gender-specific beliefs and customs reflecting gender inequalities in opportunities and resources. These constraints are found especially in intra-household inequalities, which are sometimes reflected by community/society norms, e.g. customary law (lack of inheritance rights etc.)
- *Imposed gender constraints* are forms of disadvantage which reflect external biases and preconceptions, such as employers who refuse to recruit women, or only employ them in stereo-typical female jobs, or trade unions which do not encourage women members.

The authors argue that a life-cycle framework permits an intra-household analysis of the gender constraints that women face at different times of their lives, can help in understanding how social protection measures can be made more gender sensitive.

By drawing on a number of case studies including SEWA, the Grameen Bank, Grameen Kalyan, SHINE, IGVGD and Mobile Crèches, the authors illustrate that in order to be gender-sensitive, SP programmes must be designed to overcome life-cycle and gender intensified constraints, as well as have the ability to meet the demands of women workers.

Agriculture in relation to social protection

For the purposes of this study, agriculture is defined to include crop and livestock enterprises. As with earlier work on this topic (Farrington et al, 2004b; Dorward et al 2006a, b, c), the focus will be on small, low-income farms. By contrast with Dorward et al, who give little attention to agricultural labourers or to consumers of agricultural products, these are explicitly brought into the analysis that follows.

Agriculture and social protection, individually and jointly, can be analysed in multiple dimensions. A task of this paper is to examine whether and how these dimensions relate to each other, and identify those of central importance to the study.

The following recognitions are important:

i. The ways in which SP does or does not relate to agriculture. Social protection can be ***generated by*** agriculture, as when, for instance, agricultural growth leads to lower and more stable food prices[6]. Socially protecting measures can also be ***for*** agricultural growth, such as those intended to reduce risks associated with fluctuations in production (e.g. via insurance against shocks caused by adverse weather), or fluctuations in price caused by market conditions (e.g. hedging on forward markets), or to increase resilience through the creation of assets whether at

---

[6] Whilst the framework offered by Dorward and Sabates-Wheeler is acknowledged as the source of the three useful distinctions presented here, we cannot agree that interventions such as land reform, or subsidies on inputs, credit, and the provision of public services or investment are "from" agriculture, they seem to us more appropriately classed as interventions ***for*** agricultural growth.

individual levels (such as improved grain storage) or more widely (such as improved infrastructure). SP can also be ***independent of*** agriculture in its design, such as unconditional cash transfers, or employment creation schemes, though in reality, and without wishing to enter the realms of general equilibrium modelling, almost all of these have some bearing on agriculture, as when for instance, cash transfers allow higher and/or smoother demand for locally produced food products, or employment creation schemes generate assets relevant to agricultural production.

ii. The levels at which interventions can take place. These can range from the individual, through household, to community, district, national, and international (via influence in international agreements). They can also take place at different points in commodity chains.

iii. The modality of intervention. As the World Bank SRM framework makes clear, these can be informal, publicly mandated or market-based

iv. The diversity among households and individuals. These can be classified in various ways. One is according to type and scale of engagement with the productive economy. At one extreme, for instance, are those who through ill health, old age or youth, or high number of dependents, are unable to engage fully with the productive economy. At the other are established farmers operating on a moderate or large scale. Between these extremes are smallholders engaged in a range of production systems and with varying degrees of viability. Somewhat separate are those relying largely on agricultural labour for their livelihoods.

v. Differences in strategies according to whether they intend to address shocks or stresses. The World Bank places considerable emphasis on getting insurance markets to work. Shocks in agriculture such as those originating in exceptional weather are in principle insurable, and Hess (2003) and others have been working on weather-based instruments. Shocks in the household, such as sickness, injury and death are also in principle insurable, and initiatives in India are seeking to address these. Other shocks such as those rooted in price fluctuations can be dealt with through forward hedging, or more simply through e.g. warehouse receipts (ref). By contrast, stresses such as the cost of marriage of sons or daughters are not insurable. Here, asset-based strategies appear to offer most promise.

vi. The question of whether an intervention aims to *prevent* a shock or stress from occurring, *mitigate* its impact, or reduce vulnerability (equivalent to enhancing resilience) so that households can *cope* better. A further question, in the context of a broad definition of social protection, is whether the intervention is transformative, in the sense of addressing vulnerabilities arising from social inequities and exclusion

vii. The diversity of livelihood strategies, the argument being that the more a household relies on a single activity, the more vulnerable it is to shocks or stresses specific to that activity.

viii. The transaction costs of introducing certain kinds of SP measure to rural populations. These will depend on the densities of population, transport and communications infrastructure, and so on. But it will also depend on the extent to which rural populations are organised. Those belonging to a self-help group, for instance, are “known entities” in terms of their basic identities and income and wealth status, making targeting easier, and reducing the transaction costs of interacting with them – premia for insurances, for instance, can much more easily be collected from groups of this kind than from those operating independently as “individuals”.

ix. The status of markets – if these are too “thin”, then measures (such as e.g. price stabilisation) that seek to transmit SP via price mechanisms, are unlikely to function.

Table 1 attempts to demonstrate how particular kinds of intervention are more or less relevant to different stakeholder groups, including those who are primarily labourers and those unable to engage fully with the productive economy. Table 2 attempts to draw together these strands of argument, providing examples of the different types and levels of social protection in relation to intended outcomes, with reference to agriculture where possible.

Dorward et al (2006a, b, c) have covered elements of the above ground and the analysis here is broadly consistent with theirs, with four exceptions:

i. Our analysis explicitly seeks to include those among the rural poor who are not primarily farmers, i.e. labourers, and those unable to engage fully with the productive economy
ii. Our view is that the “four basic responses to stress” (2006a, p.i) that they postulate, namely removal, resistance, recovery and relief, do not add to the established categories of prevention, mitigation and resilience (in order to cope better), and we retain these, adding to them a fourth, namely the transformative of Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler (2004), by which the vulnerabilities arising from social inequities and exclusion are addressed.
iii. We do not find useful the notion proposed by Dorward et al (2006c, p. i), suggest that marginal, medium/small scale and large scale farmers may be “stepping up” in favourable circumstances; marginal farmers are likely to be “hanging in”, and the more successful may be “stepping out” where accumulated assets serve as a basis for investment in alternative, higher-return livelihood activities. We disagree with their notion of a “progression” here (ibid.), since much of the evidence points to the fact that the resource-constrained may be just as likely as the better off to diversify[7], and that seasonal migration – either rural-rural, or rural-urban – is likely to be found among all income classes[8].
iv. Whilst we find their notion interesting that interventions may be particularly valuable if they take the poor across the threshold that might demarcate a particular poverty trap, we find it hard to see how this concept might be applied in practice – such thresholds would vary among individuals and shift with changing circumstances over time, and so do not provide a robust basis for designing interventions. Moreover, they add yet a further layer of complexity in what is already a seriously crowded conceptual field, and one which – without simplification and selectivity – is well ahead of the implementation capacity found in most countries.

[7] In the ODI Livelihood Options study (Farrington et al (eds) 2006) which generated new field data on diversification in rural India, the extent of diversification was in fact found to be “bell-shaped” with respect to income, as has been noted in a number of other studies from elsewhere.
[8] For a review of the livelihood characteristics of seasonal migrants in Asia, see Deshingkar, 2005)

Table 1: Schematic characterisation of rural households in relation to poverty, shocks and stresses

Schematic characterisation of rural HH[9]	***Poverty links/ Characteristics***	***Financial***[10] ***interventions potentially complementary to agricultural growth:***	
		………to address ***Shocks***	……..to address ***Stresses*** and ***chronic poverty***
		Risk reduction[11] through:	Reducing vulnerability by:
Large-scale farmers	Contribute to poverty reduction via job creation and cheaper food	a) Price hedging; crop insurance Facilitate and regulate market-based farm asset insurance and domestic insurances (health; life; assets) to prevent flight of capital out of agriculture	f) Not necessary – assets adequate
Medium/small-scale farmers	As above, but to a lesser extent; moderately vulnerable to shocks and stresses	b) as in (a), but with need to promote and (perhaps initially) subsidise farm asset and domestic insurances	g) Promote asset accumulation by savings schemes, possibly including "matching funds" Targeted transfers (e.g. social pensions) to cope with stress of old age, prevent (and possibly reverse) outflow of capital from agriculture and enhance consumption of agricultural products; Targeted and conditional transfers (e.g. infant health; girls' education) can achieve same effects
Marginal farmers	The poor as entrepreneurs – highly vulnerable to shocks and stresses	c) As in (b), but crop insurance will be more important than price hedging[12] Employment assurance schemes of some importance	h) as in (g), but possibly greater importance to transfers, perhaps including also general income support to households below poverty line
Farm labourers	Rely on agriculture for job creation and cheap food	d) Indirectly via (a) and (b), insofar as they impact on food prices and job opportunities; domestic insurances likely to be particularly important Employment assurance potentially very important	i) as in (g)
Those unable to engage regularly/fully in economic activity (very elderly, sick, disabled, very young….)	Relate to agriculture mainly as consumers – increased income will be spent mainly on food	e) as in (d), but with reference only to impact on food prices. Employment assurance irrelevant	j) Targeted transfers likely to be particularly important. Some evidence that they do not simply stop outflows from the consumption or productive needs of relatives, but in some cases flow back into productive investment.

[9] To simplify for present purposes, productive activity is limited to agriculture (though in its broad definition to include livestock, forest and fisheries). Similar categorisations from higher to lower income, including those unable to participate, could be made for any other productive sector in rural areas

[10] A large number of other interventions can reduce risk and vulnerability in agriculture, such as irrigation schemes to protect against drought, the promotion of disease-resistant plant varieties, legislation on plant quarantine, and measures to promote livelihood diversification (see Farrington et al 2003 for a conceptual frame and numerous examples). The focus here is not on these, but broadly on social protection and so on measures directly associated with financial security.

[11] The generic term "reduction" is taken here to embrace prevention, coping and mitigation. It has to be recognised that it is extremely difficult to take preventative, coping or mitigating action against certain kinds of shock or stress. For instance, long-term decline in markets for certain industrial commodities (such as coir or hemp) represents a stress on average over an extended period, but may be characterised by particular price shocks in any one year. Structural adjustment and reallocation of resources is the only long-term solution to pressures of this kind.

[12] Price hedging is of little value to this category since they rarely produce a marketable surplus

Table 2 Preventive, mitigating, coping and transformative interventions relevant to agriculture

Type of effect **Type of intervention**	***Reducing likely incidence of shock or stress (preventive)***	***Reducing impact of shock or stress (mitigating)***	***Increasing resilience/reducing vulnerability (coping)***	***Addressing vulnerabilities arising from social inequities and exclusion (transformative)***
International agreements and conventions	Reworking of trade regimes; preventing international spread of ag-related disease		Rights of workers, of women and children….	
National legislation, regulation, public investment	Investment in major infrastructure; prevention of monopsony power, including in food processing, wholesaling and retailing, and of monopoly in farm input supply.	Promotion of good business climate, and of diversified rural economy; promotion of strong rural-urban links	Health and safety standards; minimum wage legislation; investments in health, nutrition and education; promotion of voice and citizenship. Promotion of social equity via sensitisation and awareness campaigns and e.g. strengthening of Trade Unions. Moser's 'second generation' assets-based policy embracing rights and security, governance and the accountability of institutions.	
Agriculture sector strategies	Prevention of spread of crop/livestock disease; crop and livestock breeding strategies; investment in medium-scale infrastructure (e.g. irrigation, feeder roads); promotion of warehouse receipts, forward hedging etc; subsidies on inputs and improvement in markets	Enterprise diversification within farms; promotion of new forms of crop and livestock insurance	Agriculture-specific training; promotion of agriculture-related savings & investment;	Promotion of collective action for workers' rights in specific sector or sub-sectors
Asset building and access at community and individual levels	Public works to create communal assets (minor irrigation, bunds, drains, soil and water conservation; grazing; forest) and improve access	Improve access to communal assets Promotion of personal insurances etc	Strengthen individual assets – financial, health, education, awareness of rights, voice…Transfers in cash or in kind (e.g. subsidised food; FFW).	Promotion of rights of minorities at community level
Promote employment			Food or cash for work; support migration out of low productivity areas, and remittances	Ensure inclusion of minorities
Increase and/or smooth consumption			Transfers in cash or in kind (e.g. subsidised food; FFW).	Ensure inclusion of minorities

References

Barrientos, A., Hulmes, D. and Shepherd, A. (2005) 'Can Social Protection Tackle Chronic Poverty' Forthcoming in *European Journal of Development Research*

Devereux, S. and Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004) 'Transformative Social Protection' *IDS Working Paper 232* Institute of Development Studies, Brighton

Dorward, A., Sabates-Wheeler, R., MacAuslan, I., Penrose-Buckley, C., Kydd, J. and Chirwa, E. (2006a) Promoting agriculture for social protection or social protection for agriculture? (i) Concepts and Framework. Future Agricultures Briefing. www.future-agricultures.org

Dorward, A., Sabates-Wheeler, R., MacAuslan, I., Penrose-Buckley, C., Kydd, J. and Chirwa, E. (2006b) Promoting agriculture for social protection or social protection for agriculture? (i) Policy approaches and emerging questions. Future Agricultures Briefing. www.future-agricultures.org

Dorward, A., Sabates-Wheeler, R., MacAuslan, I., Penrose-Buckley, C., Kydd, J. and Chirwa, E. (2006c) Promoting Agriculture for Social Protection or Social Protection for Agriculture: Strategic Policy and Research Issues. Discussion Paper. Future Agricultures Consortium. www.future-agricultures.org.

Farrington, J., Slater, R. and Holmes, R. (2004b) 'The Search for Synergies between Social Protection and the Productive Sectors: the Agriculture Case', *Working Paper 232*. London: Overseas Development Institute.

Hess, U. (2003) 'Innovative Financial Services for India: Monsoon-indexed Lending and Insurance for Smallholders', *Agriculture and Rural Development Working Paper* 9, Washington DC: World Bank.

Hickey, S (2005) - Thinking about the politics of social protection in Africa: towards a conceptual and theoretical approach. Manchester: IDPM

Moser, C. (Ed.) (2006) *Assets, Livelihoods and Social Policy* World Bank and Palgrave

Norton, A, Conway, T and Foster, M (2001) Social protection concepts and approaches: implications for policy and practice in international development. Centre for Aid and Public Expenditure, ODI, London

Sabates-Wheeler, R. and Kabeer, N. (2003) 'Gender equality and the extension of social protection' *Extension of Social Security Paper* no. 16, ILO

World Bank (2001a) *Social Protection Sector Strategy: From Safety Net to Springboard*, Washington DC: OUP for the World Bank.