DATA AND INFORMATION MANAGEMENT FOR SOCIAL PROTECTION. HOW YOU DO IT MATTERS!

The question we should be asking as policymakers and practitioners is not what a country’s system is called, but how it has been set-up and how that affects what it can achieve. Who is covered? How is data being collected? Where is the data flowing to and from? How does this impact my policy objectives and operational effectiveness?

### Comparing country examples across selected variations in set-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% Coverage vs 100% of population</th>
<th>Data collection and updating approach</th>
<th>Number of programs it serves</th>
<th>Data flowing back from programs it serves</th>
<th>Level of interoperability with other databases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan’s National Socio Economic Registry (created 2001)</td>
<td>NSER Social Registry 85%</td>
<td>National census surveys in 2009-2011 and 2016-2018 (piloting on-demand)</td>
<td>Shares data, providing gateway for potential inclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium-low Authentication with NADRA National ID database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines’ Listahanan (created 2008)</td>
<td>Listahanan Social Registry 60%</td>
<td>National census surveys in 2007, 2009-2010 and 2015 (piloting on-demand)</td>
<td>Shares data, providing gateway for potential inclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Low Not yet interoperable with other systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia’s Unified Database (UDB) (created 2011)</td>
<td>UDB Social Registry 40%</td>
<td>On-demand (through municipalities and online) combined with data integration from existing administrative databases</td>
<td>Shares data, providing gateway for potential inclusion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium-low Links to National ID database, and has ad-hoc links with health HMS, education IMS, bank database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile’s Registro Social de Hogares (created 1979, adapted extensively 2016)</td>
<td>RSH Social Registry 72%</td>
<td>On-demand (through municipalities, with home visits when needed) and occasional census surveys in selected areas. Obligation to update data every 2 years</td>
<td>Shares data, providing gateway for potential inclusion</td>
<td>Only From Bolsa Familia</td>
<td>High Linked to civil registry, social insurance database, data from 43 state agencies and 345 municipalities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil’s Cadastro Unico (created 2001)</td>
<td>Cadastro Unico Social Registry 43%</td>
<td>Each program linked has a different data collection approach, all variations on census surveys</td>
<td>Receives data from main cash transfer programs</td>
<td>Yes, as this is an Integrated Beneficiary Registry by construction</td>
<td>Medium-low Limited data sharing and cross-checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya’s Single Registry (created 2016)</td>
<td>Single Registry integrated Beneficiary Registry 8%</td>
<td>On-demand registration (through municipalities, with home visits when needed), combined with data integration from existing administrative databases</td>
<td>Shares data, providing gateway for potential inclusion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Medium Authentication with IPRS population registry and bank database. Link to social security database in plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey’s Integrated Social Assistance System (ISAS) – or Butunlesic (created 2009, finalised 2015)</td>
<td>Butunlesic Social Registry 45%</td>
<td>On-demand registration through municipalities, with home visits when needed, in 5th national program and hundreds of subnational data requests</td>
<td>Shares data, providing gateway for potential inclusion</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Medium-low Authentication with NADRA National ID database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How these variations in set-up can affect outcomes, some examples

- **Affects**
  - Potential for targeting multiple programs
  - Potential for shock-responsiveness
  - Potential for policy analytics (including planning and costing)
  - Use cases for other sectors
  - Potential for exclusion and inclusion errors
  - Up-to-dateness and usability of data
  - Ease of access for applicants
  - Data quality
  - Fairness
  - Potential for systematic exclusion across programs
  - Cost-effectiveness
  - Synergies across programs
  - Potential for M&E across existing programs (e.g. overview of who receives what)
  - Potential for policy analytics (e.g. planning and costing)
  - Foundation for establishment of common delivery systems
  - Data quality and trustworthiness
  - Cost/timeliness of data collection
  - Type of data available
  - Potential for policy integration

For further information:
- Join our online community at http://socialprotection.org/subscribe/
- Sign up to our newsletter contacting valentina.barca@opml.co.uk