

Addressing the risk of Maladaptation in Social Protection: The case of World Food Programme

Andreia Bordon Rosa & Helene Lykke Strøbech | Division of Risk
Management and Societal Safety | LTH |
LUND UNIVERSITY, SWEDEN



**Addressing the risk of Maladaptation in Social Protection:
The case of World Food Programme**

Andreia Bordon Rosa & Helene Lykke Strøbech

Lund 2020

Addressing the risk of Maladaptation in Social Protection: The case of World Food Programme

Andreia Bordon Rosa & Helene Lykke Strøbech

Number of pages: 91

Number of illustrations: 4

Keywords

Maladaptation, Social Protection, Climate Change, Climate Change Adaptation, Pathways, Vulnerability, Adaptive Capacity

Abstract

The need to adapt to climate change has been widely acknowledged as a challenge expanding beyond the discrete realm of adaptation initiatives. Accordingly, social protection has received growing attention due to its potential to promote adaptive capacity, whilst partly addressing both direct and indirect drivers of vulnerability to climate change. Addressing the risk of maladaptation has been proposed as a first step of this wider process, to avoid inadvertently increasing vulnerability that initiatives were meant to reduce. Based on a multidimensional analytical framework that understands maladaptation as a *socio-political process*, influenced by *multiple drivers* across several *temporal* and *spatial* scales; this thesis explores the case study of the World Food Programme, in Latin America and the Caribbean region. Through interviews, the empirical findings indicate that a long-term and systemic vision of social protection and climate change is crucial to leverage cumulative impacts of World Food Programme's social protection work. However, a process-oriented analysis of the organisation finds continuities between their historical mandate and present attempts to act upon a broader adaptive landscape. Thus, underlining the influence of power and politics when framing and balancing multiple drivers. The study suggests that an inclusive negotiation of the adaptive-maladaptive continuum can potentially pose emancipatory opportunities for groups generally subjected as vulnerable. Hence, beginning social protection initiatives with an ex-ante approach to the risk of maladaptation can contribute to the explicit consideration of adaptation goals and barriers, by identifying the type of processes and outcomes perceived as important to avoid, in a given context.

© Copyright: Division of Risk Management and Societal Safety, Faculty of Engineering
Lund University, Lund 2020

Avdelningen för Riskhantering och samhällssäkerhet, Lunds tekniska högskola, Lunds universitet,
Lund 2020.

Riskhantering och samhällssäkerhet
Lunds tekniska högskola
Lunds universitet
Box 118
221 00 Lund

<http://www.risk.lth.se>

Telefon: 046 - 222 73 60

Division of Risk Management and Societal Safety
Faculty of Engineering
Lund University
P.O. Box 118
SE-221 00 Lund
Sweden

<http://www.risk.lth.se>

Telephone: +46 46 222 73 60

Acknowledgements

This research is the result of an ongoing learning process that began in 2018, alongside some of the most passionate individuals we have had the pleasure to share a classroom with. Thank you for your creativity and passion which inspired us to strive for more, in academia and beyond. Our appreciation also goes to every teacher from the Division of Risk Management and Societal Safety at Lund University, we truly thank you for your devotion and guidance.

To Mo Hamza, not only for your supervision and expertise but also for the plentiful words of advice that would seamlessly get us back on track, thank you for your continued support throughout this research. Thank you to Per Becker, for scrutinising our view on maladaptation in the early stages of this research and for being an example of academic integrity.

To Dr. Ana Solórzano, our co-supervisor from the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama, for her guidance and expertise throughout this process, and for providing essential contextual inputs and reflections. We would also like to thank Juan Gonzalo Jaramillo from the World Food Programme in Rome, for his enthusiasm regarding the research and valuable inputs and perspectives. To Dominique De Bonis and Cecilie Gundersen, thank you both for your openness and for connecting us with the Social Protection Unit from the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama.

Our sincere gratitude goes to every key informant that shared their time and vision with us despite the inherent constraints posed by COVID-19. Thank you for your availability and support, which made this research a reality.

To our dogs, thank you for your invaluable companionship throughout the writing process and for keeping us grounded on the simple things. Lastly, but foremost, we would like to thank our families and friends, for uplifting support and confidence, for being patient and for sharing bigger perspectives throughout this process. We promise to leave the computer now.

Summary

Maladaptation is closely connected to negative consequences such as increasing vulnerability to climate change or reducing adaptive capacities. Several scholars have focused on assessing maladaptive outcomes of adaptation initiatives. However, considering the ubiquitous role of power and politics, this study conceptualises maladaptation as a *socio-political process* that is influenced by *multiple drivers* and involves various *temporal* and *spatial* scales. A pathways approach provides the metaphor to understand initiatives as embedded within ongoing and interdependent processes of change and response.

In the context of climate change, social protection has received growing attention for its potential to contribute towards adaptation efforts while reducing socio-economic inequalities. However, the often uncertain dynamics of climate change exacerbating development issues, coupled with the increase of climate-related hazards, establish the importance of addressing the risk of maladaptation to *first, do no harm*. Based on an instrumental case study of the World Food Programme in Latin America and the Caribbean Region, a multidimensional analysis of maladaptation guides this research to understand how social protection programming can address the risk of maladaptation.

The study starts by introducing foundational concepts underpinning the logic of inquiry: social protection, vulnerability and adaptive and maladaptive pathways. Followed by the analytical framework, centred around five dimensions to understand maladaptation: *multiple drivers, process, temporal scales, power and politics, and spatial scales*. A comprehensive introduction to the case of the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama and organisational approach to social protection contextualise the empirical findings. In addition to case-specific secondary data, fifteen semi-structured key informant interviews constitute the main empirical data. The empirical findings are presented and discussed, based on the logic of the analytical framework, first per dimension then collectively stating the interlinkages. These outputs inform the research question regarding how maladaptation can be addressed in social protection.

The findings indicate that, firstly, World Food Programme needs to explicitly consider what adaptation goals are deemed desirable through the integration of social protection and climate change. An explicit and inclusive deliberation of goals provides the normative frame that enables the assessment of maladaptation. Defining adaptation goal entails a process of contestation and negotiation of values; hence, it is crucial to consider the role of power and politics in practical aspects, such as how and at what stage different groups are being included in decision-making. The goals defined will inform the role and depth of climate change

integration in social protection, which will entail inherent trade-offs, reflecting the values and assumptions behind such decisions.

Both normative goals and corresponding trade-offs need to be considered across units, programmes, policies and broader partnerships, to establish an appropriate balance between multiple objectives. Open to contextual variations and evolving conditions, a long-term vision of social protection and climate change is crucial to strategically leverage the cumulative impacts of World Food Programme's work. Additionally, aligning with ongoing processes of response through a broader systems' perspective can provide relevant insights when designing social protection initiatives, highlighting cross-scalar concerns that need to be considered when aiming to address the risk of maladaptation.

The interconnectedness of ongoing processes across spatial and temporal scales highlights the importance of context-specific programming that also considers the wider socio-ecological dynamics in which initiatives are embedded. Such a perspective underlines the importance of monitoring how adaptation pathways evolve and interact, according to the commonly agreed goals, across spatial and temporal scales. Thus, including broader perspectives in monitoring, evaluation and accountability procedures, both within and beyond the bounded scales of initiatives, could benefit World Food Programme's social protection work.

Notwithstanding, social protection is only one part of a broader multi-sectoral strategy to adapt to climate change. Accordingly, the study suggests that linkages between social protection and climate change should be mutually considered to ensure that adaptation initiatives also consider how social protection mechanisms can be integrated to proactively reduce social inequalities and, potentially, address the challenge of 'winners and losers' of adaptation.

Finally, the study suggests that an inclusive negotiation of the adaptive-maladaptive continuum can potentially pose emancipatory opportunities for groups generally subjected as vulnerable. Beginning any social protection strategy, policy or programme with a process-oriented intention to address the risk of maladaptation can help identify barriers for adaptation in a given context, by underlining what type of processes and outcomes are perceived as important to avoid. Such an ex-ante approach to maladaptation, that explicitly considers values, goals and aspirations can open up space for the empowerment of groups generally subjected as vulnerable.

Abbreviations

3PA	Three-Pronged Approach
3P+T	Protect, Prevent, Promote and Transform Social Protection Functions
CBPP	Community Based Participatory Planning
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CO	Country Office
CSP	Country Strategic Plan
CSR	Country Strategic Review
EMS	Environmental Management System
EPR	Emergency Preparedness and Response
ESRS	Environmental and Social Risk Screening
ECLAC	United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean
FbF	Forecast-based Financing
FSN	Food Security and Nutrition
HQ	Headquarters
ICA	Integrated Context Analysis
ILO	International Labour Organization
LAC	Latin America and the Caribbean
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
RBP	Regional Bureau Panama
SDG	Sustainable Development Goals
SLP	Seasonal Livelihood Planning
SP	Social Protection
SRSP	Shock-Responsive Social Protection
UN	United Nations
VAM	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
WFP	World Food Programme

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	10
1.1	Scope	11
1.2	Outline	11
2	Conceptual Background	12
2.1	Social protection	12
2.1.1	Social protection schemes	12
2.1.2	Universal social protection	13
2.1.3	The 3P+T Framework	14
2.2	Vulnerability	15
2.3	Adaptive and Maladaptive Pathways	16
3	Analytical Framework	19
3.1	Multiple drivers	19
3.2	Process	20
3.3	Temporal scales	20
3.4	Power and politics	20
3.5	Spatial scales	21
4	Methods and Materials	22
4.1	Case presentation	22
4.1.1	WFPs mandate and social protection approach	22
4.1.2	Social protection: regional context and WFPs role	22
4.2	Methodology	24
4.3	Secondary data collection	25
4.4	Primary data collection	26
4.4.1	Interview guides	27
4.4.2	Interview process	27
4.5	Data analysis	28
4.6	Limitations	30
5	Results and discussion	31
5.1	Multiple drivers	31
5.1.1	Results	31
5.1.2	Discussion	33
5.2	Process	34
5.2.1	Results	34

5.2.2	Discussion	37
5.3	Temporal scales	39
5.3.1	Results	39
5.3.2	Discussion	42
5.4	Power and Politics	44
5.4.1	Results	44
5.4.2	Discussion	49
5.5	Spatial scales	51
5.5.1	Results	51
5.5.2	Discussion	54
5.6	General discussion	55
6	Conclusion	60
6.1	Implications and future research	61
7	References	63
8	Annexes	72
8.1	Annex 1 – Direct and indirect entry points for social protection	72
8.2	Annex 2 – Overview of informants	76
8.3	Annex 3 – Interview guides	77

1 Introduction

The increasing need for effective action on climate change (CC) has originated several discussions on what constitutes sustainable (Eriksen & O'Brien, 2007) and successful (Adger et al., 2005) adaptation. With a similar end-goal, several scholars have delved in the concept of maladaptation to understand what constitutes undesirable or failed efforts to address the risks of CC (Barnett & O'Neill, 2010; Scheraga & Grambsch, 1998). Despite important points of contention around operational challenges (Juhola et al., 2016) and the normative limitations of the concept (Lama et al., 2017); maladaptation has gained traction and appeared in several reports (IPCC, 2001) and practice-oriented guidelines (WFP, 2019). Presently, the awareness of potential maladaptive risks extends beyond the traditional realm of climate change adaptation (CCA) initiatives, having permeated humanitarian and development organisations alike.

The global increase in climate-related disasters (Thomas & López, 2015) coupled with the dynamic and often uncertain consequences of CC, are expected to have compounding effects on pressing development issues such as poverty, inequality, food insecurity and weak governance systems (Jones et al., 2010; Tenzing, 2019). Several authors have highlighted the emergent challenges that CC poses for social protection (SP), raising concerns about potential unintended consequences arising from strategies that aim to foster coping capacity in the short-term but insidiously affect long-term vulnerability or adaptive capacity of households (Jones et al., 2010; Solórzano & Cárdenes, 2019; Tenzing, 2019). However, SP has also received growing attention for its potential to contribute towards CCA, especially in low and middle-income countries (Davies et al., 2014). Several scholars have, particularly, underlined the role of SP in addressing important drivers of vulnerability, both climatic and non-climatic related (Tenzing, 2019). Nevertheless, when tackling the complex nexus of poverty, vulnerability and adaptation, virtually all initiatives entail trade-offs and the creation of 'winners and losers' (Adger, 2016; Nelson, 2011).

The importance of understanding how SP can navigate this uncertainty while avoiding maladaptation generated a knowledge gap expressed by the World Food Programme (WFP) Regional Bureaux in Panama (RBP) (Solórzano & Cárdenes, 2019). The goal was to understand how maladaptation could inform WFPs SP work which is beginning to integrate CC considerations (WFP, 2020).

1.1 Scope

The purpose of this research is to analyse how the risk of maladaptation can be addressed in SP programming, through the case of the WFP, specifically focusing on the RBP covering the Latin America and Caribbean Region (LAC). This contextual understanding will be guided by a multidimensional analysis of maladaptation. Subsequently, case-specific considerations to address the risk of maladaptation in SP programming will be reasoned. The study seeks to answer the following research question:

How can social protection programming address the risk of maladaptation,
with a specific focus on the World Food Programme?

1.2 Outline

To answer the research question, the study starts by introducing the conceptual background, laying the foundation for the logic of inquiry. This includes clarifications regarding SP and the researchers' stance on the concepts of vulnerability, adaptive and maladaptive pathways. This chapter will be followed by the analytical framework, centred around five dimensions of maladaptation. Chapter 4 will introduce the case of the WFP, including their mandate and approach to SP, in addition to a contextualisation of the WFPs presence in LAC. This will be followed by methodological foundations, including data collection and analysis, and reflections on limitations. The empirical findings will then be presented and discussed, firstly per dimension and then collectively stating the interlinkages. These outputs will inform the conclusion, where the research question will be answered.

2 Conceptual Background

This chapter introduces the key concepts informing the research, supporting the analytical framework and providing the foundation for the discussion of empirical findings. These concepts have multiple contested definitions; however, this chapter clarifies the researchers’ conceptual position considering the research problem.

2.1 Social protection

In the early twenty-first century, SP witnessed a rapid rise in the development agenda due to growing evidence of its contributing role to poverty reduction (Jorgensen & Siegel, 2019). Alongside SP proliferation, different understandings of its core components and boundaries prevailed (Devereux et al., 2015). This trajectory included narrower perspectives of SP as a safety net oriented for pro-poor economic growth (World Bank, 2001) and broader rights-based approaches that encompassed transformative action for social equity (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004). As a result, various perspectives on SP functions and instruments persist. In this thesis, SP is understood as “*all initiatives that transfer income or assets to the poor, protect the vulnerable against livelihood risks, and enhance the social status and rights of the marginalized*” (Sabates-Wheeler & Devereux, 2007, p. 25).

2.1.1 Social protection schemes

A useful distinction when understanding SP is the characterisation of its main schemes (Cecchini et al., 2014; OPM, 2017), as illustrated below:

Social protection						
Non-contributory				Contributory		
Social assistance			Social care	Social Insurance	Labour market policies and interventions	
Social transfers -Cash transfers -Vouchers -In-kind transfers (including school feeding)	Public works programmes -Cash for work -Food for work -Vouchers for work	Fee waivers -For basic health/education	Subsidies -Fuel -Food	-Family support services -Home-based care	Health insurance Insurance for: Unemployment; Maternity/paternity; Disability; Work accidents; Old age pension Crop/livestock insurance	Active -Work sharing -Training -Job-search services Passive -Maternity benefits, injury compensation, and sickness benefits for those in work -Changes in legislation (e.g. minimum wage, safe working conditions)

Table 1 - Social protection schematics (Carter et al., 2019, p. 13)

Non-contributory schemes include social assistance and social care services, generally targeted at groups identified as poor or vulnerable (Carter et al., 2019; OPM, 2017). Safety nets are categorised as non-contributory SP and often used interchangeably with social assistance; however, safety nets are sometimes associated with short-term, emergency-focused SP (Carter et al., 2019). In this study, safety nets and social assistance will be understood as the same type of SP scheme, thus aligning with WFPs SP typology (WFP, 2012, p. 9). Non-contributory SP does not require direct contribution from beneficiaries to receive benefits (ILO, 2018). However, programmes can be conditional or unconditional, where conditionalities require beneficiaries to undertake certain actions, normally concerning behavioural aspects perceived as long-term investments in human capital, such as attending school or visiting health facilities (Carter et al., 2019; Schüring, 2010).

Contributory SP covers social insurance and is managed by governments, with funded contributions paid by beneficiaries or through taxation, including programmes such as health and unemployment insurance or old-age pensions (Cecchini et al., 2014; OPM, 2017). In many contexts, coverage by contributory SP remains low due to obstacles such as the prevalence of employment in the informal sector, without contributory pension rights (Arza, 2017). Persistent inequalities, such as gendered labour markets often make contributory pension systems unable to cover older women and men equally (ibid.).

2.1.2 Universal social protection

Founded in a rights-based approach, universal SP aims to ensure that everyone has access to essential social services and basic income security, throughout the life cycle (ILO, 2019). The commitment to universalism is reflected in several Sustainable Development Goals¹ (SDG) aimed at ending poverty and inequality (United Nations, 2015), highlighting SP as a tool to promote social justice and ensure human security (ILO, 2019).

Universal SP seeks to cover all social risks or contingencies that may arise in a lifetime (ILO, 2019), reflecting the impacts of idiosyncratic and covariate risks². This underlines the need for a life cycle approach, since specific risks and vulnerabilities are reflected at different life-stages (Cecchini et al, 2015; ECLAC, 2020). This goal is said to be achievable through the articulation of contributory and non-contributory SP schemes (ILO, 2019), by coordinating and harmonising programmes within and across sectors such as health, education and food security

¹ Social protection is explicitly mentioned in three of the SDG, specifically in target 1.3, 3.8 and 8.b and implicitly referenced in target 5.4, 8.5 and 10.4 (ILO, 2017, p. 3)

² Idiosyncratic shocks affect the individual or household level, while covariate shocks involve entire communities or countries (Laws, 2016).

and nutrition (FSN) to provide basic economic and social rights (Cecchini et al., 2014; GHPC, 2019).

2.1.3 The 3P+T Framework

The Protection-Prevention-Promotion-Transformation (3P+T) framework underlines the importance of refocusing SP “on causes rather than consequences of vulnerability” in order to effectively reduce economic vulnerability alongside social vulnerability of poor, vulnerable and marginalised groups (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2007, p. 32). Thus, considering SP potential to *transform* economic opportunities by addressing concerns of social justice and exclusion (ibid.). Similarly, the reduction of socio-economic inequalities is often advanced as a principle to address maladaptation (Barnett & O’Neill, 2013; Magnan, 2014). When adaptation pathways do not scrutinise the development goals being furthered, there might be a risk of contributing, rather than challenging unsustainable development trajectories; for instance, by reinforcing social differentiation and vulnerability (Magnan et al., 2016). Accordingly, this thesis advances the importance of considering power imbalances and structural factors shaping vulnerability when *understanding* and *framing* potential maladaptive pathways. Hence, the broader understanding of vulnerability and SP proposed by Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler (2004) in the 3P+T, was embraced by the researchers who deemed it appropriate for this research problem. The table below advances the overall functions and corresponding instruments of SP:

SP category	SP instruments	Adaptation & Disaster Risk Reduction benefits
Protective (coping strategies): <i>guarantee relief from deprivation</i>	Social service provision Basic social transfers (food/cash) Social protection schemes Safety nets Public works programmes	Protection of those most vulnerable to climate risks, with low level of adaptive capacity
Preventive (coping strategies): <i>avert deprivation in various ways</i>	Social transfers Livelihood diversification Weather-indexed crop insurance	Prevents damaging coping strategies as a result of risks to weather-dependent livelihoods
Promotive (building adaptive capacity): <i>measures enhancing income and capabilities</i>	Social transfers Access to credit Asset transfer or protection Starter packs (drought/flood-resistant) Access to common property resources Public works programmes	Promotes resilience through livelihood diversification and security to withstand climate-related shocks Promotes opportunities arising from climate change
Transformative (building adaptive capacity): <i>address concerns of social equity and exclusion</i>	Promotion of minority rights Anti-discrimination campaigns Social funds	Transforms social relations to combat discrimination, underlying social and political vulnerability

Table 2 - 3P+T framework adapted from Davies et al. (2009)

Being broadly connected by the mitigation of risk, SP can also contribute for adaptation and risk reduction efforts (Davies et al., 2009). Several frameworks have explored these synergies such as *adaptive* (Davies et al., 2014), *climate-responsive* (Kuriakose et al., 2013) and *shock-responsive* (OPM, 2017) SP. Yet, as advanced by Tenzing (2019), while conceptual differences between them are mostly tied to distinct SP approaches, in practice, these frameworks tend to focus on similar technical adjustments without necessarily considering transformative measures. The WFP promotes Shock-Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) to enable flexible emergency responses to covariate shocks through national SP systems (Beazley et al., 2019). Strategies such as vertical and horizontal expansion or piggybacking are employed to scale-up the support normally provided (ibid.).

2.2 Vulnerability

Processes that inadvertently increase vulnerability to CC can be understood as enhancing maladaptation (Magnan et al., 2016). However, being inherently normative, multidimensional and context-specific, vulnerability requires framing as to *what* and for *whom* (Bankoff et al., 2004).

Vulnerability to CC is often conceptualised in relation to the exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity of systems³ to CC (IPCC, 2007; OECD, 2009). However, CC is seldom the only ongoing process of change influencing vulnerability (O'Brien & Wolf, 2010). Contextual drivers of vulnerability extend beyond climatic drivers alone and are embedded in a variety of ongoing processes such as socio-political, economic and demographic (Wisner, et al., 1994; Bankoff et al., 2004). Being dynamic processes, the same impact can be differently experienced, depending on people's values, across temporal and spatial scales (O'Brien & Wolf, 2010). Disregarding these aspects can lead to, generically, framing certain categories of people as vulnerable, creating a false assumption that every person within that group is vulnerable and experiences vulnerability uniformly (Buckle, 1999). Understanding vulnerability as contextual, however, underlines the fact that individuals are exposed to different magnitudes of loss (ibid.). For instance, within a community, vulnerability distributions can greatly vary (Bankoff et al., 2004). Hence, if the multiple drivers of vulnerability, leading to unsafe conditions, are not understood or addressed in programmes, there is a risk of merely mediating or even exacerbating existing vulnerabilities to CC (Wisner et al., 1994).

³ A system can be defined across multiple scales, such as a household, community, group, sector, region, country etc.

Eakin et al. (2014, p. 1) consider two main components of adaptive capacity: “*those associated with fundamental human development goals (generic capacity), and those necessary for managing and reducing specific climatic threats (specific capacity)*”. To address the multiple drivers of vulnerability, an appropriate balance between generic and specific capacities is fundamental if synergies between sustainable development and CCA are to be met (ibid.). However, such a balance hinges on contextual realities. In some cases, building generic capacity could be the preferred strategy to decrease vulnerability to CC, e.g. by improving access to education or tackling poverty (Eakin et al., 2014; Grüneis et al., 2016). However, high generic capacity does not necessarily translate into specific capacities (Eakin et al., 2014). Hence, a CC-centred approach to adaptation, although apparently contributing to reduce the threat of CC, also carries the risk of neglecting or reinforcing other drivers of vulnerability (Eakin et al., 2014; Magnan et al., 2016). For the purpose of this thesis, this understanding of adaptive capacity as depending on both generic and specific elements provides relevant insights to understand the multidimensional aspects of vulnerability that SP addresses. However, the researchers recognise that, ultimately, an ‘appropriate’ balance of generic and specific capacities is inherently normative, involves trade-offs and is highly dependent on the contextual drivers of vulnerability.

Poverty reduction is understood as a prerequisite for sustainable development and fundamental to build generic capacity, across scales (Eriksen & O’Brien, 2007). Poverty is generally understood as a key driver of unsafe conditions, thus increasing people’s vulnerability to CC (ibid.). However, these direct linkages generally rely on the direct association between poverty and access to resources, or the fact that poorer individuals often rely on climate-sensitive livelihoods (Leichenko & Silva, 2014). It is important to recognise that not all poor are vulnerable in the same way, and that connections between poverty and vulnerability to CC are not as straightforward as often assumed; vulnerability goes beyond poverty and there is no necessarily positive correlation between reducing poverty and reducing vulnerability to CC (Eriksen & O’Brien, 2007; Béné et al., 2012; Leichenko & Silva, 2014).

2.3 Adaptive and Maladaptive Pathways

Widely conceptualised as a process, action or outcome, adaptation is a mean to reduce a threat on what is considered valuable (Smit & Wandel, 2006; Becker, 2014). In a broader sense, a process of overcoming risk (O’Brien & Holland, 1992). In relation to CC, this entails both experienced and anticipated impacts, but also how these impacts are differentially valued, and how they influence the lives and wellbeing of humans and other species (O’Brien & Wolf, 2010). Adaptation processes can range from short-term coping to longer-term, deeper

transformations, occurring in a complex context of interacting climatic and non-climatic drivers (Moser & Ekstrom, 2010, p. 22026). These processes may or may not succeed in moderating harm or exploiting beneficial opportunities, potentially leading to unforeseen trajectories, displaced across spatial and temporal scales (Fazey et al., 2011).

Barnett & O’Neill (2010, p. 211) define maladaptation as a “*process that results in increased vulnerability to climate variability and change, directly or indirectly, and/or significantly undermines capacities or opportunities for present and future adaptation*”. This definition is widely used and represents an outcome-oriented approach to maladaptation, typically connected to a pragmatic stance to overcome operational challenges (Moser, 2013). However, setting criteria and boundaries of analysis for adaptation decisions is not simply a procedural aspect, but rather normative, historically contingent and context-specific (ibid.). Whilst, maladaptation is intrinsically linked to increased vulnerability – of a system, sector or group – which the action was meant to reduce; questions remain regarding *when* it can be diagnosed and by *whom*, considering the complexity of scalar interactions (Magnan et al., 2016). A narrow view of maladaptation simplifies the assessment of unintended consequences by establishing conceptual boundaries linked to climatic drivers (Juhola et al., 2016), however, it downplays the crucial role of values and contextual vulnerability.

For the purpose of this thesis, adaptation and maladaptation are understood as ongoing socio-political processes embedded within broader pathways of change and response emerging over time (Câmpeanu & Fazey, 2014). Adaptive and maladaptive pathways need to be considered within a broader adaptive landscape, whereby people adjust to multiple drivers depending on their values, goals and aspirations (O’Brien & Wolf, 2010; Wise et al., 2014). In such a landscape, as conceptualised by Wise et al. (2014), rather than a clear line dividing adaptation and maladaptation, there is instead a continuum affected not only by a changing climate but also by multiple processes of change and response across scales. Maladaptation is inherently a normative judgement based on values perceived as desirable and prioritised through processes of contestation and negotiation (Lama et al., 2017; Nightingale, 2017). In light of diverse values, goals and aspirations, initiatives can lead to potentially contradictory, yet simultaneous effects (Lama, 2019). Thus, this research attempts to move beyond a binary conceptualisation of adaptation as ‘good’ and maladaptation as ‘bad’ (ibid.), and rather highlight the context-specific and normative continuum between them.

The authors uphold a broadening of the adaptive landscape that allows for a conceptualisation of maladaptation in line with notions of power, agency and trade-offs between ongoing trajectories of change. To achieve this goal, the concept of *pathways* provides a helpful

metaphor for interplay between initiatives that can, not only explicitly, but also through balancing objectives, constrain the adaptive landscape (Grüneis et al., 2016; Wise et al., 2014). This approach acknowledges maladaptive outcomes as subjective and potentially contested, since not all outcomes may be achieved simultaneously (Lama et al., 2017); thus, moving towards understanding how processes of change and response can contribute to emerging maladaptive pathways (Butler et al., 2014).

3 Analytical Framework

In this chapter the analytical framework, which structures the data collection and analysis, will be introduced. The framework builds upon Magnan et al. (2016, p. 18) multidimensional approach, understanding maladaptation as a “*process that is influenced by multiple drivers and involves various temporal and spatial scales*”. Similar to the researchers’ conceptualisation, this framework goes beyond maladaptive outcomes, towards addressing maladaptation as a process.

Whilst Magnan et al. (2016, p. 6) are ambiguous towards the possibility of maladaptation also arising from “*poorly planned development unrelated to climate change*”, the researchers argue that maladaptation should be understood as, potentially, arising from a broader range of multiple interconnected drivers (Jones et al., 2015; Gajjar et al., 2019). This broader understanding of maladaptation will be used to analyse WFPs SP work, in combination with a pathways approach, recognising that a broader adaptive landscape can potentiate unintended implications for vulnerability to CC and adaptive capacity.

Central to a pathways approach is the recognition that the same system has different frames depending on normative decisions about which elements to highlight, which boundaries to set and from which scales to analyse (Leach et al., 2007). The dominance of particular framings to the detriment of others underlines the structural importance of power relations. Acknowledging how such power relations can either reinforce or hinder existing relationships and social inequalities is important in viewing adaptation and maladaptation as social-political processes (Fazey et al., 2016). Therefore, in addition to the four dimensions presented by Magnan et al. (2016), the researchers propose the inclusion of power and politics as a critical dimension. The following subsections will explore each dimension of maladaptation.

3.1 Multiple drivers

CC is seldom the sole driver to a changing adaptive landscape, but rather several cross-scale processes of change that interact and contribute to multiple stressors and contextual vulnerability (O’Brien & Wolf, 2010). Acknowledging the role of multiple drivers of vulnerability to CC involves recognising that most initiatives are faced with inherent trade-offs and potential synergies, depending on the context-specific interaction between these multiple drivers (Eriksen et al., 2011). A selective focus on actions that respond solely to CC impacts might be far from addressing the most pressing concerns of those most vulnerable to CC (Grüneis et al., 2016). Therefore, it is foundational to understand what is valued, by whom, and how those values may influence and/or be influenced by CC (O’Brien & Wolf, 2010).

Furthermore, addressing the risk of maladaptation requires that interventions consider the context-specific interaction between multiple drivers, in order to strategically balance between generic and specific capacities (Eakin et al., 2014).

3.2 Process

Moving beyond maladaptive outcomes, current scholarship focusses on maladaptation as a multiscale process that increases vulnerability to CC and/or undermines adaptive capacity (Magnan et al., 2016). Maladaptive pathways are contingent on the progression of vulnerability – from root causes to unsafe conditions – which are exacerbated by multiple climatic and non-climatic drivers, rooted in interdependent social, political, economic and demographic processes (Wisner, et al., 1994; Bankoff et al., 2004). The continuum between adaptive and maladaptive pathways should be understood as always in formation, debate and negotiation, depending on the values, perceptions of risk, vulnerability and power relations (Nightingale, 2017; Neset et al., 2019). These processes are interconnected and occur simultaneously, potentially limiting future adaptation (Wise et al., 2014). Hence, it is important to understand if adaptation pathways are oriented towards specific bounded outcomes, or if a broader recognition of ongoing processes of change and response is sought.

3.3 Temporal scales

As a process extended through time, there is no start or endpoint for assessing maladaptation, such boundaries entail a normative judgement (Magnan et al., 2016; Gajjar et al., 2019). Initiatives aiming to reduce present vulnerability might create lock-ins or trade-offs that inadvertently reduce adaptive capacity in the future, or vice-versa (Juhola et al., 2016; Lama et al., 2017). This creates a challenge for short-term initiatives since maladaptation can occur long after a programme cycle has ended (Jones et al., 2015). The temporal dimension of maladaptation also concerns how past trajectories impact the present adaptive landscape, through legacies and continuities, which in turn shape the future adaptive landscape (Fazey et al., 2016; Gajjar et al., 2019). Understanding past changes can provide inspiration for new and transforming futures, whereas disregarding such pathways can, potentially, increase the risk of maladaptive trajectories (Fazey et al., 2016).

3.4 Power and politics

Adaptation pathways are enrolled within a broader political context, wherein processes of contestation and cooperation occur when governing everyday affairs (Eriksen et al., 2015). Authority, knowledge and subjectivity interact, both within and beyond initiatives, leading to the prioritisation and exclusion of certain values, drivers of vulnerability and alternative

pathways (ibid.). Embedded in such politics, different knowledges for addressing CC are prioritised and legitimised through adaptation decisions (Nightingale et al., 2019). A relational conceptualisation of power draws attention to the contradictory outcomes of pathways of change and response, relations and broader contexts wherein power is exercised (Nightingale, 2017; O'Brien & Wolf, 2010). Disregarding the potential of uneven power relations and dominant political structures, may contribute towards a risk of maladaptation, through entrenching pre-existent inequalities and marginalisation processes driving vulnerability (Fazey et al., 2016). It is therefore important to consider how power and politics shape, mediate and influence adaptation pathways, and how such responses can, in turn, mediate or exacerbate pre-existing power relations and differential vulnerabilities (Eriksen et al., 2015; Fazey, et al., 2016).

3.5 Spatial scales

Multiple drivers of vulnerability are interconnected across different spatial scales, ranging from macro, meso and micro (Lama et al., 2017). Each context holds specific dimensions and dynamics, such as values, gender, socio-economic and ethnic conditions, that are interdependent and that can contribute for the emergence of maladaptive pathways (Fazey, 2016; Müller et al., 2017). Due to the interdependence of multiple pathways, initiatives can impact vulnerability to CC both across and within spatial scales, with differential distributional effects (Barnett and O'Neill 2010; Juhola et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2015). Magnan et al. (2016) describe how, ideally, initiatives should have an attenuating effect on the vulnerability of the system or, at the very least, no collateral effect. However, since initiatives are part of ongoing change and response processes, avoiding displacing pressures across scales remains a challenge. Hence, the creation of trade-offs with 'winners and losers' are particularly complex to avoid, considering that maladaptation depends on normative system framings (Magnan, 2014; Zavaleta et al., 2018). Therefore, consideration should be given to *what* or *who* a particular pathway represents, acknowledging that people, across and within scales, perceive and value adaptation pathways differently (Fazey et al., 2016).

4 Methods and Materials

This chapter will introduce WFP RBP as the instrumental case providing the empirical data that will be used to answer the research question. This will be followed by a section describing the study's methodological basis, including the data collection and analysis strategies and techniques. Finally, limitations will be stated and discussed.

4.1 Case presentation

4.1.1 WFPs mandate and social protection approach

WFP is a humanitarian organisation whose mission is to provide food assistance and promote food security, oriented towards the objective of eradicating hunger and poverty (WFP, 2004). SP is an important corporate priority contributing to WFPs mission by reaching those at risk of food insecurity and malnutrition, addressing structural gaps and promoting resilience (Hoddinott & Skoufias, 2004; Cabral et al., 2014). However, since “*any programme that is temporary, unpredictable, or that does not build, or support government safety net systems cannot be described as social protection*” (Sabates-Wheeler & Devereux, 2018, p. 5), the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan advances WFPs approach of working through and strengthening national SP systems, frameworks and capacities, in line with emergent consensus viewing SP as a core governmental mandate (WFP, 2017). This approach is seen as contributing for the sustainability, ownership, coherence, complementarity and integration of SP into broader national development strategies (Sabates-Wheeler & Devereux, 2018; ILO, 2019).

4.1.2 Social protection: regional context and WFPs role

The LAC SP systems underwent major transformations since the beginning of the new century. Cecchini et al. (2014) described four clear trends amongst LAC countries: (i) sustained efforts to increase SP coverage; (ii) increasing quality and variety of the SP provisions, both in programming and in the growing specificity of the population reached; (iii) increasing regulatory-institutional support enabling stable policies based on entitlements with genuine financing; (iv) pursuit of inter-sectoral synergies and coordination with broader social areas. Albeit with variations between countries and remaining gaps; the LAC region is, generally, advancing towards the implementation of comprehensive SP systems, based on a rights-based approach (ECLAC, 2019).

However, critical obstacles to inclusive development in the region remain (ECLAC, 2019). Despite poverty reduction achievements between the early 2000s and the mid-2010s, setbacks occurred since 2015, including an increased incidence of extreme poverty (ibid.). Regional poverty rates are most severe among children and adolescents, women, indigenous peoples,

Afro-descendants and people living in rural areas; demonstrating the progression of vulnerability, partly, due to intersectional dimensions of gender and ethno-racial inequality (ibid.). The region is witnessing a sharp increase in obesity in all countries, with persistently high levels of undernutrition in some countries (FAO et al., 2017; WFP, 2020). Furthermore, the regional migration crisis is likely to fundamentally impact national systems, prompting important paradigm shifts both at source and destination areas (WFP, 2020). While SP is only part of a broader solution, this offers a strategic platform for addressing structural root causes of risk and vulnerability across the life cycle, hence creating a window of opportunity for system strengthening (ibid.).

Improvements in the formal labour market and changes in eligibility criteria for beneficiaries have improved the coverage of contributory SP in the region, over the last decades (Cecchini et al., 2014). However, the unequal integration of beneficiaries in programmes based on multidimensional discrimination remains a challenge (Cecchini & Rodrigo, 2012; ECLAC, 2019). Despite efforts to increase regional coverage of non-contributory SP, needs-based targeting still dominates over universal coverage as the historical deficits of SP systems persist throughout the region, although with considerable differences between countries (Cecchini et al., 2014). Likewise, WFP states a universalistic orientation to SP, grounded in a needs-based approach that, while valuing SP as a guarantee, understands it as differential in practice according to specific contexts and populational needs (WFP, 2020). WFPs SP work is generally organised around three interconnected levels of action:

<i>Geographical presence</i>	Within LAC, WFP has a geographic presence in 12 countries: South America, Bolivia, Ecuador, Colombia, Peru, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Haiti and Barbados. The WFP Barbados Office also supports every country participating in the Caribbean Disaster Emergency Management Agency. Additionally, when requested, support to non-presence countries can be provided.
<i>Country level</i>	SP work is led and managed by Country Offices (CO) which organise their humanitarian and development portfolio, for a period up to 5 years, within Country Strategic Plans (CSPs). These are informed by country led Zero Hunger Strategic Reviews, consisting of multi-stakeholder consultative processes that align priorities and contributions for the achievement of SDG 2.
<i>Regional level</i>	SP work is led by the RBP who acts as a convener and facilitator of South-South and Triangular Cooperation, in efforts to advance the regional vision for SP (WFP, 2020)
<i>Global level</i>	The RBP liaises with Headquarters (HQ) on all aspects of global relevance, including broader discussions on the organisational role in SP, informing corporate policies and tools and broader evidence generation for exchanges with the SP community of practice and partners.

Table 3 - Overview of WFPs SP work across levels

With, overall, mature SP systems and innovations, such as the widely replicated conditional cash transfer programmes (Cecchini & Madariaga, 2011; Beazley et al., 2019); WFP only implements SP when support is requested, on behalf of SP institutions (e.g. nutrition-sensitive component of the national SP programme *Progresando con Solidaridad* in the Dominican Republic) (WFP, 2020). The organisation's main SP role in the region consists of technical assistance, capacity strengthening, advocacy and policy support to government-led SP initiatives (ibid.). This support is underpinned by an analysis of the political economy of initiatives, complemented by a whole-of-society approach and embeddedness in legal frameworks.

The regional SP strategy provides the vision and framework for inclusive, equitable and gender transformative national systems, prioritising the most vulnerable and marginalized groups to effectively and sustainably contribute to reach Zero Hunger and Malnutrition in LAC (WFP, 2020). Given the, generally, high level of governmental capacity and WFPs comparative expertise, the following integrated objectives constitute the four main pillars of WFPs SP work in LAC: nutrition-sensitive, shock-responsive, climate change and system strengthening (ibid.)

Despite WFPs general advancements on most pillars, the integration of SP and CC remains at theoretical level and is yet to be operationalised, as advanced in the SP strategy (WFP, 2020). However, linkages and specific entry points have been identified regarding climate-related activities, such as forecast-based financing (FbF) and microinsurance. Ongoing processes include the potential integration of climate information and specific tools, developed by the Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) internal unit supporting RBPs SP work. Furthermore, innovative regional experiences presently integrating CC into SP, such as the *Poverty, Reforestation, Energy and Climate Change Project* (PROEZA) in Paraguay, will provide learnings to inform RBP SP work.

4.2 Methodology

This research draws on a case study of WFPs SP work in LAC, informed by practitioners at three interconnected levels. An instrumental case study was selected to provide insights on the issue of maladaptation in relation to SP programming (Stake, 1995). While the researchers recognise the limits of instrumental cases regarding generalisations, the goal is rather to emphasise the richness of qualitative research through the possibility of identifying patterns and comparing themes with other cases (ibid.).

The case selection was, firstly, based on the maturity of most SP systems in LAC countries, and on their strategic partnership with WFP. Secondly, while little explicit SP programming to

advance CCA is in place (WFP, 2020), the RBP has started to explore how SP can support households to face CC and the types of distinctive challenges CC might present to SP programming (Solórzano & Cárdenes, 2019). Thirdly, based on the region's economic reliance on agriculture and low adaptive capacity of its population, it is upheld that CC will considerably impact LAC (WFP, 2020). Climate-related hazards are expected to become more frequent and intense in the region, with compounding effects on development challenges (Beazley et al., 2019). The challenges and opportunities posed to SP generated, the previously mentioned, knowledge gap for which this thesis seeks to contribute.

To understand the selected case, the researchers began by focusing on SPs programming cycle. However, the first interviews and further access to internal documentation contributed to a distinct perception of WFPs operational reality. Thus, from that point, the researchers grounded the research problem according to the diversity of WFPs work, that extends beyond programming towards facilitation of SP support. Additionally, over decades of implementation, WFP has developed good practices, tools and innovations in resilience-building and CCA programmes, that can be scaled-up and integrated with national SP programmes and systems (WFP, 2020). Thus, in addition to SP specific insights, the researchers decided to broaden the scope of the case study to capture further insights with potential implications for a nuanced understanding of the research problem. Annex 1 provides an overview of the identified entry points, distinguishing between SP specific insights and broader programmatic areas, methodologies and policies. Further, explaining how these areas inform SP.

4.3 Secondary data collection

The researchers conducted a desk study to collect secondary data on the topics of maladaptation, SP, vulnerability and adaptation pathways. Academic and grey literature was collected through web-based academic search engines such as Google Scholar and ResearchGate. Key search terms were 'maladaptation climate change', 'social protection', 'vulnerability to climate change' and 'adaptation pathways'. Given the wide array of results, literature exploring potential linkages between core concepts was deemed relevant and reviewed. The selected literature informed the design and content of the analytical framework applied to the case study.

WFPs web-based search engine⁴ facilitated the collection of organisational policies, manuals, evaluations and case studies. Key informants supported this process by advising on relevant data and providing additional access to internal documents. Firstly, case-specific secondary

⁴ <https://www.wfp.org/publications>

data was used to develop a contextual understanding and to inform the design of the interview guides (Bowen, 2009). Secondly, to address potential subjective views from informants towards the discussed topics, and as a means to ensure the validity of results, secondary data was used to triangulate data (Stake, 1995; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

4.4 Primary data collection

Primary data was collected through semi-structured key informant interviews. This method was chosen to gather in-depth insights from WFP staff on multiple areas relevant to the research topic, primarily staff working with SP, CC, resilience and environmental and social safeguards.

Prior to the data collection, the researchers discussed how the analytical framework could guide the primary and secondary data collection. By scrutinising each dimension of the analytical framework through specific sub-questions, the researchers identified which WFP areas of work could be relevant. The subsequent entry points constituted the foundation for the sampling strategy, that followed a purposive sampling approach, where initial informants were selected first through recommendations from the external WFP supervisors, based on requests for specific areas of the research topic (Creswell, 2013). Secondly, through snowball sampling, additional informants were identified through communication with informants, based on remaining or emergent knowledge gaps (*ibid.*). The combination of these techniques helped identify relevant focal points within the organisation, and the support from external WFP supervisors and informants proved crucial in this process.

The sampling size was determined by multiple factors. Firstly, perspectives ranging from global, regional to national level were considered necessary to inform the research problem, hence the informants represent WFP from HQ, RBP and multiple COs. Secondly, the intent of the research was not to generalise but to elucidate specific aspects of the case deemed relevant for the research, enabling a narrowing of informants (Creswell, 2013). Thirdly, the data collection process was somewhat iterative with ongoing assessments of potential knowledge gaps, leading to the planning of more interviews and follow-up correspondence with informants.

Upon finishing the interviews, some degree of information redundancy was identified, indicating a satisfactory level of theoretical saturation (Glaser & Strauss, 2009). Fifteen interviews were conducted, out of seventeen informants contacted. Annex 2 contains the list of informants. Fourteen of the informants are employed in WFP. The final informant is the head-author of the article informing the analytical framework, Alexandre Magnan, who has given verbal consent to disclose his name in this study. Magnan's inputs refined the researchers

conceptual understanding of maladaptation and quotes will be referenced in the discussion section as (Magnan, interview, 2020). This was deemed relevant considering his expertise on the topic, to ensure the credibility of inputs.

4.4.1 Interview guides

All interview guides were formulated prior to the interviews. When developing questions, the researchers attempted to avoid leading questions that could potentially influence the reliability of the data (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015). The interview guides can be found in Annex 3. To refine the format of the interview guides, the initial guide was peer-reviewed. Additionally, researchers' own experiences throughout the interviewing process provided continuous inputs to the refinement of guides.

Each interview guide was tailored to the individual informant, to meet a specific analytical purpose, reflecting their respective area of expertise. In this way, the researchers were able to cover the relevant topics that were identified in the prior discussions. Consequently, questions specific to the informants' expertise weighted the most in the interviews, nevertheless, general questions regarding the research topic were also included, to ensure variation and allow the emergence of potential unknowns (Creswell, 2013). This also informed a holistic contextual perspective of the case in which the research is grounded.

4.4.2 Interview process

All interviews were conducted online, through Zoom, Skype and Microsoft Teams. Both researchers attended all interviews, alternately acting as the interviewer while the other managed time and posed potential follow-up questions. The interviews followed the structure of the interview guides, however with room to explore relevant emerging topics, depending on time availability.

Prior to the interview, each informant received a specific outline informing about the research topic, interview purpose, overall themes of inquiry and expected duration. The complete interview questions were not shared beforehand to minimise rehearsed answers and ensure genuine inputs. Based on the outline description, every interviewee provided informed verbal consent before the interview started, allowing the recording and analysis of the interviews in the research and the inclusion of their job titles, to ensure a degree of confidentiality (Creswell, 2013; Kvale & Brinkmann, 2015).

All interviews were recorded directly in Zoom or QuickTime and stored on a password protected hard drive. Anonymity was ensured by using pseudonyms for the informants in every file related to the interviews. This was also applicable to the transcripts which were not made

public with the thesis, however, upon securing informant consent, these may be shared with peers (Saunders et al., 2015).

4.5 Data analysis

To facilitate a thorough and repeated analysis of primary data, all interviews were transcribed and audited in a collaborative effort by the researchers (Bryman, 2012). In parallel to the primary data collection, pre-coding efforts were undertaken by adding preliminary jottings to the interview transcripts (Saldaña, 2009). The quality of some recordings was slightly hindered by internet connection issues, compromising the utter accuracy of the transcription results.

The interview transcripts were uploaded to the programme NVivo, which facilitates coding processes through the use of 'nodes' that compile references about specific themes (Bryman, 2012). Firstly, both researchers conducted an independent pilot coding round on the initial interviews. One of the researchers followed an open coding logic, whilst the other based the coding scheme on the analytical framework. Based on this iteration, the researchers shared internal thinking processes and merged coding schemes (Saldaña, 2009). The first coding cycle was then conducted in parallel to the data collection, by both researchers independently and informed further refinement of the coding scheme. The second and third coding cycle followed a different method, wherein the researchers divided the interview transcripts into two batches, ensuring a diverse range of topics in each batch. Subsequently, each researcher solo coded one of the batches and, upon completion, exchanged batch. Through this method, the researchers collaboratively completed two additional coding cycles with the same coding scheme.

Interview transcripts were first coded according to five nodes, corresponding to the maladaptation dimensions: multiple drivers, process, temporal scales, spatial scales, power and politics. Within each node, first-level child nodes were created to capture the essence of each dimension (Saldaña, 2009). The latter process was iterative and intertwined emergent aspects based on primary data with relevant concepts from academic literature. The table below illustrates the node hierarchies:

<i>Node</i>	<i>Child nodes</i>
Multiple drivers	Generic and Specific
	Drivers
	Food Security, Nutrition and Hunger
	Holistic approach
	Interlinkages between drivers
	Progression of Vulnerability
	Root causes of vulnerability
Process	Analysis and planning tools
	Flexibility of programmes
	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
	Outcomes vs. Process
	Coordination
Temporal scales	Long-term planning
	Sustainability of programmes
	Past events
	Short-term planning
	Sequencing
Power and politics	Capacity development
	Framing of vulnerable groups
	Funding & resources
	Knowledge(s)
	3P+T
	Government-led
	Partnership
	Community Engagement
	WFP Mandate
	Clientelism
Spatial scales	Context-specific programming
	Interdependent Scales
	Layering
	Local adaptation & global mitigation
	Multi-stakeholder cross-sectoral

Table 4 - Node hierarchies

After the coding process, the researchers first compared, then condensed, analysed and discussed the coding-inputs from each dimension and corresponding child-nodes, identifying emerging key observations, meanings and their interlinkages (Saldaña, 2009). The outputs from this second-level analysis were systematically discussed and arranged in an internal overview, providing the foundation and direction for the presentation and discussion of results.

4.6 Limitations

The collaboration with WFP granted access to several key informants and to co-supervision by Dr. Ana Solórzano, which refined the researchers' analytical inquiry in accordance to current practices. Initial contact with the informants was mainly initiated by the co-supervisor. This contributed towards a sense of credibility and willingness from the informants to participate. As a drawback, the selection of informants was potentially affected by selection bias risking not capturing variations within the research scope. However, in addition to the suggested informants, the researchers sought further contacts through snowballing sampling. This combination of techniques was deemed appropriate considering the time and resources available, in addition to the limited number of informants that could potentially contribute.

The interview process occurred during the COVID-19 pandemic which limited the access and availability of some informants, particularly at CO level, considering ongoing emergency responses. The prioritisation of English-speaking informants potentially limited language expression and comprehension (Fryer, 2019). However, no significant language barriers were detected during the interviews. Further practicalities such as weak internet connection also impacted the final number of interviews. The researchers were able to obtain the necessary information by rescheduling interviews and reaching informants within similar areas.

Data analysis is an interpretive process that can be affected by the researchers' potential biases or assumptions (Creswell, 2013). The inclusion of two researchers allowed for investigator triangulation throughout the research (Thurmond, 2001). Cross-checking and continuous discussion enabled the introduction of internal accountability mechanisms (Genareo et al., 2014). To address potential biases and avoid amplifying them, both researchers were cognisant of each other's ontological and epistemological preferences (Thurmond, 2001).

The data analysis was guided by the analytical framework and respective dimensions, which potentially limited an open analysis grounded on the text (Blair, 2015). To avoid overlooking any major aspects that could potentially inform the research question, the researchers assumed a reflexive position throughout the process by writing separate analytical memos on potential emergent aspects.

5 Results and discussion

This chapter will introduce and discuss the results from the data collection and analysis. Guided by the analytical framework and corresponding node-hierarchy, results will be presented. The findings will be firstly discussed by dimension and connected to related literature. Then, a broader discussion will connect the findings from each dimension, enabling further insights.

5.1 Multiple drivers

5.1.1 Results

Most informants mentioned the exposure to a wide variety of natural hazards in LAC: *“Because of where we are located, we are at high risk of any sort of threat, whether that’s hurricanes, droughts, earthquakes or tsunamis”*. Most hazards were associated with climate variability and change: *“This area is quite vulnerable to the effect of climate variability in terms of the increasing frequency, the intensity of extreme climate-related events, especially droughts and floods, and also for the events related to the ENSO phenomena, el Niño and la Niña”*. One informant stated: *“it really is climate vulnerability that we are talking about in this region”*.

Many informants highlighted the negative impacts of climate risks on FSN, one informant stating that *“we know that the effect of climate variability and climate change can negatively impact the food security and nutrition, especially of vulnerable population, in terms of food access, food availability and also in terms of dietary diversity”*. An example provided by many informants, illustrating the consequences of climate risk in the region, are the recurrent droughts in the Dry Corridor of Central America, impacting *“traditional livelihoods and abilities”*, where *“you have probably 6 million who are food insecure and 1.5 to 2 million who are really in a dire situation”*.

Some informants mentioned additional *“covariate shocks”*, including *“economic crisis, political crisis and prolonged international conflict”*, perceived to create *“compounded aggregate risks at the covariate and idiosyncratic level”* due to *“several layers of vulnerabilities”*. One informant shared that *“what’s really challenging in the region for the moment is the response to the [Venezuelan] migration crisis”*. One informant highlighted *“food insecurity, violence and lack of opportunities, at different levels”* as drivers of forced migration in the region. According to one informant, the high vulnerability of Venezuelan migrants in Peru can potentially increase their propensity to resort to negative coping strategies since *“in many cases, they don’t have the possibility to work, they don’t have the possibility to access [...] the health care system”*.

Many informants described different social consequences and impacts of risks, at local scale and household level, based on pre-existent vulnerability to a given hazard. Gendered social norms were highlighted by many informants: *“there are locations where we know that women have less opportunities”*. Another informant mentioned that people are *“vulnerable to different factors”* and that while *“this included some gender elements, [...] other social identity markers come to play such as disability, age, ethnicity, citizenship”*. Most informants highlighted the importance *“of understanding the underlying vulnerabilities of communities in a country”*. Additionally, one informant mentioned that *“all these different dynamics have to be considered, you cannot just focus on one element”*.

Some informants advanced that while WFPs *“expertise is food security [...] we [organisation] are slowly shifting towards a broader concept of vulnerability and essential needs”*. In Haiti, WFP currently supports the development of the national SP policy, whose main pillars are childhood, labour and employment, health and SRSP. One informant advanced that *“we wanted the social safety net in Haiti to be shock-responsive and climate change is a key element of it”*. One informant mentioned *“in a certain point in our history [WFP] realised that, if we want to stop feeding people when there is an emergency, we have to build their resilience to cope with a given shock”*. Most informants mentioned the importance of a *“holistic approach to development goals”*. However, one respondent recognised structural elements beyond the organisational reach: *“we can contribute to zero hunger, but there are also structural issues that need to be tackled in many contexts”*. Another informant highlighted that it is frequently envisioned *“that social protection can do it all, as a magic bullet, but this is definitely not the case. It’s just one part of the strategy to [tackle] poverty”*.

When describing the four pillars of the regional SP strategy, one respondent highlighted their interdependent nature: *“the fact that you do shock-responsive social protection does not mean that you should not be taking into consideration nutrition issues, in the end, we are the World Food Programme and this is our core mandate”*. The SP strategy entails supporting *“climate change adaptation as it is closely related, evermore, with poverty and vulnerability”*; however, one informant advanced that there is still work to be done in the *“idea of blending climate change and social protection together, beyond the shock-responsive social protection side of things”*. Concerning SRSP, one informant stated that *“you could argue [...] that there is a link with climate change, but it is not in-depth”*. Some informants mentioned that *“climate change is only one part of the risk agenda of social protection”*. Being a new pillar for SP, an informant mentioned that for *“climate change-related shocks and long-term adaptation the organisation will need to come with an integrated agenda”*.

One informant mentioned some conceptual confusion regarding the drivers of maladaptation: *“is it the result of simply poorly planned development, which is basically, not related to climate change or related to climate change”*? While another informant stated that *“maladaptation and the issue of externalities”* could contribute towards an integrated understanding of SP interventions since *“you cannot think of the environment, without thinking of the wellbeing of people, their rights and their dignity”*. The informant further developed that this integration needed to be oriented towards *“a great goal that is ending poverty, vulnerability and inequalities, but we cannot do it with means that do not abide to that”*.

5.1.2 Discussion

WFP is still at the early stages of operationalising its approach to SP and CC, in LAC. Hence, to understand the multiple drivers of vulnerability and how these could potentially contribute to maladaptation in WFPs SP work, the researchers attempted to capture how vulnerability was understood and informing programming approaches and the regional strategy. Based on the assumption that different understandings of risk and vulnerability influence how adaptation is conceived, leading to different policy and programming implications (Adger, 2006; Eakin et al., 2009).

The findings show that WFPs historical mandate on FSN has shaped the perception of drivers of vulnerability in the region, which can be observed by the recurrent understanding of climate risks through the impacts on FSN. This focus is present in the regional SP strategy, highlighting nutrition-sensitive SP as a key pillar and nutrition desired outcomes as a cross-cutting concern. Similarly, WFPs historical mandate as an emergency-oriented organisation has contributed towards an emphasis on reducing risk to shocks, which can be observed by the strong SRSP agenda. This approach to vulnerability focusing on addressing the risk to a potential set of outcomes, such as hunger, is consistent with a narrower approach present in WFPs early resilience-building agenda and safety nets related work.

Nevertheless, as mentioned by several informants, the organisation is broadening its interpretation of vulnerability and essential needs. A more holistic approach can be discerned through the focus on pre-existing conditions shaping vulnerability. The existence of normative deep-rooted structures contributing to compounding vulnerabilities was highlighted, not only connected to climate-related risks but to multiple risks. For instance, several informants mentioned the impacts of the migration crisis in the region, contributing to increasing the complexities for WFPs SP work. Increasing evidence shows that CC can, in certain contexts, have significant impacts on the multiple drivers of migration (Black et al., 2011; Foresight, 2011) and the potential role for SP in supporting such existing and emerging needs has been

highlighted in policy documents (ILO, 2011; ILO, 2015). Accordingly, one informant underlined the importance of creating such linkages, in light of CC. Challenges for integrating such concerns into SP systems are highlighted in section 5.4.

In this context, WFPs vision of the adaptive landscape is broadened by an integrated understanding of multiple drivers of vulnerability, across levels and scales, that incorporates the complex relationships of people to broader political economic forces as well as to their specific environment and to each other (Bankoff, 2013). Potential challenges to act upon this broader understanding of vulnerability will be addressed in the other dimensions, including the perceived limits of WFPs mandate and potential path-dependencies.

In the regional SP strategy, this integrated approach becomes evident through the inclusion of CC as a key pillar but also through an orientation towards systems, moving from fragmented SP interventions towards promoting entitlements (WFP, 2020). Further, reflecting that individuals face variable risks and vulnerabilities throughout the life cycle, and that SP can contribute to address them comprehensively. However, the challenge to integrate SP and CC, whilst addressing the risk of maladaptation, lies in recognising that the balance between these areas is highly dependent on contextual needs and capacities. Hence, advancing a static approach to SP and CC can lead to maladaptation, with the risk of neglecting or reinforcing the multiple drivers of vulnerability (Magnan et al., 2016). Thus, it is important to explicitly consider and negotiate synergies and trade-offs that may appear cross-scales when balancing the goals of addressing the emergent challenge of CC with the protection of vulnerable groups.

5.2 Process

5.2.1 Results

The organisational shift from, mostly implementing programmes, towards “*promoting the integration of WFPs assistance into the national social protection system*”, was mentioned by several informants, underlining the role of governments and “*the ultimate objective to strengthen the national social protection system*”. However, regarding WFPs advocacy efforts for SP and CC, one informant mentioned that governmental counterparts generally question: “*why using the social protection programmes to respond to an emergency? These are different things. And then imagine we [WFP] come and say, well, yes, and also you can use them for adaptation*”. The informant connected this issue to coordination challenges and siloing CC topics, at high-level with the politicians, but also at technical level because “*multidisciplinarity is not something necessarily embedded in this region*”.

One informant underlined that, considering shocks and wider dynamics holistically, *“one agency cannot cover everything, one government certainly will have issues in addressing the different issues on its own, so how do you leverage your support with the other actors”*? To support governments in SP, most informants advanced the importance of coordinating with relevant sectors to align processes and leverage potential cumulative impacts, to establish *“co-benefits to wider development”*. One informant mentioned this requires *“coherence between overarching goals and means that have to be synchronized and aligned morally, ethically, programmatically”*. As noted by one informant, *“you may have different small impacts that are implemented [...] and although those are all small activities, the cumulative impact might be high”*. Informants also mentioned the importance of sectoral coordination across scales, such as between *“all the local and national institutions in charge of climate change and environmental issues, in order to ensure that these actions are aligned and contribute to objectives and goals of national and local policies and strategies”*. One informant shared how supporting the coordination and integration between the SP system and the emergency system included a process of *“naturalisation”* at country level: *“making aware to the emergency preparedness and response stakeholders, that social protection was not going to take out the leadership”*.

In addition to alignment with ongoing processes, most informants mentioned the need for internal coordination towards integrated programming. One informant noted that *“we are proactively trying to build links together on the two areas⁵ and start working more as an integrated team that is breaking the silos”*. The integration of SP, CCA, resilience and EPR were commonly mentioned by informants when reflecting on areas that could benefit from an integrated approach; nevertheless, stating that existing gaps still needed to be addressed between them. Several informants mentioned a *“siloesd way of working”* as a challenge for such integration.

Concerning the integration of SP and CC, informants mentioned the identification of linkages such as *“different tools that are being developed by our VAM area on climate information and how this could be integrated to social protection”*. In this process, informants perceived general unclarity surrounding this integration, *“causing a bit of confusion, as it sounds like just two different streams of work”*. Lack of technical capacity was mentioned by some informants as challenging an integrated SP and CC agenda, advancing that there is *“not much explicit integration between climate change and social protection programmes”*. One informant

⁵ Emergency Preparedness and Response (EPR) and CC

mentioned that the region generally remains “*business as usual*” apart from some newer programmes which are “*more about sustainability and environmental conservation, but not climate change and social protection*”. Several informants mentioned resilience as “*the main entry point for climate change adaptation*”, with the main difference being that “*resilience-building would not especially consider the climate change impact projections*”. Linking resilience-programming to maladaptation, one informant said that “*we involve [a] type of engineer in order to make sure that our assets are created in a way that we don't allow for maladaptation*”. When integrating CC considerations, one informant mentioned the importance of also incorporating “*a wider thinking*”, since there were some capacity issues in terms of understanding CC in the region: “*that's also one reason why we've also been working in a theory of change around climate change to really articulate [...] what are the objectives of a climate change project*”.

Most informants mentioned that the Three-pronged-approach (3PA) works to “*strengthen the design, the planning and the implementation of programmes*” in “*resilience-building, but also safety nets, disaster risk reduction or preparedness programmes*”. One informant explained that, supported by the VAM methodology, “*we do a context analysis based on the pre-existent data on vulnerability, social and economic vulnerability and exposure to shocks, and we identify which would be the area that are a priority in a country*”. Most perceived benefits of the 3PA were process-oriented, with one informant stating that “*the SLP [Seasonal Livelihood Planning] is definitely not meant to be a one-time exercise*”, and that “*we're always validating and we're always refining our information with specific focus groups*”. Some informants highlighted that “*vulnerability is not something that remains stable over time*” and that these methodologies allowed them to “*capture changes in vulnerability*” throughout programmes.

One informant mentioned that “*the concept of maladaptation is very much linked to the issue of safeguards, [...] of ensuring that there is safeguards in social protection*”. The Environmental and Social Framework, encompassing the Environmental and Social Risk Screening (ESRS) and the Environmental Management System (EMS), was often mentioned as a way to capture and potentially address maladaptation in programming, by trying “*to internalise the externalities of our work*”. The EMS focuses on reducing environmental footprints, while the ESRS “*looks at the environmental and social potential adverse impacts of WFP operations*”. One informant mentioned the ESRS had the potential to standardise the way WFPs understands and documents maladaptation. If there are potential adverse environmental and social risks, these should be integrated into the environmental and social management plan and addressed “*during the design so that then you can come up with the mitigation measures*”.

that can be implemented during the implementation stage". Some informants cautioned that *"it can become a checklist thing where people just say yes, yes, yes, we will meet these standards and there is no mitigation need because it is low risk"*. This concern was linked to the ESRS methodology, described by one informant as *"you answer either Yes or No, let's say you have 24 No's, it means that the categorisation of your activity or project is low, so there is a low environmental and social risk and there are no further actions required"*.

Monitoring and evaluation (M&E) for adaptation and maladaptation was mentioned as a challenge by several informants, stating that *"there certainly is no consensus on how to measure resilience, and so, the same goes with how you measure climate change adaptation and maladaptation"*. The WFPs reporting system for adaptation initiatives was described as *"not very strong on climate change adaptation"*, with the consequence that *"we don't get that much information [...] to make sure that we have an impact with the different activities that we're doing and to try and also gather a bit more evidence of what we are doing is actually working or not"*.

5.2.2 Discussion

Adaptation pathways closely connect to the process dimension, providing the lens to reflect on potential linkages to WFPs work on SP (Magnan et al., 2016; Wise et al., 2014). As highlighted by Wise et al. (2014), one way to accommodate processes of change and response across spatial scales, sectors and jurisdictional boundaries is to coordinate responses. WFPs efforts on coordination were mentioned at several levels: cross-sectoral; governmental; intra-organisational; across scales. The latter will be elaborated in section 5.5.

At a cross-sectoral level, the findings show that WFP attempts to enhance coordination and that there is an awareness of potential contributions to broader development. Being aware that WFPs efforts are part of wider cultural, political, economic, environmental and developmental contexts is important to understand the potential cumulative effects and co-benefits of initiatives; further, to discern current processes driving vulnerability, enabling to *first, do no harm*, thereby partly addressing the risk of maladaptation (Magnan, 2014).

The results indicate enhanced coordination with governments and alignment with national SP systems, enabling longer-term planning and integrated practices. Better coordination between multiple complementary initiatives is key to address the risk of limiting future flexibility and opportunities within the adaptive landscape (Wise et al., 2014). Aligning processes towards shared strategic objectives is critical to inform decision-making throughout adaptation pathways, enabling coherence towards overarching goals (ibid.).

Regarding WFPs internal coordination, the results suggest general efforts to integrate key programmatic areas⁶. However, persistent gaps were mentioned for the integration of SP and CC. The findings suggest a lack of CC-related expertise, both in LAC and within WFP, and general uncertainty concerning what CC implies for SP programming. Low capacities could greatly impact the integration of SP and CC and the possibility to capture maladaptation, since this *“highly depends on the level of expertise of the stakeholders that are involved”* (Magnan, interview, 2020). Understanding these pathways as interdependent and co-evolving is crucial to address the risk of maladaptation, additionally contributing to rethink vulnerabilities and capacities for response as relevant beyond specific shocks (Câmpeanu & Fazey, 2014). The gaps in M&E for CCA and maladaptation pose another limitation for the integration of SP and CC. The inherent uncertainty of CC tends to narrow decision-making towards more managerial solutions (Wise et al., 2014), which could explain WFPs focus on FbF and climate information as key linkages to integrate CC and SP. Another challenge for this integration is linked to the predominance of resilience programming, mentioned as the main entry point for CC. Considering the differences mentioned by informants between resilience and CCA programming, such as longer timescales of analysis and inclusion of climate projections; *“re-labelling”* resilience programmes as CC could indicate missing depth in the integration of CC, potentially contributing for maladaptive pathways. Furthermore, within resilience programming, the results indicate some association between maladaptation and technical fixes, which could potentially impact how maladaptation is addressed within the wider scope of WFP programmes. The issues of siloed work and conceptual unclarity could be seen as possibly exacerbating such trajectories.

The process dimension, informing WFP, is closely connected to the adaptation-maladaptation continuum. As articulated in the interview, *“understanding the risk of maladaptation is fully part of the way you design your adaptation pathway and it’s critical to understand at what point the action you put in place will become really maladaptation”* (Magnan, interview, 2020). Hence, a main ability to address maladaptation *“is to be able to define when to shift from one option to another”* (ibid.). To enable this, both monitoring and an ex-ante approach in planning to address maladaptation are required (Magnan, 2014). Results informing these aspects relate to analysis and planning tools, and M&E for adaptation and maladaptation.

The results indicate that several tools, primarily the 3PA and VAM, integrate a process-oriented approach that is aware of cross-scale dynamics, by incorporating measures to capture changing

⁶ Given the research scope, inputs regarding programmatic integration was centred around the areas of SP, CC, resilience and EPR.

contexts and vulnerabilities, thereby also fostering a degree of flexibility into programming. Acknowledging that vulnerability is dynamic and a succession of different states is mentioned by Magnan et al. (2016) as key to capture maladaptation.

The ESRS was mentioned as the main tool for, potentially, aligning with an ex-ante approach to maladaptation. One informant identified it as a vehicle to embed “[doing] *no harm and safeguards*” into the operationalisation of maladaptation. However, the results raise some concerns regarding this tool. Multiple descriptions of the ESRS implied an outcome-oriented approach, for instance, by assuming that if a programme initially is assessed without social or environmental risks, none will arise throughout the programme. This approach risks not capturing emerging and unforeseen risks throughout and beyond initiatives. Another critique concerns the assessment questions being the same for all types of programmes, indicating a lack of flexibility, potentially challenging the ability to reflect the contextual dynamic processes of certain programmes. Contrastingly, the 3PA, particularly the SLP and the Community Based Participatory Planning (CBPP), were highlighted as highly adaptable to specific contexts, underlining the idea that WFP is, generally, moving towards a process-oriented approach. Finally, remaining concerns regarding staff capacity to undertake such a screening reflects that the ESRS tool goes beyond the traditional technical scope of the organisation; potentially leading to “*identifying that there is no risk when actually there could be a risk*”, which could enhance maladaptation. The issue of capacity strengthening that supports the integration of SP and CC will be further explored in section 5.4.

While strong M&E systems are crucial to capture maladaptive risks potentially emerging throughout initiatives; addressing such risks also requires flexibility in programming and a process-oriented approach that allows systems to adapt to changing conditions (Wise et al., 2014). The findings indicate a large degree of flexibility in WFPs SRSP work, that enables national SP systems to adjust and respond to emerging shocks. Tools such as the 3PA and the VAM were also found to enhance a process-oriented approach to programming, contrastingly to the ESRS that indicates a more outcome-oriented approach.

5.3 Temporal scales

5.3.1 Results

When explaining WFPs SP role in LAC, many informants reverted back to the historical evolution of the organisation’s mandate. One informant stated that, in the realm of food security, rural development and agriculture, WFP was “*the operational arm of the UN, the one that was supposed to programmatically roll out those policies and support the implementation*”

phase". Further advancing that, *"because of the emergency issues, [WFP] ended up doing emergency work and becoming a humanitarian organisation"*. 2008 was *"the year which is called the revolution"*, as mentioned by one informant because *"there was a shift in WFPs mindset"* from food aid towards food assistance, also reflected by WFP *"moving away from in-kind assistance towards cash-based transfers"* in the region. Presently, one informant stated that WFP *"is working in the intersection of the humanitarian versus development, rather than in one or the other area"*. In the future, one informant mentioned that WFPs SP work in LAC *"will be more an advisory and enabling role"*. Further advancing that, in comparison to other regions, in LAC *"it is more about working with the governments on the programmes and systems that have been there for a long time or advising on specific topics"*. This transition is often done as in Haiti, where *"sometimes, WFPs support to a national government starts as a response [to] a specific need or a specific request but what we try to do is to strengthen their system and adopt a more comprehensive and holistic approach and make sure that our support is based on a longer-term vision to make sure that their systems are solid enough to respond to people's needs"*.

Concerning SRSP, one informant stated that it *"has been a very strong entry point to work on social protection in this region"* since the technical assistance provided *"will help the system as a whole, not only during times of emergency"*. One informant provided the following example: *"Dominica was a context where WFP responded to an emergency, so we provided just three-months cash-based assistance through the national social protection system but the success was that after the emergency. When the emergency was over, what we were doing was to provide technical assistance to the Ministry of Social Services for them to strengthen their information management system"*. Another respondent mentioned contrastingly that in Haiti *"currently, it's more the emergency social protection response that has been put at the forefront and WFP has often been directed to help that part of the response"*. One informant added that, *"shock-responsive social protection [...] is largely preparedness"*. This sustained focus on EPR and shorter-term timescales was advanced by another informant stating that longer-term climate projections *"isn't really something that we are considering in the planning, [...] because generally speaking the timeframe that are envisaged are rather short"* and that the *"problem with longer term climate projections is the uncertainty"*, with another informant stating that *"it [WFP] is an emergency organisation so the mentality generally speaking is very much like one year, maybe two – if you're lucky"*. Internally, the role of WFPs resources and expertise was mentioned by one respondent stating it was *"challenging to bring in the climate focus or point of view, on the different programming that are being done because there are very set ways on how resilience is being done there is a whole manual and lots of guidance on corporate level"*.

However, many informants also mentioned WFPs long-term SP efforts, for instance in the Dominican Republic where they *“are working on, shifting a little bit that focus on, instead of spending so much money on a big scale response at the humanitarian level, why don't we start preparing the country to deal with the threats that is going to happen, not today but in 20 or 50 years”*. A concrete effort to enhance longer-term planning was shared by one informant stating that *“when we work on micro-insurance, we try to integrate this with financial inclusion initiatives which is definitely more longer-term”*. WFPs work through governments was also seen as enabling longer-term planning by several informants, stating that *“social protection is aimed to protect people from the beginning of life until the end”*, which is only realistic through national SP systems, ensuring that *“beneficiaries have access to longer-term assistance and to a solid system that assures that they can satisfy and meet their needs in the longer-term”*.

Long-term planning in relation to maladaptation was reflected upon by one informant stating the importance of *“not meeting immediate and practical needs, but [that] you are strategically meeting their needs in the long run [...], that is what I think the whole concept of maladaptation needs to bring”*. Challenges for WFP to work on long-term scales were mentioned by most informants, one stating that *“short-term solutions are okay [...], but it's better to work for the longer-term solutions, and sometimes it's very hard to build that logic, that we need sustainable resources or time for example, and long-term investment”*.

Sustainability of initiatives was highlighted by most informants, both regarding sustainability of WFPs programmes and broader reflections concerning environmental and social sustainability. Aligning with government SP systems was mentioned as a way to increase sustainability of WFPs activities, thereby addressing the risk of maladaptation, as projects without such linkages *“might exacerbate vulnerabilities, rather than creating benefits for our beneficiaries”*. Additional reflections on sustainability beyond programme timeframes were added, one informant stating that *“we can implement and identify the most efficient adaptive measure, but if we do not ensure sustainability of this action also beyond the project ends, in some cases we are contributing to maladaptation”*. Addressing environmental and social sustainability was mentioned by several informants, stating that *“if you don't address environmental and social risks that may be associated with an implementation of a given activity or establishment of a given asset, the risk is that you underestimate the sustainability over time of that activity or that asset”*, highlighting how the *“environmental and social plan”* aims to ensure *“that the sustainability of some given intervention is actually strengthened”*. One informant reflected on the tension between the increased environmental awareness and the *“economic, liberal agenda of social protection”* where *“in the 90s and also in the early 2000s*

wasn't considering at all sustainability [...] So, we cannot continue thinking that the theory of change of these programmes is more productivity and more economic development and business as usual, because then you are also contributing to the climate crisis".

As mentioned by several informants, monitoring impacts was predominantly bound to initiatives' specific timescale: *"you implement a project, you have a monitoring system, but then very often you don't go back to those communities"*. This was generally connected with the challenge of short-term funding, hindering the contribution for long-term impacts, highlighted by several informants: *"this is often a limitation, because of our funding is normally short-term"*, which will be elaborated in section 5.4.

WFPs SP work relates both to short- and long-term timeframes, and the issue of sequencing activities and strategies across such scales was mentioned by several informants. One informant from the VAM regional unit stated that *"when we conduct an analysis we try to make a mix of immediate recommendations and a long-term perspective recommendation"*, to enable in *"the short-run to fix a problem"*, but *"more importantly to offer these communities, in the long-term, to build resilience to these shocks"*. Longer-term recommendations were said to be done by *"looking at the past to model the future"*, with another informant advancing that some programmes are working with *"more sophisticated analysis, so what we call sort of an ICA [Integrated Context Analysis] plus, where we have more layers of analysis [...] where more sophisticated models"* are used *"to look at, not only trends, but try to project future trends as well"*. Practical examples of sequencing were given by some informants, stating how the SLP allows WFP to understand *"who is doing what, where, and then you look at how you can better sequence interventions"*. Having this sequential understanding was mentioned as a way *"to make sure that we don't overburden people when it's just in planting season, for instance"*.

5.3.2 Discussion

Guided by the temporal dimension of maladaptation (Lama et al., 2017), two main entry points informed WFPs SP work. Firstly, the fact that future pathways are historically contingent, underlined the importance of understanding WFPs historical role in LAC to inform potential path-dependencies (Wise et al, 2014). Secondly, since maladaptation is a process extended through time (Magnan et al., 2016), WFPs work across different timescales was analysed.

The findings indicate that WFPs history, originating as a humanitarian organisation aiming to meet emergent needs of the most food insecure, has implications for organisational attempts to broaden approaches to a longer-term, adaptive and rights-based mindset. While this transition is clearly occurring in WFPs SP role through increased support to governments and system strengthening efforts, several informants stated that EPR and SRSP have been the main entry

points for WFPs SP work. These are areas where WFP has accumulated most expertise, in contrast to CCA, for instance. Several informants underlined that a short-term mindset does not meet the necessary timeframe for CCA. Additionally, as mentioned in the process dimension, resilience-programming has been the main entry-point for CC integration. Overall, these findings suggest that WFPs past role can be potentially closing-off options for future adaptation alternatives through SP (Fazey et al., 2016).

The challenge of integrating CC and SP can be partly explained through the origins of SP. As one informant mentioned, SP has emerged from a growth-oriented liberal agenda, without underlying considerations of sustainability and CC (Devereux and Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Tenzing, 2019). Although there is a tendency to integrate such elements, the historical pathway of SP poses inherent tensions between growth-oriented and rights-based paradigms (Wise et al., 2014; Jones et al., 2010; Tenzing, 2019). This propensity, in addition to WFPs past focus on EPR, SRSP and needs-based approaches, can potentially emphasise a "protect and prevent" mindset rather than an integrated approach to the four functions of SP. Several informants highlighted this, stating that a lot of WFPs SP work in the region remains mostly shock-responsive and EPR oriented. This organisational path-dependency reflects a degree of historical determinism that can restrict future options, potentially narrowing WFPs contributions to broader adaptive pathways (Wise et al., 2014; Barnett & O'Neil, 2010).

In light of CC, working towards SP systems that accommodate all functions of SP requires strategic sequencing of initiatives through both short and long-term planning. Such approach to temporal scales is crucial to understand how short-term decisions and changes can potentially close off future adaptation options (Fazey et al., 2016). The findings indicate that several methodologies, such as the 3PA and VAM, allow WFP to work across timescales, while balancing short and long-term interventions. Integration of CC projections into programming was mentioned as a way to consider long-term effects of CC, however several informants perceived them as highly uncertain. The findings also suggest challenges to integrate a climate focus due to a past short-term mindset and the present focus on resilience programming, which is commonly seen as the main entry point for CC despite the considerable differences in temporal scales. Limitations regarding long-term funding and investments also challenge WFPs integration of longer-term CC considerations into programming, as stated in the power and politics dimension.

Maladaptation can occur long after a programme cycle has ended (Jones et al., 2015). This relates to the issue of sustainability, both of programme activities and of socio-ecological impacts. If potential detrimental effects are not addressed, there is a risk of disregarding how

processes and outcomes unravel (Magnan et al., 2016). When addressing potential negative socio-ecological consequences of activities beyond programme timeframes, the importance of an ex-ante approach to maladaptation was highlighted to *“bridge the present and the future, by asking what can you do now in order to avoid the future being worse than if you don't address these things”* (Magnan, interview, 2020), additionally stating that *“if you don't enter this long-term dimension, it's difficult to address the risk of maladaptation”* (ibid.). Accordingly, several respondents mentioned that the ESRS tool supports the socio-ecological sustainability of WFP activities, prior to implementation. Challenges for the applicability of such tool have been explored in the process dimension.

The findings indicate that programmatic sustainability is being enhanced through the alignment with national systems, minimising the risk of exacerbating vulnerabilities and enhancing the capacity to strategically leverage cumulative effects (Wise et al., 2014). However, the results indicate that M&E of impacts beyond programme timeframes are often not conducted, which can challenge an ex-ante approach to maladaptation, due to a lack of evidence-creation and learnings based on longer-term programme impacts.

5.4 Power and Politics

5.4.1 Results

When describing WFPs SP regional strategy, one informant stated that *“what we are looking for is actually to put the governments on the lead and to support them, either with technical assistance or with financial support when needed”*. One informant shared that, in the Dominican Republic, the CO works with the Vice President and is funded to implement the nutrition component within the main SP programme. Further, advancing that *“the CSR [Country Strategic Review] has been a very interesting process in the Dominican Republic because it was led by the government [...] we had these two big consultations, with 180 people participating in these consultations, from private sector, the government, NGOs, UN agencies and other international organisations”*. This consultative process informed the national roadmap for zero hunger and the COs CSP. In Haiti, WFP supports *“the creation of the [SP] policy. We've done national consultations with each department, which was a huge endeavour, it's not often done in Haiti. And, this mobilized civil society and government in the different regions of the country. So, at the end of that, people shared similar goals”*. Conversely, one informant shared that the migration crisis has been the biggest challenge for SRSP promotion; WFP spent *“basically, more than one year and a half trying to negotiate with the government”* piggybacking on the national SP systems since *“that emergency is very different from a climate-related emergency because there is a lot of political sensitivity”*.

Some informants mentioned the importance of WFPs SP work “to protect, prevent, promote and transform”, as presented in the 3P+T framework. Further reflecting that the “three P’s are very much individualised, even if you give people access to social protection services or benefits, people won’t be able to control, benefit and use those services because there are structural barriers that make it impossible for people to really do it on their own”. Hence, informants highlighted the transformative function of SP stating that “when they talk about social justice, they talk about the institutions [...] There are some institutions that are disabling for people, so we need to challenge discrimination, create basic standards and safeguards to people and make sure that there are some structural rights”. In relation to SP and CC, one respondent stated: “Who can deal alone with climate change? So, you need institutionalised responses in which you make sure that you look at those that are the most vulnerable. Those that don’t have their own capacity to respond. And you devise measures to compensate for that historical social debt the society has kept with specific segments of society”. However, another respondent shared that “the transformative aspect is more an ideological point that has to inform your perspective. How do you programme for transformation”?

One informant highlighted that WFP works with “the most vulnerable groups of the population, so, we have a huge responsibility” of internalising this transformative element “because transformation is also that, I mean, if you can’t change the structures, at least don’t create more vulnerability”. One informant shared that while “sometimes gender is taken in superficially”, during the drafting process of the Haitian SP policy “we really dwelled on that issue. I think lots of partners learned about gender through the process. It was always put as a subject for discussion on how specific elements of the policy would have to include gender considerations”. The informant further added that the government perceived this as a “Haitian-owned policy” and underlined the importance of the team composition during policy drafting: “the fact that half of our team is Haitian as well really helps, one of the key writers is Haitian, she’s an academic, so that also helped in positioning WFP, not as too colonial in its approach to development”.

Groups most commonly identified as vulnerable by the informants included “children under five, pregnant and lactating women, elders, people living with HIV and migrants”. However, informants mentioned challenges in targeting the most vulnerable since, for instance, “talking about migrants is different than talking about national populations”. In the context of CC, some informants shared difficulties in including indicators for climate impact when targeting households in-country since “shocks are not constant, so it was difficult to say well, an extremely poor household will, necessarily, be affected by a climate-related catastrophe”. The

informant further advanced that *“we really need to expand social protection coverage, to have a national safety net”*.

Some informants highlighted *“the clientelist use of social protection in this region”* as undermining the transformative SP function. One informant mentioned that *“if your targeting is not very transparent for your programme it's very easy just to use to, enrol in programmes those that voted for you or to promise specific programmes to a population in exchange of your votes. And this happens on the national level, but also at the local level”*. Another informant highlighted that, during the design of an emergency cash transfer programme, they attempted to avoid any political biases of the beneficiary selection committees by including *“village councils’ representatives, but also representatives and members of the communities, to ensure a little bit the neutrality of that committee”*. One informant shared how clientelism could impact maladaptation: *“you are creating dependency and you are creating relations of power that are actually not creating entitlements to people because of their clientelist and political use of programs”*. One informant shared that *“in this region, this [clientelism] is a big, huge problem. But for us, as WFP, we can't really do much about that”*. However, another informant shared that *“an indirect impact of having a strong subsystem [is that it] will be protected from these issues of corruption and clientelist use”*. The system strengthening pillar of the regional SP strategy, as highlighted by one informant, aims to address this through *“institutionalisation, making this [SP] an entitlement rather than a charitable, fragmented handout, that is context-specific to the government and their willingness or not to get votes and look good”*.

Regarding SP and CC, one informant mentioned WFPs role to *“open a discussion with governments, open areas of research and potential areas for the development of capacities and the design and implementation of interventions that support climate change adaptation”*. However, another informant advanced that *“the WFP mandate and sort of expertise is more emergency-related, rather than climate change-related”*. One informant mentioned the SP *“approach that you get is influenced by your political stance of several issues in the political spectrum”*, advancing that *“this region, is very divided in the political spectrum”*. In this regard, climate scepticism as a challenge for WFP to promote SP and CC in LAC was highlighted: *“most countries have aligned to the sustainable development goals, to the Paris agreement as well. But then you also have the climate sceptics”*, further advancing that this *“poses a challenge to these types of programmes because then you will have to frame things more as in terms of sustainable development and not climate change”*. One respondent highlighted: *“what is happening in some countries is that it's a development-as-usual programme, and it's only being framed as resilience, but it's the same public works programme that you have been doing*

for the last 20 years with no actual implications on climate change". Some informants mentioned the challenges of advocating for governmental use of climate information in current SP programming: *"There aren't any political incentives for the government to deal with this in a ministry that is not actually having to deal with that"*.

One informant mentioned that *"we propose Latin America and the Caribbean as one of the more advanced regions for governments having capacities to having social protection systems in place; internally and informally, I understand there's still a lot of challenges"*. In Haiti, the CO developed a methodology to support capacity-building for the institutionalisation of a safety net, enabling to assess whether *"government have the right human resources, management capacity and material resources. And we break this down in seven criteria and we rank governments on five levels, so from one being we are barely informed of what is going on in social protection, up to five, where government is actually not only enforcing norms but actually conducting activities itself"*. Despite positively perceiving this methodology, the informant shared the following experience of the implementation: *"we were in charge [...] of the transfer of the programme to government and we developed a methodology to do that. I think the consortium structure made it quite difficult for this to be achieved, because we were the only ones really pushing for capacity-building with government"*.

Concerning organisational knowledge on maladaptation, one informant advanced that *"it's not well understood within WFP, I don't think we have incorporated [maladaptation]"*. This knowledge gap was perceived in relation to the type of CC expertise present in the organisation, as mentioned by one informant: *"we've got people working on other types of risk finance, on forecast-based financing, they are kind of niche areas that we concentrated on as innovations [...] and if something does not come up from the donor, then it's just one of those things that they don't consider"*. Another informant mentioned that *"expertise in climate change is very limited in this region, so we need resources and we need expertise and sometimes services are not available"*. To address these gaps, one informant mentioned the use of experts such as *"weather experts, climatologists"* when doing anticipatory analysis looking at long-term impacts of shocks and CC. Additionally, one informant highlighted that *"we are trying to also map this out from the south-south cooperation perspective so that we could basically allow governments to indicate where they have expertise and where they do not [...] a supply and demand kind of matching of needs"*. One informant advanced that *"from just saving lives, the motto right now is also changing lives. Changing lives does require different mindsets, a different approach, which does need different aspects to be considered and different details to be included in the elaboration of our activities and operations"*. While many informants

advanced that *“there is no concept of maladaptation in WFP”*, one informant stated that the ESRS could potentially address unintended consequences, stating that *“if you design something, then you should have the responsibility to screen, in terms of environmental and social adverse impacts, the activities you are designing”*. However, while *“there is very huge support by senior management”*, the informant stated that *“the capacity and skills of the organisation in the elaboration, use and implementation of environmental and social standards is not too high in many cases”*. Another informant mentioned that, while there is interest to find synergies between ESRS and SP, it is important to be *“cautious of not overwhelming our capacity”*.

Many informants mentioned the role of climate finance in the development of the ESRS: *“climate financing donors, so the green climate fund and the adaptation fund do require, to access their funds, environmental and social screening”*. However, the process of accessing climate finance was still perceived as being extensive and complicated: *“in Latin America, our COs are relatively small and depend completely on external funding for their staff. In that sense, they don't always have the funds within the COs to actually work on those proposals, since they are highly technical, and you really need a designated person to be able to write the proposal over a course of a year”*. Accordingly, one informant highlighted the impact of funding on SP programming since *“every single thing we do, is reliant on resource mobilisation with donors [...] and voluntary contributions”*. The role of donors was also mentioned in relation to SP policy development: *“they [donors] participated in the design of this policy and now we're at a point where basically all the interests are aligned”*. Similarly, some informants highlighted human and financial resource constraints in the ministries, *“coming from the national budget to cover social protection”*. One informant advanced that *“countries sometimes will comply with the international agenda and with the trends, in order to be able to get those critical funds to develop a system”*.

Access to multi-year funding was frequently presented as a key factor to present tangible results. Accordingly, many informants shared how short-term funding constrained integrated programming approaches: *“3 to 4 months of support per year, pretty unpredictable, so that was the main limitation of our approach”*. The role of funding was also mentioned regarding programme framing: *“depending on what funding stream we might be going for, we kind of frame it in like climate change adaptation, or resilience-building or disaster risk reduction [...] in the end, the essence of what we are doing is very similar”*. Additionally, it was mentioned as potentially influencing SP targeting: *“the government and donors may make us deviate from the same areas that we have already been working in, so that makes it difficult to really layer”*.

5.4.2 Discussion

Being dependent on contextual political realities, the analysis of WFPs approach to SP cannot solely focus on understanding strategic intentions but also how liable these are to distortion (Nightingale, 2017). Therefore, the role of power and politics was considered a crucial dimension shaping ongoing trajectories of change and response along the adaptive landscape (Fazey et al., 2016). However, it is important to underline that these findings represent a narrow understanding of power and politics since they do not feature perceptions beyond the organisation, particularly, and most importantly, of the people commonly framed as vulnerable.

Several informants described cases where WFPs SP work, with governments and through national systems, tended to become enrolled in ongoing processes of political contestation and governing (Nightingale, 2017). The case of the emergency SRSP response to the migration crisis exemplifies how the framing of vulnerable groups can be subject to exercises of power, hindering the universalistic orientation of WFPs SP strategy and humanitarian commitments. The findings also advanced how targeting mechanisms and eligibility criteria can increase the scope for clientelist uses of SP, increasing risk of maladaptation (Eakin et al., 2009; Nelson & Finan, 2009). Therefore, although system strengthening may be perceived as necessary for the institutionalisation of SP, WFPs work aimed at alleviating vulnerability can inadvertently exacerbate it, if ongoing processes of recognition and subjection are not addressed (Nightingale, 2017). Political issues are commonly perceived by the informants as beyond WFPs mandate, however, the presented methodology implemented in Haiti can provide a first step to assess institutional capacities and gaps. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that although improving institutional design is relevant, a close analysis of the social-political struggles at play within these institutions is fundamental (ibid.).

As advanced by one informant, despite the overall maturity of SP systems in LAC, nuanced country-level challenges regarding the coverage and quality of SP systems persist. Limited funding and resources for regular SP programming, decrease the political incentives to incorporate an additional climate layer into these systems. Informants also stated that some countries would be more open for an integrated approach to SP and CC than others based on their political positioning and receptivity to a CC-related agenda. One informant scrutinised the repackaging of business-as-usual SP programmes through a superficial inclusion of resilience objectives since this concept was not perceived as necessarily pro-poor or as addressing future vulnerabilities in the context of CC. Accordingly, several informants mentioned the need to frame programmes according to whose interests and voices were most influencing which, in

the examples provided, ranged from governments to donors. These processes of contestation, collaboration and negotiation can potentially increase maladaptive potential if groups framed as vulnerable are excluded from strategic decision-making, and if decisions are based on a narrow understanding of vulnerability (Adger, 2006). Since, not only does a narrow conception of adaptation reduce the focus on other drivers of risk, but it also leads to an overemphasis on technological solutions, potentially limiting the scope for other alternatives (Boyd, 2017; Lama, 2019).

Structural drivers of vulnerability that challenge the accessibility, availability and potential to mobilise SP provisions to adapt, were mentioned by some informants as a challenge requiring the full range of SP functions. The particular importance of the transformative function was perceived in relation to social structures and connected to the importance of social justice, however, the operationalization of this function was not clear in the proposed entry points for SP and CC. For instance, linking FbF and safety nets is mostly connected to the protective and preventive functions of SP and, while potentially building resilience to specific shocks, these actions do not necessarily address concerns of social justice and exclusion (Devereux & Sabates-Wheeler, 2004; Maru et al., 2014). Without tackling entrenched power structures that lead to differentiated impacts of shocks, these SP measures may not equally benefit all the groups concerned, generating both ‘winners and losers’ (Magnan et al., 2016; Tenzing, 2019). Hence, to address maladaptive risks, SP and CC must work across the functions of SP with special attention on how to transform the socio-political contexts where vulnerability to CC emerges.

WFPs reliance on resource mobilisation and voluntary contributions lead to the prominence of donors and partners as key actors that, to some extent, shape programming approaches and priorities. Internally, difficulties to access long-term funding were mentioned as an impediment to implementing integrated programming approaches which, subsequently, contributed to the perceived importance of climate financing (WFP, 2018). The findings demonstrate how donor requirements have contributed to the development of the environmental and social standards for WFPs operations. However, based on informants’ insights, the extent to which these standards have been accompanied by an actual restructuring of programming approaches is less clear. One informant highlighted how maladaptation was not properly understood in WFP, partly, because donors have not raised this issue. The findings help understand how safeguards or maladaptation-related concerns are mostly understood as a top-down concern, legitimised through donor authority. Similarly, COs shortage of funds, resources and climate-related expertise was mentioned by the informants as limiting access to climate finance, establishing a

barrier for integrating CC considerations. WFPs historical mandate establishes a certain path-dependency in terms of EPR and resilience-building expertise, as explored in the temporal dimension.

Understanding the political dimension of maladaptation exposes the diverse, and potentially contradictory, values, goals and aspirations amongst stakeholders; thus, creating emancipatory opportunities through conflict-resolution. According to informants, in the Dominican Republic, collaborative processes based on stakeholder consultation informed strategic planning, whilst contributing to articulate priorities for action and establish partnerships. In Haiti, the drafting of the national SP policy advances how co-production of knowledge can enable a sense of ownership and a plural debate on norms and values, contributing to a contextualisation of the transformative element of SP. This process was supported by the WFPs close analysis of the government's capacity needs and gaps, but also by an alternative framing enabled by a diverse team composition. Further learnings, highlighted by one informant regarding WFPs binational project (WFP, 2017a), can inform an integrated SP and CC agenda, whereby indigenous knowledge and practices provided inputs, not solely for adaptive measures, but also to localise relevant climate services and community-based Early Warning Systems. This advances the importance of considering how power relations may be reflected in knowledge production; starting from local ways of knowing can address the risk of maladaptation by opening framings for plural knowledges (Nightingale et al., 2019).

5.5 Spatial scales

5.5.1 Results

Regarding activity design, planning and implementation, most informants mentioned how the 3PA integrates multiple spatial levels: *“the integrated context analysis that starts with the national level”* where you *“identify potential sub regions”*, from where *“you conduct the seasonal livelihood programming, [...] [to] have a better understanding of the situation and the subnational level, at the district level”*. The last level in the 3PA allows *“you to go even deeper at the community level, at the local level, through community based participatory planning, which is really the tool that we use to identify which activities or which assets should we rehabilitate or construct, in order to address the issues that are relevant in that particular context”*. This approach enables *“work with different layers of information”*, as WFP has been conducting with the government in the Dominican Republic. This layering is important to capture contextual vulnerability, explained by one informant: *“Sometimes the government only plans for recurring poverty, but then, how do you mix that with vulnerability to any potential shock? So that's what the ICA tried to do in 2017. And not necessarily the poorest parts, [...]*

they are not necessarily the most exposed to different shocks [...] depending on what shock you look at”.

Some informants mentioned how such spatial levels “*are integrated*” and “*clearly connected*”, and how global processes such as “*climate change, [...] a pandemic [and] macroeconomic shocks [...] are having compounded aggregate risks at the covariate and idiosyncratic level*”. Another informant reflected on how “*ecosystem biodiversity [...] is affected by the impact of climate variability and climate change in terms of reduction of ecosystem services, which are linked also to the food security and biodiversity of these communities*”. Reflecting on the local implications of integrating CCA in programming, one informant shared that “*it’s hard to address these big challenges at a local scale when people normally do not have the biggest capacities. [...] It’s not contradictory necessarily, but we need to further align*”. Interdependencies across levels were mentioned by some informants regarding the impacts of programme activities, for instance by “*shifting vulnerability to another community*”. Avoiding displacement of pressures across scales and limiting negative feedback loops still remain a challenge, as reflected by one informant when asked about unintended distributional effects: “*I have been very much focused on more emergency responses and in those cases we have not, honestly, taken that aspect into consideration*”, continuing by stating: “*it’s very short-term interventions, [...] focused on addressing immediate needs, so that aspect was not really considered*”.

Reflecting on potential negative consequences across spatial scales, one informant shared that “*we want positive externalities coming out of programmes, of social protection interventions, and diminish, to the minimum, the risk and the possibility of having that externalities for the environment, but also for people*”. However, several informants stated that monitoring is generally bounded by the scope of the programme, for example by solely including “*the people we assist*” in the “*beneficiary feedback mechanism*”. One informant underlined “*little consensus on whether maladaptation refers only to people, to your beneficiaries, to the ecosystem*”, further mentioning M&E challenges associated with the fact that maladaptation occurs within a wider system: “*can you then attribute certain results into your intervention or not? I mean, the whole issue of causal relationships between interventions and results, it’s pretty complex*”. Reflecting broadly on evaluation procedures, one informant shared that “*usually there is a question provided on unintended effects, positive or negatives*”, although without explicitly mentioning cross-spatial effects. To address the spatial dimension of maladaptation, many informants mentioned “*the key issue to avoid maladaptation, is to carry out the process in collaboration with key actors*”, which generally enables the inclusion of “*a*

broader number of actors [...], national actors, local actors, civil society, environmental corporations and obviously the communities”, representing multiple levels. Some informants mentioned that such multi-stakeholder and cross-sectoral approaches ensure that actions “are aligned and contributes to objectives and goals of national and local policies and strategies”; thus, enabling that “results of project[s], at local level, orient and guide the decision-making process at a broader level, at national level”.

Several informants mentioned that having these “*discussions on both levels*” helps identify “*what are the problems and how could we offer solutions, but also within a community, open up the discussions on how to address these*”, thereby generating multi-sectoral and multi-level plans tailored to local needs. Another informant exemplified how stakeholder representativity can be informed by context-specificities to solve communities’ problems across boundaries: “*involving sometimes people that are not necessarily the vulnerable people from the communities [...] whose lands are basically impacting the watersheds and also the water retention of the lower-lying lands that are used for agriculture of the more vulnerable people in the community*”. Programming based on “*good community assessments*” was highlighted as key to “*avoid unintended consequences*” with unequal distributional effects within and beyond communities. Advancing this, one informant stated: “*the unintended consequence, because you did not do that proper analysis, is that the women are actually even worse off*”. Most informants highlighted the importance of understanding contextual vulnerabilities and needs. In response to Hurricane Maria in Dominica, WFP “*engage[d] with the community, so to get the better understandings of their needs and their preferences*” to enable “*designing the programme based on the real needs of the population*”.

Many informants highlighted the importance of “*adjusting programmes to the context*” to address potential unintended consequences, for instance by using “*different values [for] transfers depending on household characteristics*” or by adapting delivery mechanisms to avoid protection issues: “*depending on the context [...] we don't use for example cash in hands or cash in envelopes because it's very risky if people need to move around*”. Another informant mentioned: “*when targeting specific groups, it's key to understand what are the social and gender dynamics in the families and communities to make sure that we are not exposing that person to risks*”. One informant advanced that “*to define targeting criteria we use a lot community-level participat[ion]*”, further advancing that “*we identify with them what defines poverty and vulnerability in their community and in their specific context*”. However, relating to the macro levels, one informant shared that “*we need to standardise the way we classify vulnerability or food insecurity and we need to be able to compare because we need to be*

accountable”; hence, “WFP has a standardised way of analysing food security and we have a set of indicators that we developed that are peer-reviewed and that technically acknowledged”.

5.5.2 Discussion

The findings demonstrate that spatial scales are, to a large extent, considered in several of WFPs methodologies. Particularly the 3PA allows for an understanding of context-specific dynamics at national, sub-regional and community-level. By bridging potential gaps between levels, the 3PA can support actions from the bottom-up (WFP, 2017b). A detailed analysis of the embedded context of interventions, including context specificities at a macro, meso and micro level, can inform the conditions contributing to compounding vulnerability. Hence, enabling programmes to arrive at a nuanced understanding of the origins of present conditions whilst informing a wider thinking about how activities may potentially contribute to reinforce or reduce inequalities (Fazey et al., 2016). Because nuances exist within each scale and level, aspects such as power are relevant to understand how cross-scalar interactions may shape vulnerability.

The results demonstrate widespread attention to micro-level contextual specificities, with community-based approaches playing a key role in the operational development of activities and in the assessments of vulnerability, needs and priorities. Understanding contextual vulnerabilities is crucial for WFPs SP work, underlining how targeting tools can be used to reach the most vulnerable and work towards social equity. However, if the context is not properly understood, intra-community inequalities can inadvertently be exacerbated, fostering maladaptation (Fazey et al., 2016). Considering that SP in LAC still lacks universal coverage, most initiatives are based on targeting, which advances the need to consider potential negative effects on the people and systems beyond bounded programme scopes. Particularly, since activities that reduce *in situ* pressures, by displacing them onto other interconnected systems may be deemed maladaptive (Maganan, et al. 2016). Accordingly, actions on a local scale can have simultaneous, and even contradictory, impacts on a regional or global scale, underlining the importance of a systems perspective if to capture potential maladaptive pathways (Juhola et al., 2016; Lama, 2019). Therefore, it is important that M&E methodologies aim to integrate wider dynamics, such as potential feedback-loops and creation of lock-ins on the wider system (Barnett and O’Neill 2010, Juhola et al., 2016).

The findings indicate some challenges regarding WFPs current M&E approach for potential socio-ecological impacts of interventions, within a wider context. The lack of clarity regarding *to whom* and *at what scales* should potential impacts of activities be monitored and evaluated, in addition to a strong emphasis on the spatial borders of specific interventions, hinders the

capacity to understand the potential displacement of vulnerabilities or impacts on the broader system (Juhola et al., 2016). Likewise, this challenge is shared across scholarship on maladaptation, as mentioned by Magnan et al. (2016, p. 10): “*How far to extend the effort to avoid displacing pressures however remains an outstanding concern*”. Broader insights from WFPs CCA binational project (WFP, 2017a) indicate the attempt to address this issue by determining project boundaries on the basis of cultural and ecological connections, thereby taking a different approach to the delineation of communities. These context-specific adjustments, based on considerations of interconnected pathways and systems, can minimise the risk of maladaptation.

The findings point to WFPs broad engagement in multi-stakeholder approaches for the development of SP programmes and systems, thus, enabling the inclusion of multiple sectors and actors across scales and levels. Considering that “*one group’s adaptation may be another group’s hazard*” (Juhola et al., 2016, p. 6), and that “*even successful policy outcomes will likely have negative effects in varying degrees for some*” (ibid., p. 7); a broad array of stakeholders could contribute to identifying and negotiating these inherent trade-offs involved in the development of programmes, policies or systems (Magnan, interview, 2020). However, as explored in the power and politics dimension, these negotiation processes require a nuanced understanding of the contextual political reality to avoid mediating or exacerbating differential vulnerabilities, through a narrow understanding of what potentially constitutes maladaptation. The role of power and politics is fundamental when adjusting the design of tools such as the 3PA to a specific context. The involvement of communities is generally arranged as the final stage of the 3PA, the CBPP, which mostly concerns operational and implementation-related aspects. This linear sequencing of the 3PA could, in certain contexts, hinder ownership and the involvement of local perspectives in earlier stages of strategic decision-making.

5.6 General discussion

The previous discussions underline the main empirical findings according to the five proposed dimensions of maladaptation, establishing linkages with literature. However, to arrive at a holistic understanding of potential maladaptive risks for WFPs SP work, it is important to understand how these dimensions interrelate. Based on these findings, implications to address such risk will be drawn for WFPs SP work.

WFPs advancements towards an integrated strategy for SP, with CC as a key pillar, signals a broader understanding of both future impacts of CC and present drivers of system’s vulnerability, such as food insecurity, poverty and social inequities. However, while these drivers are generally articulated as interrelated, the findings indicate that SP is generally

discussed in relation to preventing food-related impacts and protecting from specific shocks. A process-oriented analysis of WFPs historical trajectories of response underlines continuities between their historical mandate on emergency-oriented food-based safety nets, and present SP work on SRSP regional agenda and nutrition-sensitive SP. This pathway of response is grounded in WFPs core mandate and strategic interests, underlining the influence of power and politics when framing and balancing multiple drivers. A potential for path dependency was also mentioned regarding the SP agenda, whose growth-oriented origins were perceived to generate internal tensions when balancing social and environmental objectives. WFPs vision of key drivers of risk and vulnerability informs the strategic SP pillars corresponding to the entry points for their work (WFP, 2020). Some authors propose the possibility of strategically balancing generic human development needs and specific risks linked to CC (Eriksen et al., 2011; Eakin et al., 2014). Likewise, WFPs SP work seeks to explicitly integrate CC considerations to address both generic capacities and specific risks. However, this approach to SP and CC entails recognising that such a balance is inherently normative, context-specific and dependent on how these multiple drivers interact across temporal and spatial scales. Hence, explicitly clarifying priorities associated with the degree of SP and CC integration is crucial to understand the inherent trade-offs of different solutions (Eakin et al., 2009).

The findings indicate a limited degree of coordination between SP and CC workstreams, potentially challenging the capacity to act upon a broader understanding of the adaptive landscape. These challenges are, in part, connected to a perceived difficulty to access climate financing and to fear of overburdening SP capacities of governmental counterparts. Within WFP, these areas are often perceived as separate pathways and the linkages established between them, generally, lack in-depth considerations of the transformative function of SP. Entry points such as FbF and climate information integration in SP might strengthen resilience to specific risks, however, these solutions do not necessarily address the underlying processes increasing vulnerability to CC (Eriksen & O'Brien, 2007). The findings suggest that WFPs accumulated expertise in resilience-building established some continuities concerning how CC is being integrated into WFPs work, through a climate resilience lens, with a tendency towards technological and managerial climate solutions (Béné et al., 2014). A narrow integration of CC may prove inconsistent with WFPs vision for SP and CC in LAC, that argues for a need to frame CCA in terms of social justice (Solórzano & Cárdenes, 2019). Aligning with such a vision may require reconsidering the depth of the linkages established with CC and how these connect to SPs four functions.

The findings indicate that WFP is generally aware of the interconnectedness of spatial scales and aims to address such complexity by combining multi-level participatory processes, such as the 3PA, and balance VAM methodologies with communities' own conceptualisation of vulnerability. However, the sequencing of the 3PA and accountability tensions between bottom-up and top-down conceptions of vulnerability might indicate how power and politics can, potentially, interact through these methodologies. Wise et al. (2014) indicate how processes of research, negotiation of values and decision-making can create learning opportunities for those involved and should not be limited to discrete stages of the planning process. Regarding WFPs SP work, such learning benefits were mentioned regarding the drafting process of a national SP policy, which was based upon attempts to contextualise genders aspects and discuss goals through nation-wide consultation. This highlights the importance of acknowledging multiple adaptation pathways that reflect a diversity of values and aspirations, but also how the broader political context inherently shapes them. Hence, throughout WFPs SP work, attention should be paid to the interplay between authority, knowledge, subjectivities across scales (Eriksen et al., 2015). Particularly, concerning efforts to address maladaptation, awareness regarding how these aspects interact to define and explain the potentially uneven and contested outcomes of WFPs initiatives is crucial.

Presently, the ESRS tool seeks to address environmental and social risks by identifying them ex-ante, however, this assessment is conducted solely by the implementing entity. Hence, excluding a broader negotiation process of risk perceptions, particularly, those of programme beneficiaries. Furthermore, the findings indicate that the ESRS tool lacks built-in flexibility mechanisms to include and address potential emergent risks, indicating an outcome-oriented approach to the consequences of initiatives, which appears to disregard the ever-changing boundaries between adaptation and maladaptation. In turn, this is reflected in M&E procedures, such as feedback mechanisms, being generally bounded to the specific temporal and spatial scale of initiatives, without systematically considering potential unintended consequences beyond these frames; which is also connected to the importance of considering cultural and ecological interdependencies when setting programme boundaries. One informant shared that local CCA initiatives can sometimes shift the burden of adaptation to the community, mentioning the importance of further aligning adaptation and mitigation efforts across scales. Likewise, Barnett & O'Neill (2013) highlight the importance of ensuring that adaptation initiatives do not increase greenhouse gas emissions to limit the risk of maladaptation. In addition to the ESRS tool, the EMS seeks to address and reduce WFPs environmental footprint, which may contribute to align current adaptation and mitigation efforts. An understanding of adaptation pathways (Wise et al., 2014), as enrolled within a broader system, can inform WFPs

approach to SP and M&E, particularly, on the importance of flexibility in situations of high uncertainty and where values and goals are ambiguous.

The findings present some limits of WFPs mandate in SP relating to the government's responsibility for SP. As any operation of power, WFPs SP work can have complex outcomes (Eriksen et al., 2015). Working with national SP systems creates opportunities for supporting the institutionalisation of entitlements, however, if entitlements are embedded in clientelist social relations the risk of mediating maladaptation remains (Harland, 2014; Nelson & Finan, 2009). As the findings presents, donors and other partners also play a role in these processes of governing and negotiation, from programme framing to geographical focus. In this latter example, informants underlined the difficulty of layering initiatives in certain areas to build cumulative impacts due to a selective geographical focus. In this case, the findings indicate that authority over resources played a role in influencing WFPs decisions regarding the timeframe and spatial scope of an initiative. These power exercises have implications for maladaptation since an over-reliance in incremental adaptation efforts may prove detrimental in the long-term, establishing the need for transformative adaptation (Kates et al., 2012; Pelling et al., 2015; Tompkins et al., 2008).

The findings indicate that maladaptive risks may be mediated through targeting mechanisms, due to the increasing scope for clientelism and challenges in capturing the dynamic and multidimensional relationship between poverty and vulnerability to CC. In light of present and future CC-related challenges, a long-term strategy to address the risk of maladaptation could involve working towards universal coverage (ILO, 2017). WFPs universalistic orientation is explicitly considered in WFPs regional SP strategy and, partly, embodied in the system strengthening pillar (WFP, 2020). As presented in the findings, SP is not a magic bullet to tackle poverty or vulnerability to CC, however, cross-sectoral coordination could leverage synergies between ongoing processes of change and response.

Some informants mentioned WFPs added responsibility to avoid maladaptation in SP considering it is directed at the most vulnerable groups. Further advancing that, beginning any initiative from a *do no harm* principle requires strategic goals to be aligned, both programmatically and morally. Such normative prescriptions underline the importance of moving beyond a binary understanding of adaptation as either only positive or negative, which can potentially exclude the possibility of contradictory, yet simultaneous effects (Lama, 2019), but rather, understanding the unfolding of SP initiatives as a moving target along an adaptive-maladaptive continuum.

Despite contention around the applicability of maladaptation, the researchers uphold that subjective value statements are inherent when planning or evaluating any initiative (Lama, 2019). As advanced by Magnan (interview, 2020), addressing the risk of maladaptation can help identify what is wrong today in daily management practices and should be perceived as a scenario-planning exercise, stimulating thinking about what types of risks would be desirable to avoid and how, in terms that people already know. Therefore, by including a power and politics dimension to maladaptation, the analysis of SP and CC is re-oriented towards ongoing power interactions within the initiative and its wider context. Thus, addressing the risk of maladaptation is hereby proposed as an opportunity to move from ‘power over’ to ‘empowerment’ of groups generally subjected as vulnerable (Eriksen et al., 2015).

6 Conclusion

A broader conceptualisation of maladaptation aligned to a pathways approach, was perceived particularly relevant to analyse WFPs SP work since policies and programmes already aim at addressing multidimensional poverty and vulnerability, and are working towards integrating CC considerations (Tenzing, 2019). To understand how power interactions across scales lead to the prioritisation of certain pathways, and shape and frame their processes and outcomes (Eriksen et al., 2015); the dimension of power and politics was included, building on Magnan et al. (2016) four dimensions to assess maladaptation: multiple drivers, process, spatial and temporal scales. Based on this conceptual understanding and grounded on the empirical findings this research proposes the following implications for WFPs SP work.

To address the risk of maladaptation in SP the organisation first needs to explicitly consider what are the adaptation goals that it hopes to achieve through the integration of SP and CC. An explicit consideration of such goals provides the normative frame through which it can guide an assessment of maladaptive risks. While the RBP underlines the need to frame CCA from a social justice perspective (Solórzano & Cárdenes, 2019), the findings indicate that CC is currently being integrated into WFPs SP work through a climate resilience lens with a tendency towards technical solutions mostly aimed at addressing the impacts of climate-related shocks. Hence, it is important to consider what different approaches to the depth of CC integration entail for the prioritisation of specific values and assumptions, leading to inherent trade-offs in the processes and outcomes of SP (Eakin et al., 2009). Aligning with such a vision may require assessing the depth of the linkages established with CC and how these connect to each of SPs protective, preventive, promotive and transformative functions.

An appropriate balance between building generic and specific capacities is inherently normative, context-specific and dependent on how multiple drivers interact across temporal and spatial scales. However, a clear long-term vision of SP and CC is crucial to leverage cumulative impacts of WFPs SP work. In addition to establishing common goals for SP and CC, the trade-offs and implications need to be properly considered across units, programmes, policies and broader partnerships. The need to consider coherence across ongoing processes of response was also mentioned in relation to disconnected adaptation and mitigation efforts. A broader perspective of WFPs SP work, from a systems approach, can provide relevant insights when designing initiatives by highlighting cross-scalar concerns that need to be considered when aiming to address the risk of maladaptation. Being aware of the interconnectedness of spatial scales, highlights the importance of context-specific programming that also considers the wider socio-ecological and legal boundaries in which an initiative is embedded.

Such a systemic perspective of ongoing processes of change and response underlines the importance of monitoring how adaptation pathways are evolving and interacting, according to the commonly agreed goals, across spatial and temporal scales. Hence, inclusive M&E procedures that capture how unintended consequences may occur, both within and beyond the bounded scales of initiatives, could benefit SP initiatives and WFPs broader work. Based on this, present adaptation pathways need to integrate flexibility mechanisms in order to anticipate the need to adjust to future conditions. For instance, in a scenario of transition to environmentally sustainable economies and societies, SP systems may need to play an indirect supportive role to avoid that adaptation efforts, potentially, originate maladaptive processes overburdening the most vulnerable (ILO, 2015). Ultimately, this highlights that SP is only one part of a broader strategy to CC. From such a perspective, and to address the risk of maladaptation, it is important that linkages between SP and CC are mutually considered, wherein CCA initiatives also consider how SP mechanisms can be integrated to proactively reduce social inequalities and, potentially, address the challenge of ‘winners and losers’ of adaptation (Magnan et al., 2016).

Ultimately, knowledge about CC is rife with unknowns (Nightingale et al., 2019), making long-term adaptation a particularly complex task to address. However, beginning any SP strategy, policy or programme with a process-oriented approach to address the risk of maladaptation, can help identify barriers for adaptation in a given context, by underlining what type of processes and outcomes are perceived as important to avoid. This entails a process of contestation and negotiation of values; hence, it is crucial to consider the role of power and politics in practical aspects, such as how and at what stage different groups are being included. Such an ex-ante approach to maladaptation, that explicitly considers values, goals and aspirations can open up space for empowerment of groups generally subjected as vulnerable (Eriksen et al., 2015).

6.1 Implications and future research

Overall, the findings broaden the understanding and applicability of maladaptation in relation to WFPs SP work in LAC. However, considering the broad array of countries where WFP operates and its variety of roles, these findings are limited by their exploratory nature (Yin, 2003). As argued throughout, addressing maladaptation requires an explicit consideration of power, values, temporal and spatial scales (Lama et al., 2017); hence, a narrower scope and a diversity of perspectives would be required for an in-depth analysis of such a research problem. Within WFP, future research could build on these findings and elaborate a process-oriented approach to maladaptation, in a specific country, wherein WFP supports SP through the integration of CC considerations. Similarly, broader SP systems attempting to integrate CC

considerations could potentially benefit from such a point of departure, given that the multidimensional nature of maladaptation is embraced.

Broader implications for SP are highly dependent on contextual factors, such as the particularity of the specific SP system and ongoing pathways of change and response. However, despite limited generalisability, the instrumental case study approach was capable of providing additional insights on maladaptation scholarship (Firestone, 1993). Particularly, by exploring the role of power and politics when analysing the risk of maladaptation. As previously advanced, an inclusive understanding and negotiation of adaptive and maladaptive pathways can potentially pose emancipatory opportunities. However, to convene such potential, addressing the risk of maladaptation requires a deeper questioning of knowledge production process in itself (Nightingale et al., 2019). Hence, future research could explore process-oriented assessments of maladaptive pathways based on participatory modes of inquiry, that embrace the significant role of values in CC and their inherent diversity (O'Brien & Wolf, 2010; Campos et al., 2016).

7 References

- Adger, W. N., Arnell, N. W., & Tompkins, E. L. (2005). Successful adaptation to climate change across scales. *Global Environmental Change*, 15(2), 77–86.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2004.12.005>
- Adger, W. N. (2006). Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, 16(3), 268–281.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.02.006>
- Adger, W. N. (2016). Place, well-being, and fairness shape priorities for adaptation to climate change. *Global Environmental Change*, 38, A1–A3.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.03.009>
- Arza, C. (2017). Non-Contributory Benefits, Pension Re-Reforms and the Social Protection of Older Women in Latin America. *Social Policy and Society*, 16(3), 361–375.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S1474746416000208>
- Balletto, R., & Wertheimer, S. (2010). *Revolution: From Food Aid to Food Assistance*. WFP.
<https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp225971.pdf>
- Bankoff, G., Freks, G., & Hilhorst, D. J. M. (2004). Mapping Vulnerability. In *Disasters, Development and People*. Sterling.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/40125800_Mapping_Vulnerability_Disasters_Development_and_People?enrichId=rgreq-04c7d80ba7e18087729cbe5505425593-XXX&enrichSource=Y292ZXJQYWdlOzQwMTI1ODAwO0FTOjI3OTY4OTYzODc2MDQ1MEAxNDQzNjk0NjE0NDA5&el=1_x_3&_esc=publicationCoverPdf
- Bankoff, G. (2013). *Mapping Vulnerability: Disasters, Development and People* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781849771924>
- Barca, V., Hebbbar, M., Malik, M., Le Quesne, F., & Ciardi, F. (2019). *Shock-Responsive Social Protection in the Caribbean: Literature Review*. Oxford Policy Management.
- Barnett, J., & O'Neill, S. J. (2010). Maladaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, 20, 211–213.
- Barnett, J., & O'Neill, S. J. (2013). Minimising the risk of maladaptation: A framework for analysis. In J. Palutikof, S. L. Boulter, A. J. Ash, M. S. Smith, M. Parry, M. Waschka, & D. Guitart (Eds.), *Climate Adaptation Futures* (pp. 87–93). John Wiley & Sons.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118529577.ch7>
- Beazley, R., Solórzano, A., & Barca, V. (2019). *Study on Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean: Summary of key findings and policy recommendations*. Oxford Policy Management in collaboration with the World Food Programme.
- Béné, C., Wood, R. G., Newsham, A., & Davies, M. (2012). Resilience: New Utopia or New Tyranny? Reflection about the Potentials and Limits of the Concept of Resilience in Relation to Vulnerability Reduction Programmes. *IDS Working Papers*, 2012(405), 1–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2012.00405.x>
- Béné, C., Newsham, A., Davies, M., Ulrichs, M., & Godfrey-Wood, R. (2014). Review Article: Resilience, Poverty and Development. *Journal of International Development*, 26(5), 598–623. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jid.2992>
- Becker, P. (Ed.). (2014). *Sustainability science: Managing risk and resilience for sustainable development*. Elsevier Science Ltd.

- Black, R., Adger, W. N., Arnell, N. W., Dercon, S., Geddes, A., & Thomas, D. (2011). The effect of environmental change on human migration. *Global Environmental Change*, 21, S3–S11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.10.001>
- Blair, E. (2015). A reflexive exploration of two qualitative data coding techniques. *Journal of Methods and Measurement in the Social Sciences*, 6(1), 14. <https://doi.org/10.2458/v6i1.18772>
- Boyd, E. (2017). Holistic thinking beyond technology. *Nature Climate Change*, 7(2), 97–98. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3211>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed). Oxford University Press.
- Buckle, P. (1999). Re-defining Community and Vulnerability in the Context of Emergency Management. *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 13(4), 21–26.
- Butler, J. R. A., Suadnya, W., Puspadi, K., Sutaryono, Y., Wise, R. M., Skewes, T. D., Kirono, D., Bohensky, E. L., Handayani, T., Habibi, P., Kisman, M., Suharto, I., Hanartani, Supartarningsih, S., Ripaldi, A., Fachry, A., Yanuartati, Y., Abbas, G., Duggan, K., & Ash, A. (2014). Framing the application of adaptation pathways for rural livelihoods and global change in eastern Indonesian islands. *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 368–382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.004>
- Cabral, C. S., Lopes, A. G., Lopes, J. M., & Vianna, R. P. de T. (2014). Segurança alimentar, renda e Programa Bolsa Família: Estudo de coorte em municípios do interior da Paraíba, Brasil, 2005-2011. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública*, 30(2), 393–402. <https://doi.org/10.1590/0102-311X00140112>
- Câmpeanu, C. N., & Fazey, I. (2014). Adaptation and pathways of change and response: A case study from Eastern Europe. *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 351–367. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.010>
- Campos, I. S., Alves, F. M., Dinis, J., Truninger, M., Vizinho, A., & Penha-Lopes, G. (2016). Climate adaptation, transitions, and socially innovative action-research approaches. *Ecology and Society*, 21(1), art13. <https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-08059-210113>
- Carter, B., Roelen, K., Enfield, S., & Avis, W. (2019). *Social Protection Topic Guide* (Emerging Issues Report Revised Edition; p. 68). Institute of Development Studies. https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/20.500.12413/14885/Social_Protection_Topic_Guide_online.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Cecchini, S., & Madariaga, A. (2011). *Conditional cash transfer programmes: The recent experience in Latin America and the Caribbean* (First edition). United Nations, ECLAC. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/27855/1/S1100263_en.pdf
- Cecchini, S., & Rodrigo, M. (2012). *Inclusive Social Protection in Latin America: A Comprehensive, Rights-based Approach*. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
- Cecchini, S., Filgueira, F., & Robles, C. (2014). *Social protection systems in Latin America and the Caribbean: A comparative view* (No. 202; Social Policy Series). Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/37340/1/S1420689_en.pdf
- Cecchini, S., Filgueira, F., Martínez, R., & Rossel Odriozola, C. (Eds.). (2015). *Towards universal social protection: Latin American pathways and policy tools*. Economic

- Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC).
https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/39484/1/S1500752_en.pdf
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed). SAGE Publications.
- Davies, M., Guenther, B., Leavy, J., Mitchell, T., & Tanner, T. (2009). *Climate Change Adaptation, Disaster Risk Reduction and Social Protection: Complementary Roles in Agriculture and Rural Growth?* (p. 37) [Working Paper]. IDS - Centre for Social Protection. https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2009.00320_2.x
- Davies, M., Béné, C., Arnall, A., Tanner, T., Newsham, A., & Coirolo, C. (2014). *Promoting Resilient Livelihoods through Adaptive Social Protection: Lessons from 124 programmes in South Asia* (p. 32) [Policy Review]. ISD. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1467-7679.2013.00600.x>
- Devereux, S., & Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2004). *Transformative social protection* (Working Paper No. 123). IDS.
- Devereux, S., & Sabates-Wheeler, R. (2007). Whose (Transformative) Reality Counts? A Reply to Aoo et al. *IDS Bulletin*, 38(3), 32–33. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2007.tb00370.x>
- Devereux, S., Roelen, K., & Ulrichs, M. (2015). *Where Next for Social Protection?* (Evidence Report No. 124). IDS. https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/bitstream/handle/20.500.12413/5945/ER124_WhereNextforSocialProtection.pdf?sequence=5
- Eakin, H., Tompkins, E. L., Nelson, D. R., & Anderies, J. M. (2009). Hidden costs and disparate uncertainties: Trade-offs in approaches to climate policy. In W. N. Adger, I. Lorenzoni, & K. L. O'Brien (Eds.), *Adapting to Climate Change* (1st ed., pp. 212–226). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511596667.014>
- Eakin, H. C., Lemos, M. C., & Nelson, D. R. (2014). Differentiating capacities as a means to sustainable climate change adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, 27, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2014.04.013>
- ECLAC. (2017). *Linkages between the social and production spheres: Gaps, pillars and challenges* (Second session of the Regional Conference on Social Development in Latin America and the Caribbean; p. 170). Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/42269/1/S1700768_en.pdf
- ECLAC. (2019). *Critical obstacles to inclusive social development in Latin America and the Caribbean: Background for a regional agenda* (LC/CDS.3/3). Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean (ECLAC). https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/44799/S1900579_es.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- ECLAC. (2020). *Universal Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean* [Selected texts 2006-2019]. Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/45093/1/S1901140_en.pdf
- Eriksen, S. H., & O'Brien, K. (2007). Vulnerability, poverty and the need for sustainable adaptation measures. *Climate Policy*, 7(4), 337–352. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2007.9685660>

- Eriksen, S., Aldunce, P., Bahinipati, C. S., Martins, R. D., Molefe, J. I., Nhemachena, C., O'Brien, K., Olorunfemi, F., Park, J., Sygna, L., & Ulsrud, K. (2011). When not every response to climate change is a good one: Identifying principles for sustainable adaptation. *Climate and Development*, 3(1), 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.3763/cdev.2010.0060>
- Eriksen, S. H., Nightingale, A. J., & Eakin, H. (2015). Reframing adaptation: The political nature of climate change adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, 35, 523–533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2015.09.014>
- FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP, & WHO. (2017). *Building resilience for food and food security*. FAO.
- Fazey, I., Pettorelli, N., Kenter, J., Wagatora, D., & Schuett, D. (2011). Maladaptive trajectories of change in Makira, Solomon Islands. *Global Environmental Change*, 21(4), 1275–1289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.07.006>
- Fazey, I., Wise, R. M., Lyon, C., Câmpeanu, C., Moug, P., & Davies, T. E. (2016). Past and future adaptation pathways. *Climate and Development*, 8(1), 26–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2014.989192>
- Firestone, W. A. (1993). Alternative Arguments for Generalizing From Data as Applied to Qualitative Research. *Educational Researcher*, 22(4), 16–23. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0013189X022004016>
- Foresight. (2011). *Migration and Global Environmental Change* [Final Project Report]. The Government Office for Science. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/287717/11-1116-migration-and-global-environmental-change.pdf
- Fryer, C. E. (2019). An Approach to Conducting Cross-Language Qualitative Research with People from Multiple Language Groups. In P. Liamputtong (Ed.), *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences* (pp. 1653–1674). Springer Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_38
- Gajjar, S. P., Singh, C., & Deshpande, T. (2019). Tracing back to move ahead: A review of development pathways that constrain adaptation futures. *Climate and Development*, 11(3), 223–237. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2018.1442793>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2009). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research* (4. paperback printing). Aldine.
- Genereo, V. R., Fornelli, R. O., & Fornelli, J. R. (2014). Experiences and Recommendations for Collaborating on Master's of Education Thesis Research. *Literacy Information and Computer Education Journal, Special* 3(1), 1798–1806. <https://doi.org/10.20533/licej.2040.2589.2014.0239>
- GHPC. (2019). *A systems perspective on Universal Social Protection*. German Health Practice Collection. http://health.bmz.de/ghpc/discussion_papers/Universal_Social_Protection/GHPC_USP_Final-1.pdf
- Grüneis, H., Penker, M., & Höferl, K.-M. (2016). The full spectrum of climate change adaptation: Testing an analytical framework in Tyrolean mountain agriculture (Austria). *SpringerPlus*, 5(1), 1848. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40064-016-3542-1>
- Harland, C. (2014). Can the Expansion of Social Protection bring about Social Transformation in African Countries? The Case of Zambia. *The European Journal of Development Research*, 26(3), 370–386. <https://doi.org/10.1057/ejdr.2014.8>

- Hoddinott, J., & Skoufias, E. (2004). The Impact of PROGRESA on Food Consumption. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 53(1), 37–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/423252>
- ILO. (2011). *Towards an ILO approach to climate change adaptation* [Employment Working Paper No. 104]. ILO. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/documents/publication/wcms_169569.pdf
- ILO. (2015). *Guidelines for a just transition towards environmentally sustainable economies and societies for all* [Guideline]. ILO. https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/---emp_ent/documents/publication/wcms_432859.pdf
- ILO. (2017). *World Social Protection Report 2017–19: Universal social protection to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals*. 454.
- ILO. (2018). *Introduction: Social Transfers*. Social Protection. <https://www.social-protection.org/gimi/gess/ShowTheme.action?id=11>
- ILO. (2019). *Universal Social Protection for Human Dignity, Social Justice and Sustainable Development*. ILO.
- IPCC. (2001). *Third Assessment Report: Climate Change 2001: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Cambridge University Press.
https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/WGII_TAR_full_report-2.pdf
- IPCC. (2007). *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Cambridge University Press.
https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ar4_wg2_full_report.pdf
- Jones, L., Jaspars, S., Pavanello, S., Ludi, E., Slater, R., Arnall, A., Grist, N., & Mtisi, S. (2010). *Responding to a changing climate: Exploring how disaster risk reduction, social protection and livelihoods approaches promote features of adaptive capacity*. Overseas Development Institute (London, England).
- Jones, L., Carabine, E., & Schipper, L. (2015). *(Re)conceptualising Maladaptation in Policy and Practice: Towards an Evaluative Framework* [Working and discussion papers]. ODI.
- Jorgensen, S. L., & Siegel, P. B. (2019). *Social Protection in an Era of Increasing Uncertainty and Disruption: Social Risk Management 2.0* (Discussion Paper No. 1930; p. 152). The World Bank.
<http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/263761559643240069/pdf/Social-Protection-in-an-Era-of-Increasing-Uncertainty-and-Disruption-Social-Risk-Management-2-0.pdf>
- Juhola, S., Glaas, E., Linnér, B.-O., & Neset, T.-S. (2016). Redefining maladaptation. *Environmental Science & Policy*, 55, 135–140.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2015.09.014>
- Kates, R. W., Travis, W. R., & Wilbanks, T. J. (2012). Transformational adaptation when incremental adaptations to climate change are insufficient. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 109(19), 7156–7161. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1115521109>
- Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2015). *InterViews: Learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (Third edition). Sage Publications.
- Kuriakose, A. T., Heltberg, R., Wiseman, W., Costella, C., Cipryk, R., & Cornelius, S. (2013). Climate-Responsive Social Protection. *Development Policy Review*, 31, o19–o34.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12037>
- Lama, P. D., Becker, P., & Bergström, J. (2017). Scrutinizing the relationship between adaptation and resilience: Longitudinal comparative case studies across shocks in two

- Nepalese villages. *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 23, 193–203. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2017.04.010>
- Lama, P. D. (2019). *Consequences of Adaptation for Risk: In Nepal and the Maldives*. http://portal.research.lu.se/ws/files/63403838/lama_e_nailing_ex.pdf
- Lamaute-Brisson, N. (2013). *Social protection systems in Latin America and the Caribbean: Haiti* [Case Study]. ECLAC. https://repositorio.cepal.org/bitstream/handle/11362/4075/1/S2013068_en.pdf
- Laws, E. (2016). *Social assistance and idiosyncratic shocks* (GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report No. 1383). GSDRC, University of Birmingham. <http://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/HDQ1383.pdf>
- Leach, M., Scoones, I., & Stirling, A. (2007). *Pathways to sustainability: An overview of the STEPS Centre approach*. Institute of Development Studies University of Sussex.
- Leichenko, R., & Silva, J. A. (2014). Climate change and poverty: Vulnerability, impacts, and alleviation strategies: Climate change and poverty. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 5(4), 539–556. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.287>
- Magnan, A. (2014). Avoiding maladaptation to climate change: Towards guiding principles. *Surveys and Perspectives Integrating Environment and Society*, 7(1). <http://journals.openedition.org/sapiens/1680>
- Magnan, A. K., Schipper, E. L. F., Burkett, M., Bharwani, S., Burton, I., Eriksen, S., Gemenne, F., Schaar, J., & Ziervogel, G. (2016). Addressing the risk of maladaptation to climate change. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 7(5), 646–665. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.409>
- Majewski, B., Duncalf, J., Ward, C., Bailey, S., Pavanello, S., van Doorn, H., Herodote, P., Patiño, M., Shtayyeh, S., & Frankel, M. (2019). *Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy Policy Evaluation* (Policy Evaluation No. 1). Avenir Analytics. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000105318/download/?_ga=2.256470539.1407104046.1589550073-613890828.1583740605
- Maru, Y. T., Stafford Smith, M., Sparrow, A., Pinho, P. F., & Dube, O. P. (2014). A linked vulnerability and resilience framework for adaptation pathways in remote disadvantaged communities. *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 337–350. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.007>
- Moser, S. C., & Ekstrom, J. A. (2010). A framework to diagnose barriers to climate change adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(51), 22026–22031. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1007887107>
- Moser, S. (2013). *Successful Adaptation to Climate Change: Linking Science and Policy in a Rapidly Changing World* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203593882>
- Müller, B., Johnson, L., & Kreuer, D. (2017). Maladaptive outcomes of climate insurance in agriculture. *Global Environmental Change*, 46, 23–33. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2017.06.010>
- Nelson, D. R. (2011). Adaptation and resilience: Responding to a changing climate: Adaptation and resilience. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, 2(1), 113–120. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.91>
- Nelson, D. R., & Finan, T. J. (2009). Praying for Drought: Persistent Vulnerability and the Politics of Patronage in Ceará, Northeast Brazil. *American Anthropologist*, 111(3), 302–316. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1548-1433.2009.01134.x>

- Neset, T.-S., Asplund, T., Käyhkö, J., & Juhola, S. (2019). Making sense of maladaptation: Nordic agriculture stakeholders' perspectives. *Climatic Change*, *153*(1–2), 107–121. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-019-02391-z>
- Nightingale, A. J. (2017). Power and politics in climate change adaptation efforts: Struggles over authority and recognition in the context of political instability. *Geoforum*, *84*, 11–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2017.05.011>
- Nightingale, A. J., Eriksen, S., Taylor, M., Forsyth, T., Pelling, M., Newsham, A., Boyd, E., Brown, K., Harvey, B., Jones, L., Bezner Kerr, R., Mehta, L., Naess, L. O., Ockwell, D., Scoones, I., Tanner, T., & Whitfield, S. (2019). Beyond Technical Fixes: Climate solutions and the great derangement. *Climate and Development*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2019.1624495>
- O'Brien, M. J., & Holland, T. D. (1992). The Role of Adaptation in Archaeological Explanation. *American Antiquity*, *57*(1), 36–59. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2694834>
- O'Brien, K. L., & Wolf, J. (2010). A values-based approach to vulnerability and adaptation to climate change: A values-based approach. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*, *1*(2), 232–242. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.30>
- OECD. (2009). *Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Co-operation* (p. 197) [Policy Guidance]. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://www.oecd.org/env/cc/44887764.pdf>
- OPM. (2017). *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems: Literature review (2nd edition)*. Oxford Policy Management. <https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a0408-shock-responsive-social-protection-systems/srsp-literature-review.pdf?noredirect=1>
- OPM. (2017a). *Study on Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean: Haiti case study* [Case Study]. Oxford Policy Management. <https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/a1537-shock-responsive-social-protection-latin-america-caribbean/haiti-case-study.pdf?noredirect=1>
- Pelling, M., O'Brien, K., & Matyas, D. (2015). Adaptation and transformation. *Climatic Change*, *133*(1), 113–127. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10584-014-1303-0>
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Devereux, S. (2007). Social Protection for Transformation. *IDS Bulletin*, *38*(3), 23–28. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1759-5436.2007.tb00368.x>
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., & Devereux, S. (2018). *Social Protection and the World Food Programme* (Occasional Paper No. 25). Institute of Development Studies.
- Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE.
- Saunders, B., Kitzinger, J., & Kitzinger, C. (2015). Anonymising interview data: Challenges and compromise in practice. *Qualitative Research*, *15*(5), 616–632. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468794114550439>
- Scheraga, J. D., & Grambsch, A. E. (1998). Risks, opportunities and adaptation to climate change. *Climate Res*, *10*, 85–95.
- Schüring, E. (2010). *Conditions, conditionality, conditionalities, responsibilities – finding common ground* [Working Paper]. Maastricht Graduate School of Governance.
- Smit, B., & Wandel, J. (2006). Adaptation, adaptive capacity and vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*, *16*(3), 282–292. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2006.03.008>
- Solórzano, A., & Cárdenes, I. (2019). Social Protection and Climate Change (p. 44) [Occasional Paper 26]. World Food Programme. <https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/WFP-0000110761.pdf>
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The Art of Case Study Research*. SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Tenzing, J. D. (2019). Integrating social protection and climate change adaptation: A review. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.626>
- Thomas, V., & López, R. (2015). *Global Increase in Climate-Related Disasters* [Working Paper]. Asian Development Bank. <https://www.econstor.eu/bitstream/10419/128585/1/ewp-466.pdf>
- Thurmond, V. A. (2001). The Point of Triangulation. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(3), 253–258. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1547-5069.2001.00253.x>
- Tompkins, E. L., Lemos, M. C., & Boyd, E. (2008). A less disastrous disaster: Managing response to climate-driven hazards in the Cayman Islands and NE Brazil. *Global Environmental Change*, 18(4), 736–745. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.07.010>
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. United Nations.
- Wise, R. M., Fazey, I., Stafford Smith, M., Park, S. E., Eakin, H. C., Archer Van Garderen, E. R. M., & Campbell, B. (2014). Reconceptualising adaptation to climate change as part of pathways of change and response. *Global Environmental Change*, 28, 325–336. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2013.12.002>
- Wisner, B., Blaikie, P., Cannon, T., & Davis, I. (1994). *At Risk: Natural hazards, people's vulnerability and disasters*. Taylor & Francis. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203428764>
- WFP. (2004). *WFP Mission Statement*. World Food Programme. <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/newsroom/wfp076289.pdf>
- WFP. (2011). *WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management* (WFP/EB.2/2011/4-A). World Food Programme. <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/eb/wfpdoc061382.pdf>
- WFP. (2012). *Update of WFP's Safety Nets Policy: The Role of Food Assistance in Social Protection*. World Food Programme. <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/communications/wfp254438.pdf>
- WFP. (2015). *Policy on Building Resilience for Food Security and Nutrition* (WFP/EB.A/2015/5-C). World Food Programme. <https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/eb/wfpdoc063833.pdf>
- WFP. (2016). *Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) for Zero Hunger and Resilient Livelihoods* [Programme Guidance Manual]. World Food Programme. https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp289341.pdf?_ga=2.221307672.1407104046.1589550073-613890828.1583740605
- WFP. (2016a). *Strengthening Capacities in Food Security and Nutrition in Latin America and the Caribbean*. World Food Programme. https://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/liaison_offices/wfp284838.pdf
- WFP. (2017). *WFP Strategic Plan (2017-2021)*. World Food Programme. <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000019573/download/>
- WFP. (2017a). *Regional Project Proposal: Building adaptive capacity to climate change through food security and nutrition actions in vulnerable Afro and indigenous communities in the Colombia-Ecuador border area*. Adaptation Fund. <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/3066WFPRegionalProjectCOLECU10AprCLEAN.pdf>

- WFP. (2017b). *The Three-pronged Approach (3PA) factsheet*. World Food Programme. <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023753/download/>
- WFP. (2017c). *WFP's Climate Change Policy*. World Food Programme. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000023971/download/?_ga=2.220867096.1407104046.1589550073-613890828.1583740605
- WFP. (2017d). *Innovating for Climate Resilience in Latin America & the Caribbean*. World Food Programme. <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000110746/download/>
- WFP. (2017e). *Environmental Policy*. World Food Programme. https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000019504/download/?_ga=2.20603192.1407104046.1589550073-613890828.1583740605
- WFP. (2018). *Summary Evaluation Report of the Strategic Evaluation of the Pilot Country Strategic Plans* (Evaluation Report WFP/EB.2/2018/7-A). World Food Programme. <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/58afe7be9cf04d68954f727db2a17dce/download/>
- WFP. (2019). *WFP Guide to Climate & Food Security Analyses*. World Food Programme. <https://www.wfp.org/publications/2019-guide-climate-and-food-security-analyses>
- WFP. (2019a). *PRO-ACT: El Niño Response in the Dry Corridor of Central America, 2016-2018*. World Food Programme. <https://www.wfp.org/publications/pro-act-el-nino-response-dry-corridor-central-america-2016-2018>
- WFP. (2020). *WFP's Social Protection Strategy in Latin America and the Caribbean* [Manuscript in preparation]. World Food Programme.
- World Bank. (2001). *Social Protection Sector Strategy: From Safety Net to Springboard*. World Bank. <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/pt/299921468765558913/pdf/multi-page.pdf>
- Yin, R. K. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods* (3rd ed). Sage Publications.
- Zavaleta, C., Berrang-Ford, L., Ford, J., Llanos-Cuentas, A., Cárcamo, C., Ross, N. A., Lancha, G., Sherman, M., Harper, S. L., & the Indigenous Health and Adaptation to Climate Change Research Group. (2018). Multiple non-climatic drivers of food insecurity reinforce climate change maladaptation trajectories among Peruvian Indigenous Shawi in the Amazon. *PLOS ONE*, 13(10), e0205714. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0205714>

8 Annexes

8.1 Annex 1 – Direct and indirect entry points for social protection

WFPs Social Protection specific entry points:

	Global level	Regional level	National level
Policies	- WFPs Safety Nets Policy, 2012 (WFP, 2012) and corresponding Policy evaluation (Majewski et al., 2019)		
Strategies		- SP regional SP strategy (WFP, 2020)	- SP sections from CSP and CSR.
SP programme components	- References to experiences regarding the following non-contributory SP components: Food transfers and vouchers; Cash transfers; School feeding programmes; Public works; Cash plus programmes	- References to experiences regarding the following non-contributory SP components: Food transfers and vouchers; Cash transfers; School feeding programmes; Public works; Cash plus programmes	Country-specific inputs regarding the four main pillars of WFPs SP work in LAC (WFP, 2020). - Dominican Republic: inputs regarding the national SP components of SIUBEN, ADESS and PROSOLI (OPM, 2017). The latter including WFPs support of the nutrition component. - Dominica: WFPs SRSP emergency response after Hurricane Maria, and subsequent SP system strengthening. - Haiti: technical assistance for the development of the national policy for SP.
Other key documents	- WFPs role in Social Protection and Safety Nets: A Strategic Evaluation, 2011 - Social Protection and the WFP, Occasional paper no. 25 (Sabates-Wheeler & Devereux, 2018)	- Study on Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean (Beazley et al., 2019) - Shock Responsive Social Protection in the Caribbean: Literature Review (Barca et al., 2019)	- Dominican Republic case study on Shock-Responsive Social Protection (OPM, 2017) - Case studies for Haiti, including “Study on Shock-Responsive Social Protection in Latin America and the Caribbean Haiti case study” (OPM, 2017a) and

		- Social Protection and Climate Change, Occasional paper no. 26 (Solórzano & Cárdenes, 2019)	“Social protection systems in Latin America and the Caribbean: Haiti” (Lamaute-Brisson, 2013)
--	--	--	---

Indirect entry points informing WFPs work regarding Social Protection:

<p>Programme areas</p>	<p>Resilience: Some resilience initiatives have been articulating CC considerations and moving towards integrated programming (WFP, 2020). Considering the potential for such interventions to be linked and provided to national SP programmes and systems (ibid.); these broader insights will be used to inform the analysis of an integrated SP and CC agenda. Two sub-categories of WFPs resilience work were identified as particularly relevant to inform SP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Food assistance For Assets (FFA) (WFP, 2016): Using food and cash-based transfers, FFA can contribute for FSN by filling a food gap whilst at the same time supporting households and communities to build assets (e.g. irrigation systems and bridges), generally identified through CBPP. Asset creation or rehabilitation seeks to reduce the exposure and impact of shocks and stressors, strengthen resilience to natural hazards, and contribute to long-term livelihood and environmental benefits. Similarities with the Public Works component of SP and experiences with cash-based programming, advance the importance of learning from integrated FFA approaches that integrate CC considerations. <p><i>In LAC</i>, the FFA programme PRO-ACT (WFP, 2019a) provided the specific entry point to understand <i>how</i>: (1) resilience programming is integrating CCA; (2) interventions are being M&E; (3) the 3PA and VAM are applied. The potential for scaling-up resilience strengthening projects as part of national SP programmes justifies why learnings from PRO-ACT can inform an integrated SP and CC agenda. <i>Programme description:</i> From 2016 to 2018, PRO-ACT supported the most affected by El Niño in the Dry Corridor of Central America to adapt to the impact of droughts and improve livelihoods through asset creation and income generation activities. Strengthening livelihoods by creating and rehabilitating productive assets, intensifying production at the household level, diversifying income sources, increasing human capital, and providing safety nets for its beneficiaries (WFP, 2019a).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climate Resilience: In LAC, WFP has established a Climate Solutions Roadmap, for resilience and other programmatic areas: <i>including with community-based adaptation, climate information services, shock-responsive social protection systems connected to risk financing instruments such as insurance and forecast-based financing</i> (WFP, 2017d, p. 1). To advance adaptation, SP programming is attempting to link initiatives with specific climate
-------------------------------	--

	<p>activities and services (WFP, 2020) hence, these broader inputs can inform an integrated SP and CC agenda.</p> <p>Climate Change Adaptation (CCA): WFPs approach to CCA informs how adaptation is understood and operationalised, which can provide relevant insights for an integrated SP and CC agenda. Further, providing additional inputs on existing organisational knowledge surrounding maladaptation and CCA-specific M&E.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Building adaptive capacity to climate change through food security and nutrition actions in vulnerable Afro and indigenous communities in the Colombia-Ecuador border area”</i> is an Adaptation Fund Binational Project (WFP, 2017a). This particular project was deemed relevant to analyse since it integrated the ESRS tool and adapted the 3PA for the scope of CCA programming. These aspects can inform potential ways to understand maladaptation and inform an integrated SP and CC agenda. <p>Emergency preparedness and response (EPR): WFP has been working on EPR in LAC since the early 1960s, recently shifting from responding to sudden-impact emergencies, towards a preparedness-oriented approach, partly focusing on building local capacity in food assistance, logistics and emergency preparedness and response tools (Balletto & Wertheimer, 2010). WFPs efforts to help address regional and national gaps in response capacity include, among others, strengthening national SP programmes and systems to respond to shocks (Barca et al., 2019). Considering close linkages to SP, through SRSP and cash-based programming; broader insights, on how CC is being integrated into WFPs EPR were deemed relevant to understand the alignment and coordination between programmatic areas.</p>
<p>Methodologies and tools</p>	<p>Three-Pronged Approach (3PA) (WFP, 2017b): Programming approach aiming to strengthen the design, planning and implementation of programmes in resilience, safety nets, DRR and preparedness, consisting of three levels:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) - national level strategic planning: combines historical trends of FSN and shocks with additional information such as land degradation, markets, etc. to identify priority areas of intervention and appropriate programme strategies. • Seasonal Livelihood Planning (SLP) - sub-national level: A consultative process to design integrated multi-year, multi-sectoral operational plans that consider seasonal variations and integrate gender concerns. • Community-based Participatory Planning (CBPP) - local level activity planning: A community level participatory exercise to identify needs and tailor programme responses to local requirements by ensuring prioritisation and ownership by communities.

	<p>Vulnerability Assessment and Mapping (VAM): provides geospatial and economic analysis, food security monitoring and assessments, post-shock assessments and thematic analysis. This evidence-base supports the identification and prioritisation of needs, informing SP targeting and appropriate types of interventions. Additionally, considering that the VAM unit also monitors the implementation and performance of programmes, further insights were sought regarding beneficiary feedback mechanism that extend to SP initiatives.</p> <p>The Environmental Policy commits WFP to three tools be applied throughout WFP programming: “<i>environmental standards that lay out essential protection measures and minimum expectations; a screening and categorization process for identifying and managing environmental risks; and an environmental management system</i>” (WFP, 2017e, p. 7). Considering the close connection between environmental and social safeguards and maladaptation, it was deemed relevant to analyse these tools (EMS and ESRS) and their applicability to SP programming. Informants shared that the ESRS tool is not yet completely rolled-out or mainstreamed into WFP operations and that it will, hopefully, become mandatory in July 2020.</p> <p>Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) methodologies, especially focusing on the Decentralized Evaluation Quality Assurance System, which was used for the PRO-ACT evaluation, but also broader insights on CCA and SP specific M&E.</p>
Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WFP Climate change policy (WFP, 2017c): WFPs approach to CC and the links between SP and CCA; - WFP Environmental Policy (WFP, 2017e): Establishes three main tools to advance environmental and social sustainability within WFP; - WFP Policy on building resilience for Food Security and Nutrition (WFP, 2015): Resilience building inputs and links to CC; resilience programming approaches also applicable for SP, such as the 3PA; - WFP Policy on DRR and Management (WFP, 2011): Links between DRR and SP; - Strengthening Capacities in Food Security and Nutrition in Latin America and the Caribbean (WFP, 2016a): Several sections on capacity-building for SP programming in the region.

Some documents listed are internal and were shared with the researchers by the WFP, which is why some references are missing. Most policies, strategies, tools and methodologies can be found on <https://www.wfp.org/publications>

8.2 Annex 2 – Overview of informants

No	Informant; Job Title	Location
1	Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Programme Officer	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
2	Resilience Programme Officer	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
3	Social Protection Programme Policy Officer	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
4	Social Protection Programme Policy Officer	WFP Headquarters Rome
5	Climate Change, Environment and Social Safeguards Specialist	WFP Headquarters Rome
6	Regional Monitoring Advisor	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
7	Strategic Planning and Partnerships Advisor	WFP Dominican Republic Country Office
8	Resilience and Strategic Planning Officer	WFP Dominican Republic Country Office
9	Regional Evaluation Manager	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
10	Programme Policy Officer	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
11	Policy and Programme Advisor on Climate Change	WFP Regional Bureau Panama and WFP Headquarters Rome
12	Resilience and Climate Change Programme Officer	WFP Colombia Country Office
13	Regional Resilience Programme Policy Officer	WFP Regional Bureau Panama
14	Senior Advisor on Social Protection	WFP Haiti Country Office
15	Alexandre Magnan, Senior Research Fellow, Vulnerability and Adaptation to climate change	IDDRI (Institute for sustainable development and international relations)

8.3 Annex 3 – Interview guides

Prior to the interview, all informants were made aware of the purpose of the study and the expected duration of the interview (approximately 45-60 minutes). Verbal consent was obtained to record the interview and to include their respective job position in the study. Finally, there was an opportunity for informants to pose any remaining questions concerning the study.

Informant 1

Job Position: Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction Programme Officer from the World Food Programme in the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean

Purpose of the interview: To understand (1) the linkages between WFPs policy and programming of Climate Action, Disaster Risk Reduction and Resilience in the Latin America and the Caribbean region; (2) how adaptation and maladaptation concepts are perceived; (3) the degree of integration of climate change considerations within social protection programming.

Area of Focus	Interview questions
Background information	1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within the World Food Programme?
Approach to climate change, disaster risk reduction and resilience	WFP has a vision of <i>a zero hunger world that is resilient to the impacts of climate-related disasters and climate change</i> , thereby linking the agendas of addressing climate change, disaster risk reduction and resilience on a policy level. 2. On a programmatic level, how is this integration being managed? 3. Do you perceive any challenges for this integration?
Environmental Policy: tools and implementation in Latin America and the Caribbean region	WFPs environmental policy commits to <i>establishing and maintaining three main policy tools: the first being, a set of core environmental standards; the second, a process for screening and categorising environmental risk and, the third is an environmental management system.</i> 4. How would you describe the implementation process of these three tools within the region? 5. How does this approach align with initiatives being carried out by national governments and partners supported by WFP?
Climate change adaptation and maladaptation conceptualisation	As a practitioner in the field of climate change and disaster risk reduction, we would like to explore your understanding of WFPs adaptation work. 6. In your opinion, how is climate change adaptation understood in WFP? 7. How does WFP assess the success of adaptation initiatives? 8. Does WFP work with the concept of maladaptation? Probing 8a: <i>(If not)</i> How does WFP address potential unintended consequences in light of climate change? Probing 8b: <i>(If yes)</i> What does WFP consider as maladaptive?

Climate change and social protection programmes	As you know, the focus of the research is on social protection, so we would like to know if; 9. To your knowledge, how and to what extent is climate change addressed in social protection programming? Probing 9a: What type of support is provided by the Climate Change and Disaster Risk Reduction unit to the Social Protection unit?
Potential trade-offs	Given that social protection is generally aligned with development objectives; 10. In your opinion, are there any trade-offs between development and climate change adaptation objectives in programming?
Finalising remarks	11. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?

Informant 2

Job Position: Resilience Programme Officer from the World Food Programme in the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean

Purpose of the interview: To understand (1) the linkages between WFPs Resilience policy and programming in the LAC region, specifically regarding Food Assistance for Assets and the Three-Pronged Approach; (2) the degree of integration of climate change considerations within resilience programming; (3) how concepts of adaptation and maladaptation are perceived in programming.

Area of Focus	Questions
Background information	1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?
Resilience Policy	In relation to programmes implemented under the resilience policy; 2. How and to what extent is climate resilience a cross-cutting concern in the design and implementation of programmes? The resilience policy mentions the need to increase support for social protection and safety nets. 3. What type of support is provided by the Resilience unit to the social protection and safety nets unit in the Regional Bureau? The resilience policy also mentions the three capacities of resilience: <i>absorptive, adaptive and transformative</i> . 4. In the Latin America and Caribbean region, how are the adaptive and transformative capacities operationalised in programming?
Resilience Programming	5. Where does the main funding for resilience come from and how does that potentially impact programming? 6. In relation to Food Assistance for Assets, how is a resilience-building approach reflected throughout the programme cycle? Some elements of the Three-Pronged Approach, that inform resilience programming, are based on historical data. 7. In your opinion, how does this affect future uncertainties in the context of climate change?

	<p>In the Community-based Participatory Planning process of the Three-Pronged Approach, vulnerability assessments are conducted to inform the development of programme activities.</p> <p>8. How do programmes consider the fact that vulnerability is dynamic and hard to capture?</p>
Adaptation and Maladaptation	<p>As you are aware, the focus of our research is on maladaptation to climate change.</p> <p>9. How are unintended consequences, beyond a programme's time frame, being considered in WFP?</p> <p>10. From your experience, how are the unintended distributional effects considered in programming?</p>
Final Remarks	<p>11. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?</p>

Informant 3 & 4

Job Positions: Informant 3: Social Protection Programme Policy Officer from the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama for Latin America and the Caribbean; Informant 4: Social Protection Programme Policy Officer from the World Food Programme in the Headquarters

Purpose of the interview: To understand (1) how the fields of Social Protection and Climate Change Adaptation are being integrated, at the global and regional level (2) the integration of climate change considerations within social protection programming; and (3) how concepts of adaptation and maladaptation are perceived in programming.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	<p>1. Can you each introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?</p>
WFP Global Perspective on Social Protection and Climate Change Adaptation	<p>We will explore WFPs efforts on social protection and climate change adaptation, firstly from a global HQ perspective and on the following section from a regional perspective.</p> <p>2. What type of support is generally provided by the social protection unit at HQ to the social protection units at the RB level?</p> <p>3. What strategic role does WFP seek to occupy in the future of SP? Probing 3a: How is this process of change being articulated at different organisational levels? From the HQ to RB, CO and local level.</p> <p>4. Given WFPs traditional focus on emergencies, food security and nutrition, do you identify any trade-offs for an integrated approach towards climate change adaptation?</p>
WFP Regional Perspective on Social Protection and Climate Change Adaptation	<p>This section starts with a broader contextualisation of SP, in the region of Latin America and the Caribbean – beyond WFP;</p> <p>5. Can start by you providing an overview of the current state of social protection in LAC?</p>

	<p>6. In your opinion, how and to what extent do past development trajectories shape current development initiatives, particularly regarding social protection?</p> <p>As stated in WFPs Occasional Paper 25, social protection can potentially have protective, preventive, promotive and transformative functions.</p> <p>7. In your view, where do you see WFPs social protection efforts along the continuum of these functions? Probing 7a: How do you see social protection programmes adding to transformation?</p> <p>8. Compared to regional efforts, how and to what extent is WFP integrating climate change considerations into social protection programming? Probing 8a: How and to what extent is WFP learning from these initiatives? Probing 8b: Do you identify and focal points we could talk to?</p> <p>9. What do you see as the main challenge for including climate change considerations into social protection programming, if any? Probing 9a: Seeing that the environmental policy addresses some of these challenges, does social protection seek to integrate the tools being developed?</p> <p>Given that social protection is generally aligned with development objectives;</p> <p>10. In your opinion, are there any trade-offs between development and climate change adaptation objectives in programming?</p> <p>11. Where does the main funding for social protection come from and how does that potentially impact programming?</p>
Maladaptation conceptualisation	<p>In the Occasional Paper 26, you mention <i>avoiding maladaptation</i> as a key principle for social protection in the context of CC.</p> <p>12. Can you elaborate on how maladaptation is currently conceptualised and potentially addressed in WFP? Probing 12a (<i>if not mentioned</i>): How are potential unintended consequences beyond a project's time frame being considered?</p> <p>Both to <i>avoid maladaptation</i> and <i>understanding trade-offs</i> are mentioned as key principles for social protection in the context of climate change in this paper.</p> <p>13. In your view, can maladaptation ever be avoided, considering the multidimensional properties of the concept?</p>
Final Remarks	<p>14. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?</p>

Informant 5

Job Position: Climate Change Environment and Social Safeguards Specialist, Climate and Disaster Risk Reduction Programmes Unit from the World Food Programme Headquarters

Purpose of the interview: To gather insights on (1) the implementation process of the environmental policy tools; (2) operational challenges of an integrated programming approach, particularly in relation to the social and environmental screening tool; (3) reflections on maladaptation in relation to the environmental policy tools.

Area of Focus	Interview questions
Background information	<p>1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?</p>
Environmental Policy tools	<p>WFPs environmental policy commits to <i>establishing and maintaining three main policy tools: the first being, a set of core environmental standards; the second, a process for screening and categorizing environmental risk and, the third is an environmental management system.</i></p> <p>2. Can you provide an overview of the progress to date and future implementation?</p> <p>As you know our research is focused on social protection in the LAC region.</p> <p>3. To your knowledge, will these tools be rolled-out in the region, particularly in relation to social protection initiatives?</p>
Implementation of the social and environmental screening tool	<p>4. Does the screening process focus on risks internal to the project, or does it also consider interactions with contextual risks created by broader drivers of vulnerability?</p> <p>5. What are the entry points for implementation of the screening tool and at what stage will this be conducted? Probing 5a: Are there plans for the screening to be revised throughout implementation?</p> <p>6. Who has the responsibility to implement the tool and how participatory is the process? Probing 6a: What accountability mechanisms are integrated to ensure that safeguards are in place?</p> <p>7. How do potential risks identified in the screening process impact programming and how are these managed?</p>
Operational challenges & integrated programming approach	<p>8. What operational challenges do you foresee in the implementation of these tools, particularly in a region such as LAC? Probing 8a: How will these challenges be addressed?</p> <p>Programming generally balances multiple objectives and considerations. Introducing further managerial changes could potentially risk overburdening programmes;</p> <p>9. How and to what extent does this challenge impact the integration of these tools in programming?</p>
Environmental Policy Tools and Maladaptation	<p>Considering that the environmental and social safeguards seek to avoid programmes exacerbating negative consequences for social and ecological systems;</p> <p>10. How and to what extent are unintended consequences across temporal and spatial scales beyond a project's scope being assessed?</p>
Finalising remarks	<p>11. Do you have any final comments or questions before we end the interview?</p>

Informant 6

Job Position: Regional Monitoring Advisor from the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama

Purpose of the interview: To understand (1) how the Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) contributes for WFP operations in LAC, particularly regarding social protection programming; (2) how VAM conceptualises vulnerability; and (3) integrates climate change considerations.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?
Goal and functions of VAM in LAC, in relation to social protection	2. In broad terms, what is VAM and how does it support WFP operations? 3. In LAC, how and to what extent does VAM inform social protection programming, both implemented and supported by WFP? Probing 3a (<i>if applicable</i>): Reflecting on the ways that VAM informs social protection programming, how and to what extent are vulnerability assessments community-based and/or participatory?
VAM's conceptualisation of vulnerability in relation to social protection	This next section will explore VAM's understanding of vulnerability. Considering our research focus, we would appreciate if your reflections focussed on how the methodology has been applied in relation to social protection programmes. Considering that vulnerability is a relative and context-dependent concept; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. How does VAM frame and conceptualise vulnerability? 5. How does VAM address the fact that vulnerability is dynamic and hard to capture? 6. How are different vulnerability distributions across spatial and temporal scales reflected upon the VAM? 7. In your opinion, how and to what extent does VAM contribute for interventions to be tailored to specific needs and vulnerability contexts?
VAM and Climate Change	Considering that climate change is likely to lead to changing patterns and new vulnerability hotspots; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 8. How and to what extent does VAM integrate current and future vulnerability to climate change with development planning? 9. In your opinion, can the VAM inform decision-making regarding adaptation to climate change?
Final Remarks	10. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?

Informant 7 & 8

Job Positions: Informant 7: Strategic Planning and Partnerships Advisor from the World Food Programme Dominican Republic Country Office; Informant 8: Resilience and Strategic Planning Officer from the World Food Programme Dominican Republic Country Office

Purpose of interview: To understand (1) the context and social protection dynamics in the Dominican Republic; (2) in-country WFP supported and implemented social protection initiatives; and (3) the integration of climate change considerations into social protection programming.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background Information	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can you please introduce yourselves and your area of work within WFP?
Context: social protection in the Dominican Republic (Strategic review, Country strategic plan, social protection national system)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Can you explain the process of the strategic review and design of the Country Strategic Plan? 3. What is the state of the Country Strategic Plan implementation (2019-2023) and what are the main challenges? 4. Regarding social protection in the Dominican Republic, can you start by giving a brief national overview of the current efforts? <p>As highlighted in the Case Study on SRSP in the Dominican Republic, the current social protection system is quite fragmented, with programmes under different institutions that to some extent have different objectives and targeting mechanisms.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Can you reflect on potential challenges for coordination within such a social protection system? <p>Furthermore, the case study also highlights that targeting generally focuses on the most vulnerable groups using poverty criteria only.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. How do programmes consider the fact that vulnerability is a dynamic aspect that goes beyond poverty?
WFP supported and implemented social protection programmes (Targeting, monitoring and flexibility of programmes, funding)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. What social protection initiatives is WFP currently implementing and/or supporting in the country? 8. Within these social protection initiatives, what is WFPs approach to targeting of beneficiaries? Probing 8a: How and to what extent are communities included in this process? Probing 8a: What are the main challenges? 9. Within these initiatives, what is WFPs approach to monitoring and for what is it used? Probing 9a: How and to what extent is WFPs social protection programming flexible and responsive to the specific context of implementation? 10. Where is the main funding coming from and how does it impact programming?
Integration of climate change considerations in WFPs social	As stated in the Country Strategic Plan, WFP aims to include considerations on climate change to improve resilience throughout programming.

protection initiatives & maladaptation	<p>11. How and to what extent is WFP integrating climate change considerations in social protection programming in the Dominican Republic?</p> <p>12. What do you see as the main challenge for including climate change considerations in social protection programming, if any?</p> <p>Considering the country context and development needs;</p> <p>13. How are short- and long-term objectives within social protection programming being balanced, in the context of climate change?</p> <p>Finally, reflecting on the concept of maladaptation in relation to the social protection programmes in the Dominican Republic;</p> <p>14. How are potential unintended consequences beyond a project's scope being considered and addressed?</p>
Final Remarks	15. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?

Informant 9

Job Position: Regional Evaluation Officer from the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama

Purpose of the interview: To obtain a general understanding of World Food Programme's approach to monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning. These general insights will inform how social protection programming may potentially address the risk of maladaptation to climate change through MEAL-specific entry points.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	<p>1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?</p> <p>Having participated in the Dry Corridor regional decentralized evaluation.</p> <p>2. Can you give a brief overview of how this process was conducted and what stakeholders were involved?</p>
Monitoring	<p>Reflecting on the Dry Corridor evaluation process;</p> <p>3. How were monitoring procedures integrated with evaluation processes?</p>
Evaluation	<p>In relation to evaluation and accountability,</p> <p>4. What influences the type and timing of evaluations, and how their respective outcomes are used?</p> <p>5. Who is usually involved in evaluation processes, preferably regarding WFP supported or implemented social protection programmes? Probing 5a: How participatory are such processes?</p> <p>6. How are the temporal and spatial boundaries of an evaluation defined?</p> <p>7. How are potential unintended consequences of a programme being captured in evaluations, especially regarding impacts beyond a programmes' temporal and geographical scale?</p>

	8. How does WFP assess the success of adaptation initiatives?
Learning	9. How would you describe the learning culture in WFP? 10. How and to what extent is learning being used and integrated into future project and programme development?
Final Remarks	11. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?

Informant 10

Job Position: Programme Policy Officer at World Food Programme in the Regional Bureau for Latin America and the Caribbean

Purpose of the interview: In the context of climate change, we seek to explore (1) regional dynamics and challenges for cash-based SP; (2) linkages between SRSP and adaptive capacity; (3) potential entry points for maladaptation in programming.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?
Cash-based social protection	2. In LAC, what type of cash-based social protection does WFP generally support and implement? If possible, please reflect also on their main objectives, targeting and conditionalities. Probing 2a: Most literature on the subject highlights the limitations of standalone cash transfers, comparing to the benefits of cash plus programmes that promote linkages to other services. In LAC, how and to what extent does WFP promote these linkages within cash-based SP? 3. In your opinion, how and to what extent are WFP-implemented and supported social protection initiatives coordinated with government-led initiatives in LAC? 4. Based on your cash-based social protection programming experiences, how would you describe the engagement and accountability towards communities? 5. How and to what extent is cash-based social protection programming flexible and responsive to the specific context of implementation? Probing 5a: How does the beneficiary targeting address the fact that vulnerability is a dynamic aspect? 6. Within WFP, how is cash-based social protection considering climate change as a cross-cutting concern? Probing 6a (If not mentioned): In the context of climate change, do you foresee any challenges for cash-based social protection programming? 7. Provided that the context is appropriate for cash transfers, what are the main risks you perceive in such a modality?
Shock Responsive Social	Moving towards Shock Responsive Social Protection; 8. How and to what extent is SRSP coordinated with government-led initiatives and contributing to capacity development?

Protection programming	9. In the context of climate change, how and to what extent does SRSP contribute towards long-term climate resilience?
Maladaptation in Cash-based social protection & SRSP programming	As you know the focus of our research is on maladaptation to climate change: 10. How are potential unintended consequences, beyond a programme's time frame, being considered? In some cases, programmes aiming to improve a community's wellbeing can lead to a shifting of vulnerability into other areas or social groups. 11. From your experience, how are the unintended distributional effects considered in programming?
Final Remarks	12. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?

Informant 11

Job Position: Policy and Programme Advisor on Climate Change from the World Food Programme

Purpose of the interview: To understand (1) the integration of climate change considerations in social protection programming, particularly in the Latin America and Caribbean region; (2) how maladaptation to climate change is conceptualised and potentially addressed in WFP.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	1. Can you introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?
Integration of Climate Change considerations in Social Protection Programming	2. In your opinion, how is WFPs social protection work progressing in the context of climate change? Probing 2a: In the context of climate change, how and to what extent does SRSP contribute towards long-term climate resilience? 3. What do you see as the main challenges for integrating climate change considerations into social protection programming, if any? Probing 3a: What role does WFP expect to play in this integration? 4. Given WFPs traditional focus on emergencies, food security and nutrition, do you identify any trade-offs for an integrated approach towards climate change adaptation?
Conceptualisation of maladaptation	5. Could you elaborate on how maladaptation is currently conceptualised and potentially addressed in WFP? Probing 5a: In your opinion, can social protection initiatives contribute to the risk of maladaptation? 6. How and to what extent do the Environmental Policy tools potentially address the risk of maladaptation in programming? Considering complex scalar interactions in the context of climate change;

	7. How and to what extent are unintended cross-scale consequences, both beyond and within, a project's scope being considered?
Finalising remarks	8. Do you have any final comments or questions before we end the interview?

Informant 12

Job Position: Resilience and climate change Programme Officer from the World Food Programme Colombia Country Office

Purpose of the interview: To obtain general insights regarding the Binational Project, particularly concerning the Three-Pronged Approach and the Environmental and Social Screening tools. Furthermore, to understand how adaptation and maladaptation to climate change are being considered in broader CO programming.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?
Climate change adaptation Binational Project: <i>objectives, three-pronged approach, environmental and social screening</i>	<p>We will start with some questions about the binational project. The project links different areas such as food security, nutrition, livelihood resilience, and climate change adaptation.</p> <p>2. In your opinion, why are these linkages relevant for building adaptive capacity in the border area?</p> <p>3. In your opinion, are there any trade-offs between the project's multiple objectives?</p> <p>We are informed that the process of seasonal livelihood planning is used for the binational project but adapted to a climate change approach.</p> <p>4. Could you please describe the process and how it was adjusted to consider climate change? If possible, include who participated and in what ways, the overall duration, and how often these processes are revised.</p> <p>Probing 4a: In your opinion, do these cross-scalar relations contribute to the legitimisation of the Afro and Awá communities?</p> <p>In alignment with WFPs environmental policy and screening tool, The Adaptation Fund also generally requires that implementing entities conduct a screening of environmental and social risks.</p> <p>5. Could you describe how, and whom, will carry out this screening process in the project?</p> <p>The project proposal mentions that <i>controls will be put in place to ensure that the project will not exacerbate inequalities, negatively impact marginalized populations or harm the environment</i></p> <p>6. What type of control mechanisms are these?</p>
Maladaptation in programming	<p>As you know the focus of our research is on maladaptation to climate change:</p> <p>7. How are potential unintended consequences, both within and beyond the project's scope, being addressed?</p>

	<p>In some cases, initiatives aiming to improve a community's wellbeing can lead to a shifting of vulnerability to external actors or different social groups</p> <p>8. How and to what extent are potential unintended distributional effects considered in the project?</p>
Final Remarks	<p>9. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?</p>

Informant 13

Job Position: Resilience Regional Programme Advisor from the World Food Programme Regional Bureau Panama

Purpose of the interview: To explore (1) the application of the Three-Pronged Approach in the El Niño Response in the Dry Corridor of Central America (PRO-ACT); (2) the technical assistance provided to Government-led initiatives; (3) how climate resilience and maladaptation are perceived in programming.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background information	<p>1. Can you please introduce yourself and your area of work within WFP?</p>
Resilience Technical Assistance	<p>Considering your support to RBP countries in the formulation of the Country Strategic Plans:</p> <p>2. In your opinion, how and to what extent is long-term climate resilience a cross-cutting concern in the region?</p>
Three-Pronged Approach	<p>This section will focus on the Three-Pronged Approach, particularly on the Community-based Participatory Planning.</p> <p>3. Can you provide an overview of how the community-based participatory planning is conducted? If possible, including who generally participates and in what ways, the overall duration, how often these processes are revised</p> <p>Considering that the Community-based Participatory Planning focuses on concrete activities as the last step of the Three-Pronged Approach;</p> <p>4. In your view, does this sequencing impact community ownership over strategic decisions taken in the earlier stages of the Three-Pronged Approach?</p> <p>Considering that the Three-Pronged Approach is based upon historical data:</p> <p>5. In your opinion, how does this affect future uncertainties in the context of climate change?</p>
PRO-ACT	<p>Moving into PRO-ACT specifics. WFPs research on <i>Food Security and Emigration in El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras</i> covered different drivers such as migration, food security, violence and climate variability.</p> <p>6. In your view, how and to what extent did PRO-ACT address these different contextual drivers?</p> <p>The evaluation highlights the gender focus as one of the project's main contributions;</p>

	<p>7. Can you reflect on how gender equality and women's empowerment was integrated as a cross-cutting concern?</p> <p>8. In your view, what are the main challenges hindering the sustainability of WFPs resilience programmes? Probing 8a: In your opinion, how successful was PRO-ACT in creating long-term resilience?</p> <p>The evaluation included as a lesson learned for future projects the need for a more explicit focus on specific shocks. However, building resilience to a specific hazard may compromise resilience-building efforts to other hazards.</p> <p>9. How do you perceive and address this challenge in resilience programming?</p>
Adaptation and Maladaptation	<p>As you know the focus of our research is on maladaptation to climate change;</p> <p>10. How were potential unintended consequences, both within and beyond the project's scope, being monitored and addressed? In some cases, initiatives aiming to improve a community's wellbeing can lead to a shifting of vulnerability to external actors or different social groups</p> <p>11. How and to what extent were potential unintended distributional effects considered in the project?</p>
Final Remarks	<p>12. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?</p>

Informant 14

Job Position: Senior Social Protection Advisor from the World Food Programme Haiti Country Office

Purpose of the interview: To understand the (1) national social protection dynamics; (2) in-country WFP supported and implemented social protection initiatives; and (3) the integration of climate change considerations into social protection programming.

Area of focus	Interview questions
Background Information	<p>1. Can you please introduce yourselves and your area of work within WFP?</p>
SP in the context of Haiti	<p>2. Can you start by giving a general overview of social protection initiatives in Haiti?</p> <p>3. In your opinion, what are the main challenges and opportunities for the Haitian social protection system?</p>
WFP supported and implemented social protection programmes and the Country Office' role	<p>The Country Strategic Plan mentions a variety of roles for WFP in Haiti in relation to SP, such as delivering direct assistance and supporting national institutions. First focusing on WFPs implemented social protection initiatives,</p> <p>4. Can you explain the process of designing and implementing such initiatives?</p>

	<p>Probing 4a (<i>if not mentioned</i>): How are these initiatives being integrated with other government-led social protection efforts?</p> <p>5. Within these initiatives, what is WFPs approach to monitoring and for what is it used?</p> <p>6. What type of support is provided by the WFP to the development of the national social protection frameworks and system?</p> <p>In a broader sense, both regarding WFPs supported and implemented social protection initiatives,</p> <p>7. Can you elaborate on how and to what extent was gender equality integrated as a cross-cutting concern?</p> <p>8. Where is the main funding coming from and how does it impact programming?</p> <p>9. In your view, what are the main challenges hindering the sustainability of WFPs social protection programming?</p>
Integration of climate change considerations in WFPs social protection initiatives & maladaptation	<p>Moving to the last section of questions, focusing on WFPs approach to Climate Change. As stated in the Country Strategic Plan, WFP aims to include considerations on climate change to improve resilience throughout programming.</p> <p>10. How and to what extent is WFP integrating climate change considerations in social protection programming in Haiti?</p> <p>11. What do you see as the main challenges for including climate change considerations in social protection programming, if any?</p> <p>Considering the country context and development needs,</p> <p>12. How are short- and long-term objectives balanced within social protection programming, in the context of climate change?</p>
Final Remarks	<p>13. Do you have any questions or comments you would like to add before we end the interview?</p>

Informant 15

Informant: Dr./Hab. Alexandre K. Magnan, Senior Research Fellow, Vulnerability and Adaptation to climate change, IDDRI (Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations)

Purpose of the interview: To explore the informant’s approach to maladaptation, based on the article *Addressing the risk of maladaptation to climate change* (Magnan et al., 2016), by discussing perceived conceptual strengths and limitations. These critical insights will clarify and contribute towards a more nuanced understanding of maladaptation, foundational to the analytical framework.

Area of Focus	Interview questions
Background information	<p>1. Could you please introduce yourself and your area of work?</p>

<p>Maladaptation Research Developments; From concept to programming</p>	<p>2. Considering that the article “<i>Addressing the risk of maladaptation to climate change</i>” was published in 2016; have you continued researching on this topic?</p> <p>3. In your opinion, what are the main conceptual strengths and limitations of maladaptation?</p> <p>4. How do you envision the operationalisation of maladaptation in programming? Probing 4a: Can you elaborate on potential operational challenges and opportunities for capturing the risk of maladaptation?</p>
<p>Maladaptation beyond adaptation initiatives</p>	<p>The article mentions adaptation pathways and the subtle line between adaptation and maladaptation;</p> <p>5. How do you understand maladaptation in this broader context of adaptation pathways? The article also raises the question if “<i>maladaptation has to result from adaptation or can also arise from poorly planned development unrelated to climate change?</i>”</p> <p>6. In your opinion, how and to what extent can development initiatives contribute towards potential maladaptation?</p>
<p>Power and politics</p>	<p>In light of limited adaptation funding, the article states the importance of pragmatic and affirmative action to lower initiative’s maladaptive risks.</p> <p>7. How do you balance this need for objectivity with the extensive research indicating that adaptation goals hinge on subjective and potentially contested values? Presently, both the Green Climate Fund and the Adaptation Fund, integrate environmental and social management standards and screening tools.</p> <p>8. In your view, how and to what extent do these types of mechanisms address the risk of maladaptation? Capturing the risk of maladaptation requires making with several normative decisions about which elements to highlight, which boundaries to set and from which scales to analyse.</p> <p>9. In your view, how can practitioners consider different system framings when designing initiatives with a low maladaptation risk?</p>
<p>Ending remarks</p>	<p>10. Would you recommend any research projects on the topic of maladaptation?</p> <p>11. Any comments or questions before we end the interview?</p>