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**Abstract:**

Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes (CCTP) are the most widely used strategy in Latin America to address extreme poverty and are currently becoming central in the discussion about non-contributory social protection. The aim of this paper is to analyse the shaping of this type of policy in Colombia and Chile. From a multilevel perspective, the selection and implementation processes of “Familias en Acción” (Colombia) and “Chile Solidario” (Chile) policies will be compared by analysing the movements of ideas and the multiple interactions of actors involved from local, national and transnational level. The analysis follows a qualitative approach and uses data collected from semi-structured interviews and documentary analysis.

Colombia and Chile, as cases of study, contribute to illustrate that: i) there is an important interaction of actors and ideas between local, national and international level in these policy process; ii) although international organizations (IOs) and policies of other countries have influenced the national policies, such influence has changed over the policy process and the national State continues playing a key role in the design and implementation of policies; iii) subnational actors and non-governmental organizations have not been involved in the design process and they have just played a secondary role in the implementation process; iv) foreign ideas have been translated considering the particularities of the national contexts in both the selection and implementation processes of CCTPs; v) the similarities, but especially the differences of these cases of study show the necessity of a deeper analysis of the policy process in Latin American countries in order to understand the diverse ways in which CCTP are configured and linked with social protection systems.

## **Introduction**

In Latin America, after the acute economic crisis in the early 1980s, structural adjustment and economic liberalization oriented by the Washington Consensus, and the financial crisis in East Asia in the late 1990s, governments and multilateral agencies started to look for different and new solutions to tackle poverty (Barrientos and Santibanez, 2009, Barrientos and Hulme, 2009). In that context, Conditional Cash Transfer Programmes (CCTP) started to be developed in Mexico and Brazil around 1997, after which they rapidly spread among other countries in Latin America (Barrientos and Hulme, 2009; Barrientos, 2011, Valencia, 2009; Sugiyama 2011). Nowadays, CCTP are the main policy for poverty alleviation in the region. 18 out of 20 countries in Latin America have a CCTP and now these programmes are also being implemented in countries in other regions, such as Turkey, Indonesia, India, Nigeria, Kenya and Philippines among others (Fiszbein and Schady 2009, Villatoro, 2012).

The main feature of these programmes is the provision of cash to low-income households, typically including children and young family members, on the condition that those households will use it for health or education services. In that sense, we can observe a traditional component of social policies, which is the direct monetary benefit to a defined group of people. The conditionality is a new feature, which implies the demand of a specific action by the recipient, e.g. children´s attendance to school or periodical health check-ups. According to Fiszbein and Schady (2009), these conditions are justified as a means to reinforce incentives for households to invest more in the human capital of their children.

These programmes were adopted by governments of different ideological positions and with different sources of funding. The majority of these programmes have external resources from the World Bank (WB) or the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB) and only six of them are supported by autonomous public resources. In general, though, international organizations (IOs) exercise a role in each of the countries, whether it is in the design, implementation and/ or evaluation of the programmes. Hence, it is important the international level to understand the shaping of these policies (Osorio, 2012). Actors, interests and ideas moving from transnational to local contexts play different roles during the policy making process of CCTP.

Taking into account the centrality of CCTP in Latin American social policies, the aim of this paper is to analyse the shaping of this type of policy in Colombia and Chile. From a multilevel perspective, the selection and implementation processes of “Familias en Acción” (Colombia) and “Chile Solidario” (Chile) policies will be compared by analysing the movements of ideas and the multiple interactions of actors involved from local, national and transnational level. The analysis follows a qualitative approach and uses data collected from 40 semi-structured interviews with policy makers, NGO’s representatives and researchers/consultants engaged with the policy process in Colombia and Chile. Also, a documentary analysis of relevant written material was conducted.

This paper is organized in four main sections. The first one contextualizes the theoretical discussion and concepts underpinning the analysis of the shaping of CCTP from a multilevel perspective. The Second section briefly characterises Familias en Accion (FA) in Colombia and Chile Solidario (CHS) in Chile. It also examines the roles of actors involved in the policy making process and its influence on CCTP configuration. In the third, some examples illustrating how transfer/translated of policy ideas from diverse scales influenced the shaping of CCTP during the selection and implementation processes as well as domestic factors filtered these foreign ideas in Colombia and Chile are examined. The fourth analyses the links between CCTP and the social protection system in the cases under study. Finally, some conclusions are presented.

## **The shaping of social policy from a multilevel perspective.**

Nowadays, many actors play a role in the process of forming and establishing policies in every country. As Kennet (2008) states, public policy is located within an increasingly complex, multiple and overlapping network of interactions at different scales (transnational, national and subnational). In this regards, Stone (2008) argues that links and networks play a relevant role in the transnational diffusion of ideas, standards, and policy practice. The above, implies the necessity of new approaches to understand the policy process in a transnational and globalised context. This transnational view is particularly relevant to understand the influence of IOs, policies of other countries and international and subnational actors in the policy arena, and specifically in the policies for poverty alleviation in which many actors develop strategies to address such as social problem at different levels.

Research in this area, in general, has been carried out following approaches such as ‘policy transfer’, understood as “the process by which knowledge about policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in one political system (past or present) is used in the development of policies, administrative arrangements, institutions and ideas in another political system" (Dolowitz and Marsh 2000, 5) and/or linked to concepts such as policy diffusion and lesson drawing (Rose 1991; Bennett 1991; Dolowitz and Marsh 1996, 2001; Dolowitz 2003; Stone 2004; Jones and Newburn 2006; Weyland, 2006 Benson and Jordan 2011). These traditional approaches have focuses on the objects of transfer, actors involved, the process and the agents of transfer. These approaches have been criticized as they assume a stability of meaning in policy ideas and dismiss multiple interpretations given by different actors involved in the process (Freeman 2004, 2009; Lendvai and Stubbs 2007, 2009; Benson and Jordan 2011). It has also been observed that they continue to assume the rationality of agents and deliberation in the movement of policy ideas and dismiss the role of contingency in this process (Freeman 2009; Lendvai and Stubbs 2009).

Based on a constructivist perspective, “policy translation” emerges as an alternative approach to deal with complexity, interdependence and heterogeneity (Freeman 2004, 2009; Lendvai and Stubbs 2006, 2007, 2009, Mukhtarov 2014; Stone 2012; Lendvai and Bainton 2013). This approach focuses on the ways in which policies (schemes, content, technologies and instruments) are constantly changing and emphasizes the interactions, the complexity and the liminality of encounters between actors, sites, scales and contexts. They highlight that the process of formation, transformation and contestation imply that policy transfer is never an automatic or unproblematic, taken-for-granted, process (Lendvai and Stubbs 2007). As Mukhtarov (2014) states, policy translation is necessarily an actor-based approach which helps understand the policy process through paying attention to policy actors and focusing on how they engage in morphing and transforming ideas coming from elsewhere. This trying to understand how they choose to act at a particular geographical scale and, the extent to which contingencies of politics and context interact with the intentions of policy actors. Freeman (2009) states that policy-making is a continuous process in which ideas and purposes move between actors and locations converting them into decisions, programmes and instruments and thus including both transfer and transformation. Because ideas do not travel by themselves, policy actors and “translators” play an important role. The translation approach, as Johnson and Hagstrom (2005) state, challenges assumptions about policy as essentially a mechanical and rationalistic process and has a strong association with the cultural, reflexive, ideational and constructivist turn in policy studies (Lendvai and Bainton 2013).

There is scarce research about the spread of CCTP ideas and its influence on adoption and implementation of this kind of policy. Research on the spread of CCT in Latin America has shown that domestic factors have only limited impact on policy adoption decisions and international factors play a central role (Sugiyama, 2011, Martinez and Voorend, 2011); the processes of learning through neighbours and professional norming through the international development community play an important role (Teichman, 2007; Valencia, 2008; Jenson, 2009; Martinez y Voorend, 2011; Sugiyama, 2011) as well as; the incentives through international financial institutions play a role (Valencia, 2008; Sugiyama, 2011, Martinez and Voorend, 2011). Additionally, Martinez and Voorend (2011) argue that there are differences in the direct influence of international actors in the policy process, the policy communities developing CCTP were small and closed (policy makers and experts) and that domestic factors still played an important role.

In the next section, the actors that influenced the adoption and implementation process of CCTP in the cases of Colombia and Chile will be characterized.

## **Actors influencing decisions in the CCTP. The cases of Colombia and Chile.**

After a brief characterisation of the Familias en Accion (FA) in Colombia and Chile Solidario (CHS) in Chile (table 1 and 2, respectively) as well as the roles of actors involved in the policy making process and its influence will be examined.

**Actors in the Colombian policy making process**

**Table 1: General features of Familias en Accion (FA)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CCT name and aim** | Familias en Accion (FA) was initially aimed to mitigate the adverse effects of macroeconomic shocks as part of the Red de Apoyo Social (including FA, Empleo en Accion and Jovenes en Accion programmes). Tree years later FA changed its compensatory original aim and started to address structural poverty adopting the accumulation of human capital as the main aim. |
| **Start year** | 2000 |
| **President** | Andres Pastrana (1998-2002) center–right wing government |
| **Target population** | Poverty in rural zones - targets 20% of the poorest households with children (0-17 years old) living in selected municipalities with less than 100.000 people, adequate supply of education and health services and with a bank branch. |
| **Coverage** | In 2000 were 340 thousands families, in 622 municipalities of 26 departments. Today there are 2.6 millions of families in the 1.102 municipalities of the country. |
| **Funding** | In 2000 100% funded by the WB and the IADB and it decreased over the years. |
| **Benefit type** | Primary school subsidy to child enrolled in primary school  High school subsidy to children between 6-17 years old  Nutrition subsidy to children 0-7 years visiting health clinics |
| **Areas tackled** | Education, health and nutrition |
| **Monitoring of the conditionality** | Yes, hard conditionality, verification system and control of the conditionality. |
| **Coordination in the implementation.** | Presidency (Departamento Administrativo de la Presidencia de la República – Fondo de Inversión para la Paz) was the responsible for the implementation of the FA through the National Coordination Unit which manages the programme with regional coordinating units (UCR) and with the municipal government through the “Enlace Municipal”. |

Sources: Own elaboration based on the bibliography and documentary analysis.

The selection and design of FA as policy instrument was made by the central State and IOs (the WB and the IADB) with a strong political support of the President Andres Pastrana (1998-2002). In this process high-ranking policy makers from the Presidential Agency “Accion Social” and National Planning Department (NDP) participated. The latter asked for advice to IOs (the WB and the IADB), because they were looking for policy instrument to address the social impact of economic crisis.

The analysis of policy alternatives was oriented by IOs representatives who presented some options took from experiences in different Latin American countries which were analysed with high ranking Colombian policy makers. The CCTP emerged as a policy alternative to address rural poverty and the Mexican CCTP “Progresa” had a big influence in the Colombian programme through the advisers of the WB and from the “study tour” and interchange of knowledge with the directive team of “Progresa” in Mexico.

The policy community was really small and close. It incorporated only national policy makers from NDP and “Accion Social” as well as officials from the IOs. The level of accumulated knowledge (expertise) of IOs staff and international consultants was highlighted and appreciated by Colombian policy makers. This valorisation of the external agents' expertise and the fact that the IOs funded the new programmes made their ideas more powerful in the policy process. National actors were highly influenced by policy ideas and some conditions linked with the financial support stated by international actors namely the WB and the IADB.

NGO’s and other national and subnational actors in the countries under study did not have a role in the CCTP selection process in Colombian. The local governments played a role in the implementation process ensuring the health and educational supply and designating an “Enlace Municipal”, which was in charge of coordinating the local implementation of the FA programme.

The Parliament had no role in the selection process. Then in 2012 they approved the transformation of FA in a law, following the Presidents and executive's policy proposals.

**Actors in the Chilean policy making process.**

**Table 2: General features of Chile Solidario (CHS)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CCT name and aim** | Chile Solidario (CHS) system had four components namely cash transfer (bonus of protection), subsidies guaranteed, preferential access to social services and psychosocial support through Puente Programme to assist families in inserting themselves in the social services. |
| **Start year** | 2002 |
| **President** | Ricardo Lagos Escobar (2000-2006) center – left wing government. |
| **Target population** | The extreme poor households from the 5.7% of total population from all the municipalities of the country |
| **Coverage** | In 2002 were 56.000 families and the aim was to reach 225.000 in 2005. In 2008 were 278.548 familias considering participants and graduates. |
| **Funding** | 100% funded by national public funds |
| **Benefit type** | Initial “Bono de proteccion” for 2 years: value decreases every 6 months, is independent of family size or composition. After 24 months, “Bono de egreso” for 3 years. |
| **Areas tackled** | 53 minimum quality of life conditions organized in 7 dimensions: identification, health, education, family dynamic, housing, work, income. |
| **Monitoring of the conditionality** | Soft conditionality, just sign the agreement to participate in the psychosocial component (Puente Programme), but formally the conditions should be evaluated after 6 months. |
| **Coordination in the implementation.** | Ministry of Planning (MIDEPLAN)  National Executive Secretary of CHS coordinates with the public Ministries and public services and supervised the implementation process. FOSIS (Social Fund) signed agreement with municipalities to implement Puente programme. There was a regional coordination and provincial support to Puente programme and municipalities created a Family Intervention Unit and Local Intervention Network. |

Sources: Own elaboration based on the bibliography and documentary analysis.

Policy selection and design was made by the central State. This had the strong political support of the President Ricardo Lagos (2000-2006) and included the participation of high-ranking policy makers, especially of the Ministry of Finance and Ministry of Planning - FOSIS. They were concerned about the stagnation of extreme poverty rates and the social impact of the economic crisis. Hence, they were looking for strategies to address the complexity of extreme poverty as well as the problems with the targeting and coordination of social programmes.

IOs played an indirect role during the policy process. The WB provided advice to the Ministry of Finance about safety net system (2001) and then, during the implementation process, the IADB joined to the WB developing support activities and evaluations.

At the same time, the European Union (EU) with the Ministry of Planning/FOSIS and the Ministry of Housing (1999-2002) implemented a Programme to address extreme poverty in 6 municipalities of Chile aiming at replicating their knowledge in other municipalities and generating new social programmes. During 2001 MIDEPLAN created a task force formed by representatives of different public services. Its aim was to develop a “National Strategy of Intervention with Families in Extreme Poverty”. In the construction of this strategy two ONGs representatives and two municipalities were invited to share their knowledge on social interventions addressing poverty and their learning from their local contexts.

Policy alternatives emerged at the national scale. On the one side, MIDEPLAN – FOSIS developed a specific programme called “Puente” (Bridge) based on the analysis of social interventions designed and implemented in local contexts and the programme developed in 6 municipalities supported by the EU already mentioned. At the beginning of 2002 a pilot version of the “Puente” programme started to be implemented in 50 municipalities in 4 regions of Chile. On the other side, the Ministry of Finance developed a proposal about a social protection system and to improve the efficacy of the social public spending (advised by the WB consultants).

NGOs and civil society in general did not play a role in the selection of policy. Some years later, NGOs started to have a role in the design and implementation of new programmes that were incorporated in the CHS system. In the origin of CHS only a small group of social policy experts from think tanks and NGOs focused on poverty were invited to participate in two meetings with the President and high ranking policy makers in order to discuss policy alternatives.

Subnationals actors just took part in the implementation process of this policy, especially municipalities (local governments). The Parliament had no role in the selection process, and then, in 2004 they approved the creation of a law to institutionalise the Chile Solidario. This was a relatively uncontroversial process, because the governments’ coalition had the majority in the parliament and after some discussion the opposition voted approving this policy too. This law was modified in 2009 to create the Intersectoral Social Protection System.

## **Transfer/Translation of policy ideas and the relevance of the national State and domestic factors.**

In these policy processes, ideas influencing the shaping of CCTP during the selection and implementation were transferred/translated from diverse scales and domestic factors has been filtering foreign ideas in the cases under study. In this section just a couple of examples of these arguments will be analysed by case of study with the aim of illustrate the relevance of a more comprehensive approach.

**The transfer/translation of ideas in the FA policy making process.**

IOs had an important influence on the FA policy design in Colombia. This influence was exerted through different channels. On the one side, the IOs had influence through the conditions of the loan. These conditions were related to the recruitment of directive team of FA should be contracted under the same conditions that the WB staff, the development of a powerful information system from the beginning of the programme and to incorporate the design the impact evaluations at different stages of the implementation of FA. In addition, the IOs had influence advising, monitoring and approving the design process of FA. On the other side, such an influence of IOs can be seen as the result of the role of experts given attributed by national policy makers to IOs officials. These are examples enabling to states that during the design process of FA elements of social learning and coercion can be identified in the process of transfer/translation of policy ideas. Elements of social learning and coercion mechanisms of transfer could be identified in these examples.

The Mexican CCTP called “Progresa” was used as a model, but it was adapted to the Colombian context. For instance, the Mexican programme transferred food and the Colombian team decided incorporated cash transfer and to pay these subsidies directly from the National State to the families through the national financial systems, starting a process of “bankarization" of poor families, in order to avoid the corruption risk and incorporate these families to the financial system.

An important difference from the Mexican CCTP is that Colombia developed an important social community component characterized by the role of the "mother leader" and activities targeted to children, young people and families. All these aspects of the programme design were monitored by the WB and the IADB but the national policy makers recognised and incorporated their particular knowledge about the cultural and social context in the discussion of the community component as well as in the model of implementation. During the implementation of FA the territorial criteria to target the programme were modified. The scheme of evaluation of the conditionality, for example, with students in the secondary school was tried different incentives such as attendance or graduation as well as the amount of the cash transfer was also modified, just to name some of the changes.

There are some examples evidencing the relevance of the national State as well as domestic factor in the FA policy process. First, in 2002, when the new President Alvaro Uribe (2002-2010) started his administration, FA programme was in risk to be finished, because the President had a negative opinion of this kind of policy. However, the National Coordination of the programme with the IOs rearrange an intermediate impact evaluation which showed positive results. The advisers of the President recognised the political potential of FA. Then, the President defined not only the continuation of FA but also the increasing of the number of families involved in it. Second, during the implementation of FA the Colombian government needed to address an increasing social problem, the displaced families by “la Guerrilla”. These families needed to leave their villages and come to the city and start a new life in really poor conditions. The government made the decision of extending FA programme (designed to address rural poverty) to the urban zone, the WB and the IADB disagreed and decided not fund this government initiative. However, the Colombian government decided to carry on this strategy implementing this expansion with national resources. This is a clear instance of the agency capacity exerted by national State and of the relevance of domestic factors in the shaping of policies.

**The transfer/translation of ideas in the CHS policy making process.**

Transnational ideas arrived and circulated through the actors involved in the national debate in diverse ways, such as informal conversations with other policy makers engaged with the Mexican and Brazilian CCTP, and routine conversations held by them with the WB’ officials and consultants about social protection system. The incentives offered by the latter to carry out some policy reforms also play a role in the influence of transnational policy ideas. Additionally, Chilean policy makers of the Ministry of Finance and MIDEPLAN-FOSIS took part in a conference aimed at showing the Mexican CCTP evaluation hosted by the WB. Learning forms in the process of transfer/translation of policy ideas were more significant during the Chilean policy debate than coercion, but the latter also are present in the form of hegemonic ideas held by IOs.

The CHS emerged mixing the policy alternatives held by Ministry of Finance (improving coordination of subsidies/social supply and cash transfer) and by the MIDEPLAN-FOSIS (psychosocial support “Puente Programme” and linking families with social services) after a process of policy debate among the closed national policy community. However, these policy alternatives included policy ideas from local initiatives and transnational policies. A very good example of negotiation between national actors was the final features of the cash transfer in CHS. While, some actors supported the idea that only a bonus paid monthly could be the policy option, other rejected the idea of incorporating that in the policy. Finally it was agreed that a bonus of protection for each family would be granted for 2 first years only and that the bonus would be decreased over the time.

During the implementation of CHS relevant changes in its design were made. For example, a community component and social capital development was not included. Other example is the modification of the targeting instrument. The “Ficha CAS” underpinned by material poverty was changed by the “Ficha de Protección Social” underpinned by the concept of vulnerability. This changed the features of the population targeted by the CHS and, as a result, the applicability of the techniques and tools developed originally to address extreme poverty was affected. In the same sense, during the implementation process new programmes targeted on homelessness (Programa Calle, 2006), older people (Programa Vinculos, 2006) and children and adolescents with parents deprived of liberty (Programa Abriendo Caminos, 2008) were incorporated in the CHS system. These new programmes were developed and implemented with the participation of NGOs which had expertise and trajectory working in these issues. This amplitude of actors involved in the design of these programmes was a relevant difference with the original design of CHS.

Finally, there are common elements in both transnational and national context which influenced the movement of policy ideas in the two cases under study. From the transnational perspective the influence of the Washington Consensus prescriptions, the idea of social risk management introduced by the WB as a theoretical framework for social protection was highlighted. The latter was well received by national policy makers and used as a theoretical pillar underpinning their CCTP in the two cases under study. As a channel of interchange of initiatives and learning also were state the international community developed by the Social Fund (during the 90’) which become in a CCTP communities during the ‘2000 as well as the multiple seminars and congress hosted by IOs (WB, IADB, ECLAC, FAO, OEA, among others). From the national context the influence of accumulated knowledge from the implementation of previous policies to address poverty and the knowledge about national culture and societal features were emphasised. These elements also highlight the relevance of considering a broader historical context in which CCTP emerged as a social policy instrument. This enables understanding of current policy decisions.

## **The links with the social protection system.**

FA was created in 2000 and in 2002 a law (789) creating a Social Protection System in the Colombian case was launched. This CCTP was incorporated as part of one of the five components of this system called Social Promotion (Accion Social – DNP, 2010). At the end of 2006 the social protection network to deal with the extreme poverty called “Red Juntos” (today “Unidos”) was created. It develops an integral social intervention with the families covering 9 dimensions. The “Red Juntos” was designed expecting an integral coordination and link with FA. However, this joint work aimed only at coordinating actions for targeting families to be included in the programmes.

From a more general view, the discourse underpinning these programmes and their links with the social protection system, the notion of social rights are not present in these programmes as well as any reference to link these programmes as a process to develop a more universal system. However, it is interesting the creation of a new strategy to social protection called “De Cero a Siempre” (from zero to ever) orientated to the early stimulation of children which explicitly stated the rights perspective in their design. It started to be implemented in 2011.

CHS emerged with some aspects linked with the idea of social rights although this perspective was not explicit, especially in the sense that the State guarantees minimal levels of welfare (53 minimal standard of Puente Programme). Then, during the 2006 new programmes were incorporated into the CHS and the Chile Crece Contigo (CHCC) programme (Chile Grows with You) was developed. This is a comprehensive child protection system, universal in scope and targets assistance to the forty percent most vulnerable of the population. It covers the period from pregnancy up to four years of age. In 2009 the Intersectoral Social Protection System with two subsystems, CHS and CHCC was instituted.

In parallel two important changes related to the non-contributory social protection in Chile took place. In 2005 the AUGE system (Universal Access with Explicit Guarantees) was developed which effectively incorporated the social right discourse determining illnesses and pathologies to be treated universally. After that, in 2009 a reform into the social pensions system which guaranteed a minimal benefit to all the population was established.

The discourse about social rights has been present in some areas of the social policies and in the political agenda over the last decade (for example, educational reform in the public debate currently). The CHS and AUGE can be recognised as the first steps in this orientation. However, social rights are not guaranteed in a universal basis in the Chilean case yet.

If we agree with the idea that the role of the CCTP is to become in a link between the families and the existent social protection system, Chile and Colombia -especially considering FA and “Red Unidos”- have fulfilled such a role. However, the CCTP have not neither incorporated the families into a scheme of rights guarantee nor contributed to develop a more Universalist perspective (Villatoro, 2012). At the same time, the CCTP has been helping increasing the families’ access to social services; however they are not improving the quality of the public supply that the targeted population receives.

## **Conclusions.**

From the analysis of the cases of CCTP in Colombia and Chile it is possible to argue that both selection and implementation process were the result of a complex process transfer/translation of policy ideas from different scales and actors and that the shape of these policies was changing over the implementation process.

Although IOs and policies of other countries had influenced on the national policies, it is possible to state that this influence is very different between countries under study. The processes of learning through neighbours and professional norming through the international development community pointed out in the previous research about the adoption process (Teichman, 2007; Valencia, 2008; Jenson, 2009; Martinez y Voorend, 2011; Sugiyama, 2011) can be recognized with clarity in the case of Colombian. In the case of Chilean CCTP professional norming through international development community can be recognised but without determinant influence.

National States and domestic factors continue playing a key role in the design and implementation of policies for poverty alleviation. It can be recognised in the agency of Colombian government which asked for help at the origin of the CCTP, after that, it accepted the proposal and the conditions of the international loan. However, in the process of operacionalisation of the CCTP, the Colombian State was able to translate the policy idea into its own context and to decide the target the programme to a different population even when the WB and the IADB withdrew their support. It does not deny the powers of influence of the WB through conditions, incentives and hegemonic ideas (Valencia, 2008; Sugiyama, 2011; Martinez and Voorend, 2011), but this approach recognised the role of national actors in this process.

Other key internal factors influencing the policy making process were, for example, the strong political support exerted by the President of the Republic and the background of national policy makers and knowledge accumulated from previous policies addressing poverty in both Colombia and Chile.

In the two cases under study were identified small and closed policy communities participating in the policy making process (Martinez and Voorend, 2011). Civil society, NGO’s and other national or subnational actors were not involved in these processes, which is consistent with previous research in this field (Grindle, 2002; Puentes 2009). The latter just played a role in the implementation process and NGO’s played a more relevant role in the development of new programmes in the CHS.

Parliaments appeared to have a secondary role, following the President’s and executive's policy proposals. The Presidencialist character of Latin American states and the central role of policy-elites may be recognized in the poverty alleviation policies too (Grindle, 1980, 2002; Grindle and Thomas, 1991; IADB, 2006; Stein and Tommasi, 2006; Puentes, 2009, Osorio, 2012). This issue makes really difficult to incorporate new actors which can push for a more Universalist Social Protection Systems.

The link between CCTP and the Social Protection System in Colombia and Chile has been made by increasing the public supply in the non-contributory part of the social protection and linking poor families with the public supply. However, the CCTP are not incorporating families into a scheme of social rights guaranteed yet.

Taking into account the similarities, but especially the differences between countries and the transformation of the policies during the policy process is necessary to understand the diverse ways in which CCTP are configured as well as their links with social protection systems. In this sense, the use of more comprehensive approaches of the internationalization process of social policies as well as the incorporation of time dimension into the policy analysis analysing together the selection and implementation processes. This enables us to better understand the complexity of the policy ideas movements and the constant transformation of policies during the policy implementation process. For example, to recognising the change of the problem addressed by the policy (Colombian case) or the effects of the decision about eliminate the social capital component originally designed (Chilean case) illustrate the important changes that policies can have during the implementation process.

In this analysis the influence of IOs and its changes over the time were identified, especially in the Colombian case. This long term analysis of the policy process can modified the conclusion generated from the analysis of selection process in which it has been stated the domestic factors are less relevant than international or external factors (Sugiyama, 2011, Martinez and Voorend, 2011). Additionally, this helps understand the policy as a process of constant transformation more than a process taken for granted.
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