

# CASH TRANSFER PROGRAMMING IN EMERGENCIES

THE CASH LEARNING PARTNERSHIP'S 5<sup>TH</sup> GLOBAL LEARNING EVENT



Market analysis, new technologies and going to scale

17 - 18 November 2011, Nairobi, Kenya

**FINAL REPORT**

# CONTENTS

Background .....	3
Objectives .....	3
Agenda .....	4
Global and regional lessons .....	4
New technology in humanitarian cash and voucher programming .....	5
Market analysis in cash transfer programmes.....	6
Delivering emergency cash transfers and vouchers at scale .....	7
Conclusions .....	8
Evaluation of the Learning Event .....	12
Annexes.....	13
Annex 1: Agenda .....	13
Annex 2: Participants .....	17

## BACKGROUND

This learning event was organized by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), in partnership with the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies (IFRC) and sponsored by the European Department of Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (DG ECHO) and Visa Inc.

### About the Cash Learning Partnership

The Cash Learning Partnership aims to improve the quality of emergency cash transfer and voucher programming across the humanitarian sector. Originating from the will to gather the lessons learnt from the Tsunami emergency response in 2005, the CaLP is today composed by Oxfam GB, the British Red Cross, Save the Children, the Norwegian Refugee Council and Action Against Hunger / ACF International. The 5 steering committee organisations have come together to support capacity building, research and information-sharing on cash transfer programming as an effective tool to help deliver aid in times of crisis.

In 2010, the CaLP partnered with the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent societies (IFRC) to further support the increased understanding and use of appropriate cash programming.

As part of its mission to promote knowledge sharing the CaLP has held five global learning events on cash transfer programming in emergencies. The four previous events were held in London (2009), Geneva (2010), Washington DC (2010) and Thailand (2011).

The global learning events provide an opportunity for humanitarian professionals to come together to debate, discuss and share experiences in cash transfer programming. The aim is to contribute to humanitarian preparedness and response that is more effective at meeting the diverse needs of disaster affected people and promoting recovery.

The 5<sup>th</sup> Global Learning Event provided a forum to bring together humanitarian organizations, researchers and donors to network and share evidence; tools; and field experience on cash transfer programming.

This event was attended by over 80 people. Representation was particularly strong from the NGO community and Red Cross and Crescent Movement, with additional representatives from UN agencies, the private

sector and donors. It brought together participants with diverse responsibilities including; senior managers, policy makers, analysts, programme staff and finance and logistics personnel. Whilst most had prior experience in cash transfer programming, several were relatively inexperienced in the use of this tool but were keen to learn more. The full list of participants is appended as Annex 2.

Whilst drawing on international best practice these events have a strong regional identity. The timing and location of this event was particularly fortunate. The proceedings were enriched by the considerable recent regional experience in using cash and voucher transfers to respond to the crisis in the Horn of Africa. As the emergency response is still on-going, the deliberations also fed into emergency response design and implementation.

## OBJECTIVES

The overall goal of the meeting was to “provide an opportunity for humanitarian professionals to come together to debate, discuss and share experiences in cash transfer programming in emergencies”. This was further refined into a number of objectives:

- To promote the appropriate use of cash transfer programmes (in the region) by;
  - Sharing of evidence, tools and experience (with particular reference to CaLP research);
  - advocating for the considered use of cash transfer programmes by decision makers; and
  - promoting and facilitating collaborative action in support of cash transfer programming amongst the regional ‘community of practice’.
  
- To promote awareness of the CaLP partnership and the use of the services provided by stakeholders.
  
- To generate feedback from regional stakeholders to help in fine tuning CaLP strategy and activities.

## **AGENDA**

Within the agenda there was a deliberate focus on a limited number of topics. The majority of the agenda was structured around three key issues which have been at the centre of recent debates on cash transfers. These topics were: new technologies and CTPs; market assessment and preparedness for delivering cash transfers at scale. Each of the sessions benefited from the results of the on-going global research commissioned by CaLP<sup>1</sup>. This was complemented and contextualized by more in-depth regional case studies. Summaries of each of these sessions are given below, with the full agenda presented as Annex 1.

Learning from the feedback of the Bangkok event there was a conscious effort to adopt a participative and interactive format – where the presentations were balanced with adequate formal and informal knowledge sharing and networking. Plenary presentations were interspersed with networking opportunities. Panel debates explored controversial issues on the use of cash transfers in humanitarian operations. Structured small group discussions were used to identify the next steps in institutionalising the use of cash transfers in the region and global strategies. This mixed format appears to have been effective in meeting participants’ expectations.

### **Global and regional lessons**

This meeting started with introductions from the IFRC and CaLP. This reminded the regional audience of the support services available from the global level principally around capacity building, research and maintaining a community of practice.

This was followed by overviews of the status of Cash Transfer Programming at the global level (presented by ODI) and within the region (presented by the CaLP focal point). A starting point acknowledged that the dialogue has progressed from an initial debate about whether cash

---

<sup>1</sup> CaLP is also funding a research piece on cash and voucher programming in urban contexts.

distributions are a valid option at all to a general acceptance of their added value. This led to a second round global dialogue on the pre-conditions necessary to use cash transfers. This meeting suggested that we are now moving beyond this and recasting the debate on improving programme quality, irrespective of the resource transfer modality being employed.

The reflection on the global analysis was reinforced this review of the regional situation. There have been big strides forward in terms of the scale of CTP programmes and diversity of objectives beyond a food / livelihood focus. The main current challenges identified were around the need for better coordination, a better understanding of when to use CTPs and further advocacy work.

## **New technology in humanitarian cash and voucher programming**

The past few decades have witnessed the rapid development of a range of new technologies that have the potential to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid. These advances – in particular changes based on the digital coding, encryption, transfer, management and analysis of data – are increasingly globally in nature and a viable resource for humanitarian work even in the most challenging environments.

Cash transfer programmes have been at the forefront of integrating the use of new technologies with the use of electronic transfer mechanisms to distribute cash and vouchers. An initial presentation from VISA International highlighted the growing interest of the private sector in working with previously unbanked sections of the population. The added value of the private sector is evident in supporting efficient cash delivery mechanisms. However, what still needs to be fully explored are the more difficult questions around the degree of overlap – and divergences between – the humanitarian and private sector agendas. Continued dialogue between these stakeholders is needed.

A range of technological advances has the potential to impact on the entire project cycle. For example recent advances in new technology have also assisted in the determination of needs, the registration process, monitoring, evaluation and enhanced accountability, and lesson learning. This meeting provided a forum to demonstrate a variety of the most promising new technologies. Participants had the opportunity to learn from case studies of their application as well as a practical, hands-on opportunity to try-out selected tools.

A technology fair presented a number of new technologies relevant to various points in the project cycle:

- The use of SMS applications for needs assessment (Frontline SMS)
- Electronic registration systems: specifically the Last Mile Mobile Solution (WVI)
- Cash distributions using mobile phones (Safaricom)
- Cash distributions through the banking system (Equity Bank)
- Mobile Vouchers (Frontline SMS)

– Monitoring using digital pens (UNICEF)<sup>2</sup>

This was followed by a presentation of CaLP research which has rigorously examined the evidence, challenges and opportunities around the adoption of these technologies. The overall conclusion was clearly positive – that new technologies have had a strong and positive impact on the efficiency and effectiveness aid, whilst reducing opportunities for corruption and diversion.

However, several constraints to adoption were identified, typically around processes rather than the technology itself, such as the lack of knowledge of new options within organizations. Other questions concerned the possible risks and wider impacts of integrating new technology into programming – for example in terms of privacy law, or the social impacts of introducing beneficiaries to unfamiliar technologies. However, technology does not come without its limitations, and access and coverage of the technologies remains a limitation in many emergency contexts.

A major practical constraint appears to be the large up-front costs associated with adopting new technologies. Although technology typically brings medium to long-term cost efficiencies, donor funding is usually orientated towards minimizing short-term costs. Therefore adopting innovative technologies requires innovative working arrangements – especially more collaborative ways of working.

Equally technologies are nothing more than a tool, not an end in themselves. The real focus must remain on the needs of the beneficiaries.

## **Market analysis in cash transfer programmes**

In order to select the most appropriate form of assistance – either in-kind, cash based or other forms of intervention – response agencies need to understand the capacity of local markets. Agencies need to know whether the market preconditions are in place to support the chosen form of distribution, and to anticipate the impact of large scale distributions on those markets.

But whilst there is an emerging consensus on this principle, there is less clarity on the detail of how to best conduct this analysis. This session allowed practitioners to learn from the use of market analysis in a range of recent cash transfer programs. It also explored some of the controversy behind market assessment, and highlighted best practice for ensuring that market analysis informs needs-based programming.

The session started with a presentation of the on-going research from CaLP that examined the available market assessment tools and methodologies, and the role that market analysis plays at critical stages of cash based interventions. This session introduced the basics of markets and market assessment. It then examined the uses of market assessment and how this analysis links to decision making. Although it has applications across the programme cycle, the specific focus of the discussion was the process of response analysis: how to make the initial choice between alternative forms of resource transfer.

---

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.cashlearning.org/where-we-work/somalia-cash-and-voucher-monitoring-group> to download the M&E plan and the full set of tools developed by ODI as a part of this initiative.

The research also addressed the current challenges in institutionalizing market assessments. How can market analysis be better integrated into existing humanitarian information systems? CaLP is committed to further research on this topic that should deliver practical tools to integrate market research into emergency transfers. This consultation provided important input into the design of the next phase of research.

This global perspective was complemented by case studies of the recent regional experiences in market analysis, how this was conducted, how the analysis was used (or not) and the main lessons learnt. This included the experience of Mercy Corps in applying EMMA assessments in Kenya and Sudan, and the work of FSNAU and FEWS NET in national level market analysis in Somalia.

The presentations and discussions were then followed by the opportunity of group work to define the next steps in institutionalizing market assessments in Somalia, Kenya and at a more generic level. The overarching conclusion was the need to discuss the feasibility of cash based responses much earlier. The mechanisms for information sharing are currently disjointed. There is a need to establish a strong collective basis for assessment and analysis. Technically a synchronized assessment tool is still lacking, with a framework for analysing markets in a holistic way across multiple sectors.

It was evident that a relatively sophisticated understanding of markets exists in this region. What is less clear was the extent to which this analysis had influenced decision making. One track of the discussion therefore related to defining our minimum information needs and avoiding over complexity in market analysis. Secondly, other considerations clearly remain influential to organizational decision making, including; questions of mandates, levels of risk tolerance (inflation, security, etc.) along with the actual capacity to deliver CTPs. Response analysis is a more complex process that market analysis alone. Both the format and institutional responsibilities of this full process are still to be fully defined.

## **Delivering emergency cash transfers and vouchers at scale**

Across the humanitarian sector there is growing recognition that cash and voucher transfers can support people affected by disasters in ways that maintain human dignity, provide access to food and shelter and help rebuild or protect livelihoods. As the recent ODI Good Practice Review says, the question is no longer whether cash is an appropriate way to meet the needs of people engulfed in crisis, but how organisations, donors and governments can use cash transfers to best effect. The practical challenge is taking cash from a pilot activity to an option that is routinely considered and can be applied at scale.

This session explored the extent of preparedness among key humanitarian donors, UN agencies, NGOs and governments to implement cash transfer programming at scale in emergencies. CaLP research was presented which examined the preparedness of the sector to implement cash transfer programming through a review of the tools, policies, systems, procedures and capacity of major actors.

The global review was complemented by a panel discussion amongst key stakeholders – NGOs, UN and donors – on their experiences in attempting to bring cash transfers to scale in response to the recent regional crisis. The panel included representatives from WFP, IFRC, Horn Relief and DG ECHO.

Multiple constraints – and by extension possible solutions – were identified:

- Risk aversion remains a strong underlying theme with an innate conservatism evident across the board, which often runs counter to the available evidence. Risk thresholds need to be clarified.
- The attitudes towards the use of cash by key stakeholders, particularly Governments and donors, remain critical. Many policies are still implicitly anti-cash and need to be revised.
- Practical guidelines need to be elaborated, such as putting in place revised Standard Operating Procedures and associated business procedures to accommodate the use of cash.
- Other preparedness measures are needed such as building the necessary technical capacities. Pre-agreement with service providers, such as banks and mobile phone companies, was mentioned.
- Information and analysis systems are needed – albeit this is true irrespective of the form of transfer.
- Coordination, coordination and coordination.
- The real opportunities of linking emergency transfers to longer-term social protection emerged.

Recommendations on what still needs to be addressed to allow for improved large-scale cash-based responses were drawn out. Reflection on these points is expected to inform the future actions of both the workshop participants and organizers. But ultimately the decision often comes down to one of *leadership and even individual courage*. Are those tasked with decision making willing to take the risks needed?

## CONCLUSIONS

Overall it was concluded that this event successfully achieved its main objectives. It promoted, and reinforced, collaborative action in support of cash transfer programming amongst the global and regional communities of practice. The specific outputs of the meeting also helped to inform where further research, guidelines and capacity development are needed. It also provided a useful reminder of just how dynamic certain aspects of humanitarian practice are.

The headline ‘conclusions’ from the event, recapitulated in the final summary, included a number of key observations. Firstly, the overall debate should be couched within an overall objective of promoting the most appropriate and timely form of assistance. The objective is not to blindly ‘promote’ cash transfers irrespective of the context.

As noted in the ODI presentation, the cash debate has progressed swiftly over the last few years. In broad terms there is no longer the question of IF cash is a valid response – with plenty of evidence to demonstrate that in the right context it offers an efficient and effective response transfer mechanism. Although at an individual level – especially outside the food/livelihood sector – this question still arises, the mainstream debate has moved on. Certainly within the context of this

meeting the principal challenge discussed was ensuring that the option of cash is “on the table” and how to guarantee that the necessary foundations in place to make it a feasible alternative in relevant contexts.

Furthermore, it was noted this typically comes down to basic issues of programme quality. Cash transfers have provided a ‘wake-up call’ – that we need to hold ourselves accountable to higher programming quality standards across the board. The cash agenda has highlighted a number of important issues – emergency preparedness, analysis of resource transfer modalities, risks, gender implications, targeting, impact and accountability, etc. – but which are themselves far from cash specific.

Therefore it was recognized that we collectively need to make the transition from discussing these issues under a cash banner to a more mainstream debate on programme quality. How we package the issues is important in itself. It also provides an opportunity to link to, and leverage, other resources working on these topics. It is unrealistic, and even counter-productive, to take too wide an agenda under the auspices of a cash network and a targeted agenda is needed.

The region provided evidence of the significant and swift progress in adopting the use of CTPs – both in terms of spread beyond the food / livelihoods sector and in terms of scale. There were plenty of examples cited from this region and beyond that demonstrate the use of cash at scale, particularly where Government is behind it. A core lesson is that there are no insurmountable obstacles to the use of CTPs at large scale. But equally, there were frequent reminders that these examples remain the exception rather than the norm. Cash transfers remain a relatively small proportion of overall humanitarian response and an underused opportunity.

The meeting identified the various issues underlying this situation. Key challenges and opportunities were grouped as follows:

### **Advocacy**

There has clearly been much concrete progress in advocating for the use of cash. But equally there is still work to be done. The meeting referred to a continuing need for a shift in humanitarian ‘culture’. Whilst CTPs are increasingly accepted in certain sectors (such as food, livelihoods and shelter, the situation in other sectors, such as health, is far less developed. There are also stark differences in attitudes between individual UN, NGO and donor agencies.

The challenge is to develop a more refined advocacy strategy, with clear objectives, targets and messages. Opportunities that were mentioned included advocacy to donors to change the perception of risks associated with the use of CTPs and break-down the ‘dual standards’ of risk mitigation measures compared to projects using in-kind resources; advocacy to encourage a more consistent policy lines between HQ and field offices of organizations; and advocacy to promote funding of the up-front costs associated with adapting systems to the use of cash.

### **Analysis and Decision Making**

There is a continuing lack of information and analysis to support decision making on the most advantageous context to use CTP’s, and further investment is needed. Even where CTPs are being

employed the analytical base of this decision is often as just as opaque as the underlying rationale for use of in-kind resources.

A number of clear messages arose from the discussion. Firstly, this is not a cash specific topic. The challenge is to put in place mechanisms to guide the choice of the most appropriate resource transfer modality. Changes in process are needed as a standard – not just to accompany CTPs.

A big step forward has been taken in market analysis in the region. In several countries this can no longer be regarded as a constraining factor to making informed choices. The positive developments on market analysis (in this region) but not necessarily translated into better *response analysis*. Indeed there were even suggestions that we might be over investing in unnecessarily complicated forms of analysis in comparison to the decision making needs. A specific gap identified was for a quick and dirty analysis to inform immediate post disaster decision making.

Overall the conclusion is that market analysis is necessary but not sufficient to ensure sound programmatic decisions. We can't be too single minded in assuming that a better understanding of markets is enough – when we often continue to operate with a constrained set of response options.

### **New partnerships**

The use of CTPs highlights the need to engage in new partnerships. Critically deploying hi-tech solutions demands a dialogue between the humanitarian community and private sector. This is only just beginning. The starting points and objectives of the two sets of stakeholders are very different. Whilst the interests of humanitarians are aligned with the economically, politically and socially marginalized, the private sector has traditionally worked concentrated on working with the richer segments of society. However, increasingly the client groups are starting to overlap and a basis for cooperation is emerging.

This new relationship brings with it great opportunities, but also significant risks. There is a recognition that we have different – but overlapping agendas. Whilst there has been noteworthy progress in bringing communities together – with this meeting as an example – the need for further dialogue is evident.

A second area of partnership lies between the humanitarian agencies and Government. It is clear that a pre-condition for CTPs at scale is Government support (or at the least a lack of opposition). The use of cash often raises sensitive domestic political issues. Therefore the absence of Government policy makers from this forum was regretted.

### **Coordination**

The meeting continually highlighted the imperative of greater coordination. This theme continually arose in the discussion. It spanned all of the discussions in highlighting the various forms of coordination needed, including:

- Coordination – or the lack of coordination – of cash related issues within existing sectoral coordination mechanisms including the cluster system.
- Coordination around market assessments and response analysis

- The need for active collaboration – and pooling of resources – to overcome the investment hurdles to in establishing the new systems necessary to deliver CTPs
- Capitalizing on the potential of cash to meet diverse needs through the new models of inter-sectoral coordination

The weaknesses of current coordination structures were repeatedly referenced. But so were examples of good practice in establishing effective coordination mechanisms, which may serve as future models. The central question rests is defining where the responsibility lies for these various coordination roles and responsibilities. The challenge goes beyond coordination into a question of allocation of *leadership* responsibilities.

### **Preparedness**

Various speakers highlighted the unrealistic challenge of trying to adopt a radically new approach – cash transfers – in the midst of crisis. This highlighted the need to anticipate and prepare for this shift well in advance of the crisis itself. A number of opportunities for building preparedness emerged:

- Continued knowledge sharing. The Greater Horn is a cauldron of innovation, but it was clear that it is a continuing challenge to circulate this information, between and even within agencies. Too often information remains siloed within institutions.
- Investing in baselines – such as prior understanding of markets – is critical for timely analysis in the event of a crisis.
- Capacity building is a continuing challenge. There were perhaps some indications that the absolute dearth of cash expertise was starting to be mitigated through on-going investments. Hopefully we may be moving towards a maintenance phase. The primary challenge appears to lie in mainstreaming cash relevant expertise across internal systems including; administration, IT, logistics and human resources.
- There was a recognition of the value in collective pooling of resources to make the upfront investments in new technologies well in advance of a crisis.

### **Linkages to longer-term Social Protection**

In many ways this issue is closely linked to the topic of preparedness. A well established system of social protection – especially cash based systems – provides a strong basis for delivering emergency relief. Social protection schemes help establish a knowledge of the population – through pre-registration often with an understanding of household level vulnerabilities. The distribution mechanisms are already in place, which can be scaled-up in the advent of an emergency. Both of these factors are huge facilitators of an emergency response. While the potential of these links was alluded to several times, the practical examples were lacking in the discussion.

This area could usefully be explored further – including by CaLP – as the barriers between relief, rehabilitation and development are re-examined. This is an area of opportunity that has still to be systematically explored.

## EVALUATION OF THE LEARNING EVENT

A full annex of the participant feedback is attached. A summary of the main points raised in feedback are given below :

### Satisfaction and relevance

Overall high level of relevance (75% rated it as Very Relevant)  
High level of satisfaction (47% Good and 53% Very Good)  
Participants fairly evenly split in rating specific sessions as most relevant between; New Technologies and CTPs; Market Assessments and Taking CTPs to Scale.  
Very few sessions negatively highlighted. Some references to specific technology fair sessions.

### Presentation and content

Positive response to meeting design (59% Good and 35% Very Good)  
Mix of presentations, group sessions, panels, etc appreciated  
Balance of presentation to discussion about right  
Mix and quality of presenters appreciated  
Background work invested in developing agenda (including CaLP research) appreciated  
Total workshop length was about right

### Organization and facilitation

Overall organization complemented  
Mix and level of participants appreciated  
Absence of Govt / policy makers a negative  
Too many participants, too crowded  
Good facilitation, time keeping (51% Good, 41% Very Good)  
Venue was generally liked – except main conference room with no windows

### Main suggestions for future events

More on market assessments and new technologies  
Coordination in its various forms (clusters, assessments, with private sector)  
Monitoring, evaluation and accountability in relation to CTPs  
Sharing of agency best practices  
Bring Governments into the dialogue  
PLUS a longer list of suggestions raised by individuals (see table below)

### Suggestions for CaLP action at global / regional level

Continue the facilitative role of knowledge sharing  
Promote coordination at various levels – including with Govt.  
Continue capacity building through training, mentoring, etc.  
Facilitate linkages with the private sector

# ANNEXES

## Annex 1: Agenda

### Thursday 17th November

8:30 - 9:00	Workshop Registration	
9:00 - 9:30	Welcome on behalf of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies	Alexander Matheou, Head of IFRC Regional Office
	Welcome and Introduction by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)	Nicolas Barrouillet, CaLP Coordinator
	Introduction to Workshop Objectives and Agenda	Nick Maunder, Meeting Facilitator
	Administrative briefings	Holger Leipe & Miriam Grove, IFRC
9:30 - 10:30	ODI Good Practice Review	Sarah Bailey, HPG/ODI
	Recent experiences with cash transfers in the Greater Horn - Progress and Challenges	Glenn Hughson, CaLP Kenya
	Plenary Discussion	

### Coffee / Tea

11:00 - 11:30	- New technologies and cash transfer programmes	Ginger Baker, Emerging Market Solutions, VISA Inc.
	Introduction to Technology Fair	Nick Maunder
11:30 - 1:00	New Technologies Fair (session 1)	
	- Using SMS applications for needs assessment	Nathan Wyeth, Frontline SMS

- Electronic registration systems: the Last Mile Mobile Solution Richard Lankas, World Vision International
- Cash distributions using mobile phones Kephers Otieno Ombewa, Safaricom

#### Lunch

2:00 - 3:20 New Technologies Fair (Session 2)

- Cash distributions through the banking system Apphia Ndungu, Equity Bank
- Mobile Vouchers Nathan Wyeth, Frontline SMS
- Light pens and accountability Irene Alunni, UNICEF

#### Coffee / Tea

3:40 - 4:30 Presentation of CaLP Research on New Technologies and Cash Distributions: Risks and challenges Ian MacAuslan, Oxford Policy Management

Plenary discussion and conclusions

## Friday 18th November

9:00 - 11:00	Introduction to Day 2	Nick Maunder
	Presentation of CaLP Research on Market Assessments to support CTPs - Dilemmas and Lessons	Jessica Saulle, Save the Children
	Q & A	
	Case studies of regional market assessments and the links to decision making	
	- Agency level experience in Market assessment to support programming: EMMA in Wajir	Chloe Stull-Lane, Mercy Corps
	- Market assessment and collective decision making: The case of Somalia	Grainne Moloney (FSNAU) and Abdullahi Khalif (FEWS NET)
	Plenary discussion	

## Coffee / Tea

11:30 - 1:00	Group exercises: Way forward for market assessment at global and regional levels	
	Plenary recapitulation	Nick Maunder

## Lunch

2:00 - 3:30	Presentation of CaLP Research on Preparedness for Large Scale Cash Transfers	Mary Atkinson, British Red Cross Society
	Panel Discussion - Agency perspectives on preparedness for CTPs at scale	
	- UN Agency representative	Cheryl Harrison, WFP
	- RCM representative	Heidi Gilert, IFRC
	- NGO representative	Degan Ali, Horn Relief
	- Donor representative	Sarah McHattie, DG ECHO

3:30 - 4:00      Conclusions: Mainstreaming cash transfers in emergency response      Nick Maunder and Austin Davis (Chair of CaLP Steering Committee)

Workshop evaluation and closure

Coffee / Tea / Departure

## Annex 2: Participants

Name	Job title	Organisation	Location
Huyen Tran		ACF	Kenya
Wato Denge		ACF	Kenya
Angela Acosta	Cash for work coordinator	American Refugee Committee	Somalia
Zahra Mohamed Ali	Program assistant	American Refugee Committee	Somalia
Beatrice Nabajja Mugambe	DI Partner – DRT Uganda	Development Initiatives	Kenya
Charles Lwanga-Ntale	Programme Manager	Development Initiatives	Kenya
Alexandra S. Guyetsky	Programme Adviser	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Nairobi
Finbarr Sweeney	Global Livelihoods Advisor	Goal	Ireland
Mohamed Moallim Abukar-Ganey	Chief Executive Officer	HARDO Organisation	Somalia
Agnes Shihemi	Program Coordinator	Horn Relief	Nairobi
Alexa Swift	Program Officer	Horn Relief	Nairobi
Anne-Marie Schryer-Roy	Communications Officer	Horn Relief	Nairobi
Gurudatta Shirodkar	M&E Technical Advisor	Horn Relief	Nairobi
Mohammed Khaled	HOA Operations Coordinator	IFRC	Nairobi
Sophie Gordon	Consultant	Independent	Kenya, Sudan, DRC Uganda
Elijah Muchiri	Head of Office Mercy Corps Dungeni and Programme Manager	Mercy Corps	DRC

	Economic Recovery - Orientale		
Charles Inwani	Adviser - Cash & Voucher	NRC	Kenya
Moses Owaka Chibole	Social Protection Manager	NRC	Kenya
Pietro Galli	Program Director	NRC	DRC
Pauline Ballaman	HSP Programme Representative	Oxfam	Kenya
Joyce Dalglish	Market and Trade Project	Oxfam- – Kenya (Turkana Programme) Ludwar	Lodwar
Ashok Nawani	HSP Distribution Manager	Oxfam GB	Oxford
Cynan Houghton	Regional Funding & Capacity Building Coordinator	Oxfam GB	UK
Fahreen Chudasama	Senior Regional Programme Funding Advisor	Oxfam GB	Nairobi
Francis Lacasse	Humanitarian Programme Manager	Oxfam GB	Kenya
Livison Muvango	Programme Manager	Oxfam GB	Zimbabwe
Loreto Palmaera	Emergency Food Security and Livelihoods Coordinator	Oxfam GB	Somalia
Abdirizak Abdi Kontoma	Deputy EFSL Coordinator	Oxfam GB	Somalia
Solange Fontana	Regional Emergency Food Security & Livelihoods Advisor	Oxfam GB	Nairobi
Marko Lesukat	Regional Disaster Risk Management Manager	Plan International Inc	Nairobi
Alexander Matheou		Red Cross Movement	

Elijah Muli		Red Cross Movement	
Mohammed KHALED		Red Cross Movement	
Walter Hajek	Head of International Disaster Management	Red Cross Movement (Austrian Red Cross)	Austria
Bruno Mesureur	Regional Agronomist	Red Cross Movement (ICRC)	Nairobi
James Ooko		Red Cross Movement (ICRC)	Nairobi
Joseph Muhwanga	Regional Livelihoods Specialist	Red Cross Movement (ICRC)	Nairobi
Kiflemariam Amdemariam	Global Food Security Coordinator	Red Cross Movement (ICRC)	Nairobi
Louise Broomhead	Regional Nutritionist	Red Cross Movement (ICRC)	Nairobi
Oola McWalter		Red Cross Movement (ICRC)	Nairobi
Charlie Musoka	Operations Delegate	Red Cross Movement (IFRC)	Nairobi
Ian Heigh	Project Coordinator for IFRC logistics strategic plan 2015 implementation	Red Cross Movement (IFRC)	
Bitacha Sora Bitacha	Regional Disaster Management Officer	Red Cross Movement (Kenya Red Cross Society)	Nairobi
Ernesto Gonzalez	Somalia Cash Consortium Coordinator	Save the Children	Somalia
Leo Skyner	Finance Advsier	Save the Children	Somalia
Nik Riloff	Cash Consortium coordinator	Save the Children	Somalia
Davina Hayles	FSL Officer	Save the Children	Kenya
Marion NG'ANG'A	Food Security Technical Assistant	Solidarites International	Somalia

Priscilla Ateyo	Emergency Relief Programme Coordinator	SOS Children's Village International	Nairobi
Overtoun Mgemzulu	Regional Humanitarian Coordinator	Trocaire	Nairobi
Joanne Bosworth	Senior Social Policy Specialist	UNICEF Kenya	Kenya
Luis Corral	Cash Transfer Specialist	UNICEF Kenya	kenya
Nicholas Cox	Regional Advisor and DART Deputy Team Leader	USAID/Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance	Nairobi
Mohamed Sheikh	Programme Officer	WFP	Afghanistan
Cheryl Harrison	Coordinator Programme Innovations	WFP Kenya	Nairobi
Mesfin Teklu	Director, Maternal and Child Health and Nutrition	World Vision International	Nairobi
Abdullahi Khalif		FEWS NET	
Alexander Matheou		IFRC	
Apphia Nudungu		Equity Bank	
Cheryl Harrison		WFP	
Chloe Stull-Lane		Mercy Corps	
Degan Ali		Horn Relief	
Ginger Baker		Visa	
Glenn Hughson		CaLP	
Grainne Moloney		FAO (FSNAU)	
Irene Alunni,		UNICEF	
Jessica Saulle		Save the Children	
Kephers Ombewa Otieno		Safaricom	

Nathan Wyeth		FrontlineSMS	
Nick Maunder		Consultant	
Nicolas Barrouillet		CaLP	
Pat Foley		BRC	
Richard Lankas		World Vision	
Sarah Bailey		ODI	
Sarah McHattie		ECHO	
Ian MacAuslan		OPM	
Mary Atkinson		BRC / CaLP	
Heidi Gilert		IFRC	
Austen Davis		NRC / CaLP	
Miriam Grove		IFRC	
Holger Leipe		IFRC	
Breanna Ridsdel		CaLP	
Alexandra Walker		CaLP	