

THE CASH LEARNING PARTNERSHIP

GLOBAL LEARNING EVENT -- BANGKOK, 16TH-17TH FEB 2011

DAY 1-16 FEBRUARY 2011

CALP IN THE PHILIPPINES

Speaker: Geraud Devred (CaLP Cash Focal Point, the Philippines)

Issues discussed

- 1. Cooperation with local government** [raised/discussed by Vitor Serrano--ECHO, Geraud Devred--CaLP, Carla Iacerda--WFP, Sanny]
 - There have been on-going meetings with the Philippines government. Constraints could be linked to political reasons. However, the government has strong interest in capacity building and means to decrease the risks.
 - Local government and humanitarian agencies have their own systems and goals. There should be coordination and shared forums on the cash part otherwise each body will just follow their own purposes to meet their different goals without being aware of others.
 - Co-ordination is very important in Asian countries where government is very much present.
- 2. Lessons learned** [raised/discussed by Vitor Serrano--ECHO, Geraud Devred--CaLP, Nicholas Barrouillet--CaLP, Sanny R. Jegillos--UNDP]
 - There are some difficulties in technical developments as decision makers do not have sufficient knowledge to make decisions.
 - We need to gather the failures in the programs and learn from them even though failures are sometimes difficult to discuss.
 - We should take into consideration the capacity of the local government. The services should be delivered in a way that the government should carry on the work and coordinate with us. When looking at lessons learned, researchers tend to overlook this and look more at local market system and local political economy.
 - When we work, we have to remember that cash transfer program is only a tool. In case of disaster, we have to try to bring back the normal or better situation with their previous local level of development in mind.
- 3. Guideline improvement** [discussed by Carla Lacerda--WFP]

In order to improve the guideline, we should think more about feasibility and the true needs of the people than just cash; there should be assessments on what is more efficient and what makes sense for the people.
- 4. Local skepticism to cash transfer and alternative responses to the needs of people** [raised by Godred Paul--Helpage International, discussed by Loreto Palmaera--Oxfam, Emma Aguinot--Save the Children, Geraud Devred--CaLP]

Experience from the Philippines [Loreto Palmaera--Oxfam]: The cash program started during the election. Political parties complained when they could not partake in cash distribution that humanitarian agencies do not cooperate with the government. In addition, there are frequent elections the Philippines. The local people are linking cash distribution to local politics.

- Not only the local government but also some parts of civil society reacted strongly to cash transfer programs. The belief that cash is used by politicians is hard to break. We have to involve the civil society in the process and build their trust.
 - People now have more knowledge about cash programs but more work is needed to be done in the Philippines to erase the cash conflicts and skepticisms.
5. **Cash distribution by mobile phone** [raised by Devrig Velly--ECHO, discussed by Geraud Devred--CaLP, Nicholas Barrouillet--CaLP, Sanny R. Jegillos--UNDP, Carla Lacerda--WFP]
- The use of mobile phone to deliver cash had been successfully practiced in the Philippines and Kenya. This could be a good example of how technology could be integrated.
 - There should be a system where we can use mobile phone for not only emergency cash transfer but also in development.
 - We should think about how to educate people about microfinance and transfer channels that people are not used to.

EXPECTATIONS FOR THE MEETING

- Knowledge on voucher system
- EMMA initiatives in terms of relationship with CaLP and in market research
- Systems in CTP in terms of data segregation and vulnerabilities of each group
- Risk mitigation in CTP
- Donor perceptions on CTP
- CTP and local economy
- Private sector perspective

IFRC AND CTP

Speaker: Heidi Gilert from IFRC

Questions and Answers

1. **International Red Cross and Red Crescent Cash Guidelines – Cash Transfer Programming**
Available in IFRC official languages: Spanish, French and Arabic
Both the livelihoods and the shelter Owner Driven Housing reconstruction Guidelines are available in English and translation is in progress...
2. **Where does cash fit within the IFRC?** [raised by Vitor Serrano--ECHO]
For the IFRC Cash is a response delivery mechanism which is cross-sectoral as well as sitting within relief and recovery programming. Specifically for ICRC, the technical design and delivery of cash programming sits within the Economic Security Unit.
3. **Unconditional cash grants as a guide?**

Within the Red Cross cash transfer guidelines, there is a table which uses unconditional cash as a guide to which conditions can be applied depending on the programme design and objective. Conditionality is used when unconditional cash grants cannot be applied to the situation.

ECHO AND CTP

Speaker: Nick Maunder from ECHO

Issues discussed

1. **Unconditional and cash-for-work grants** [raised/discussed by Rosie Jackson--Save the Children, Sarah Bailey--Overseas Development Institutes, Devrig Velly--ECHO, Carla Lacerda--WFP, Nick Maunder--ECHO]
 - We can use cash-for-work programs when the local government or society is against large-scaled unconditional cash transfer and causes the projects to be scaled down.
 - Vouchers or the combination of voucher and cash-for-work can also be used instead of cash-for-work.
 - Upon cash-for-work programs, organizations should be clear about their primary objectives: to provide assistance and/or to have the outputs such as rehabilitation of the damaged infrastructures.
 - Upon unconditional grant programs, organizations should be able to quantify the needs to ensure that the money is spent in appropriate ways. For example, it is more effective to build a well if people spend the majority of the cash to buy water (Nick Maunder sharing a case in Somalia).

Experience from Vietnam [Godred Paul--Helpage]: It is not an option for smaller organizations like Helpage to carry out cash-for-work programs and they resolve into unconditional cash transfer. The responses from people were positive.

Experience from Indonesia [Puspasari Indra--Oxfam]: There should be more investment into EMMA. In Yogyakarta, the civil society and local organizations voice very strongly against cash transfer. So, Oxfam facilitated an EMMA training and practice in the field. The result was that it improved people's opinions and understanding on cash transfer program.

Experience from Bangladesh [Michel Meerdink--WFP]: Even though cash-for-work programs require a lot of time to be set up, which is a hindrance in an emergency case, it yielded double benefits for the people.

2. **Capacity building** [raised by Rajendra Aryal--Food and Agricultural Organization, Geraud Devred--CaLP]

There is a consortium for trainings, and guidelines and policy papers are available. Also, ECHO works with WFP, NGOs and UN for building the capacity of partners.
3. **EU's 100,000 euro ceiling for unconditional cash** [raised by Nupur Kukrety--Oxfam, discussed by Devrig Velly--ECHO]

The ceiling applies for NGOs not international organizations like UN. This puts constraints in Pakistan and Haiti. ECHO is trying to work on this regulation.
4. **In-kind and cash project impact assessment** [raised by Giancarlo Stopponi --WFP Sri Lanka]

There should be assessments on how shifting from in-kind to cash projects has different impacts on the people.

Experience from Sri Lanka [Giancarlo Stopponi--WFP]: Cash and voucher programs put higher costs on the recipients than in-kind ones.

5. **Proposal writing** [raised by Dave Tooke -- Save the Children, Puspasari Indra--Oxfam]

- It is difficult to write an appealing proposal on unconditional cash grant as it does not specify the actors or activities.
- Some countries experience challenges in writing proposals to ECHO

CHARTS FROM DISCUSSIONS

CHART 1: Challenges

- Involving vulnerable groups in the M & E system
- Targeting (using cluster approach vs. individual agencies characteristics)
- Monitoring long term program
- Level of cash (amount) Government vs. local opinions
- Disaster preparedness / contingency planning + link with private sector (bank and mobile phone)
- How to monitor remote / small local markets
- Capacity building in Spanish and other non-English languages
- Minimum standard vs. reality

CHART 2: lessons learned

WHO	Status/where/when	Modality	Context	Lessons
Save the children	Vietnam Limited geographical targeting	Bank disbursement † farmers	Disaster preparedness mitigation	Preparedness
ECHO	Pakistan/flood response ongoing	Cash transfer	Post disaster Emergency 'PEFSA' support	Coordination needed NGOs & UN
ACF	North Pakistan	CFW Cash grants	Restoration of assets to disaster affected communities	Low capacity for cash and voucher Low coordination
FAO	China Government support high	Vouchers for agricultural inputs	Emergency response after earthquake in Sichuan Province	Government Involvement++
WEF the Philippines	Emergency response to typhoon affected population 2009-ongoing	Cash for work: Cheque Mobile transfer Rural/urban In-kind: FFW	Post-disaster rehabilitation of infrastructure Addressing Conflict	
WFP/IFPRI Global study on Cash and voucher	Just beginning Ecuador Timor-Leste Yemen Uganda Niger	Various studies for impact and effectiveness	Research to direct programming design and implementation	Large monitoring and evaluation component

CHARTS 3: gaps and challenges

- Capacity/ knowledge (expertise) of staff
- Coordination and sharing experience (both across and within organizations, *i.e.* WFP)
- Reporting and liaising of government
- UNOCHA's role in emergency response of coordination of cash activities
- Clusters
- It's not about just doing cash (over in-kind) but also combination of in-kind and cash depending on needs
- No guidelines (knowledge) on assessing needs for cash and evaluating impact

- Objective--what about ("just") giving freedom of choice
- Importance of community sensitization/social preparedness and financial education (remove fear factor)
- Random: how about using cash as assessment/selection of need and assistance

LIVESTOCK AND CASH STUDY

Issues discussed

1. **Contradiction with the government on the process of de/restocking of livestock** [raised by Michiel Meerdink--WFP]
As some interventions cross into government territories, we should involve government and key stakeholders so that they have more understanding in the approaches.
2. **Preparedness for emergency case** [raised/discussed by Puspasari Indra--Oxfam, Rajendra Aryal--FAO]
 - Preparedness in livestock and crop protection is very important on the government part. Experience from Mongolia was very important for FAO on the use of LEGS in livestock emergency and need of cash/voucher transfer existed in remotes areas where procurement from the capital was logistically difficult and costly.
 - LEGS Guidelines should be very useful in an emergency case.

Experience from a case of volcanic eruption [Puspasari Indra--Oxfam]: While the volcano's activity was increasing, it was hard to get people to the safe ground because they are worried about their livestock. And sometimes they decided to sell them without profit which is a loss in productive assets. The government should be ready for destocking.

Experience from Mongolia [Rajendra Aryal--FAO]: When there was a snow disaster where millions of livestock died. FAO tried to save the remaining animals through the supply of animal feed, vaccines and milk powder. Procurement was done in Ulaanbaatar and inputs were transported as far as to Kazakhstan border due to the lack of time and knowledge of local markets in the provinces. Use of LEGS Guidelines with the provision of cash / voucher transfer for herders in the provinces could have been useful, however it could not be done.

Experience from Pakistan [Rosie Jackson--Save the Children]: 60% of households lost livestock and 80% lost them to sales. We should speed up unconditional cash transfer not only on asset but on livestock as well.

3. **Capacity building and training for organizations and beneficiaries** [raised by Geraud Devred--CaLP]
Unconditional cash transfer should be given with a package of advice so that the actors and recipients know how to best use it.
4. **Means to assess a good cash program on livestock** [raised by Vitor Serrano--ECHO]
This can be done by looking at impact assessments.

CASH AND GENDER

Speaker: Nupur Kukretty from Oxfam

Issues discussed

1. **The flexibility of the programs; how it could be adjusted according to emergent issues** [raised by Aviento Amri--Plan International]
2. **Standardized assessment** [discussed by Provash Mondal--Oxfam]
In an emergency, it is more important and more useful to make sure that the assessments are standardized than doing an in-depth analysis.
3. **Concerns about other groups of people, i.e. the elderly, the young, the incapable** [raised by Rajendra Aryal--FAO]
4. The case studies were carried out only in women. Elderly, disabled, youth, etc were not considered by gender in this case.
5. **Values of cash transfer** [discussed by Rosie Jackson--Save the Children, Nick Maunder--ECHO]
 - We should take into consideration issues like recipients' time and transport cost when we consider the values of cash transfer. If they have to, for example, spend a day off work to travel to the cash distribution point, the value of cash transfer should be increased.
 - We could consider other transfer mechanisms, e.g. mobile, to reduce the cost of transfer.
6. **An instrument used by UNOCHA and WFP to assess women after disasters** [Emma Aguinot--Save the Children]
7. **Transformation in gender roles** [discussed by Sanny R. Jegillos--UNDP]
We should look at gender issues in development perspectives because they are long-term problems. Plans to assist the transformation in gender roles are not linked with ongoing development and capacity building processes, leading to the past unsatisfactory results.
8. **Impact of cash transfer in gender relation** [raised/discussed by Carla Lacerda--WFP, Sarah Bailey--ODI, Mark Agoya--WFP, Peter Agnaw--WFP, Michel Meerdink--WFP]
 - There should be studies on cash impact in gender relation in complex society, e.g. Pakistan and Afghanistan.
 - There has never been a solid evaluation on cash-gender complex in emergency.
 - There should be a good baseline study to monitor the impacts of cash. Sometimes it is unsure whether the cause of tension and violence is poverty or cash transfer. [Sarah Bailey--ODI]
 - There is an interesting study on emergency cash transfer in Malawi by James Davi

Experience from Kenya [Mark Agoya--WFP]: There was tension and violence in 40% of households in cash transfer programs (see comment from Sarah Bailey above). Men with drinking problem beat up women to get money.

Experience from Bangladesh [Michiel Meerdink--WFP]: In one cash transfer program, male roles were neglected while the female roles were of focus. This created tension among men. So, there had to be a change in the project direction to acknowledge the need to keep men informed. In addition, we did studies on the difference it made to good (functional) marriages and bad ones. The results showed that the good ones absorb the situation better. (Not many people have alcoholic problem which makes a big different)

ODI GOOD PRACTICE REVIEW (GPR)

Speaker: Sarah Bailey from Overseas Development Institute

Issues discussed

1. **Taking inflation into consideration** [raised/discussed by Asif Nawaz--Oxfam]

We hear about CTP and the effect on local inflation a lot. In my view if cash transfer amounts are adjusted to cater for future inflated prices then it's okay, however when we hear or read that CTP itself will be the cause of inflation in a local area, then we need not worry about that too much. This is because localized inflation is only because of an imbalance between demand and supply. This imbalance is very quickly realized by the market and normal or adhoc traders jump into make a short profit. Very soon an equilibrium point is reached where local prices equal prices prevailing in surrounding areas. Prices in a local area of implementation normally move in line with provincial/country wide prices because of macro-economic factors that apply systematically across the province/country. There has been no conclusive study on the effects and extent of such inflation which is caused by CTP activities itself, we should therefore avoid talking about it so loosely.

2. **Cases of corruption** [raised by Geraud Devred--CaLP]

There are examples of corruption from non- humanitarian sectors. There is no evidence that cash is more prone to corruption. This could affect donors' decisions.

3. **Man power for implementing a cash program** [raised by Carla Lacerda--WFP]

This varies from case to case and depends on financial size. There is no stereotype.

4. **Cooperation to deal with cash transfer and systems across many agencies** [raised by Carla Lacerda--WFP]

We have to try to think outside of our agencies.

5. **Importance of contingencies and preparedness** [commented by Emma Aguinot--Save the Children]

6. **Evaluation on overall household wellbeing (as opposed to what the money is spent for)** [raised by Michiel Meerdink--WFP]

There has been a thorough study on household economy with analysis on expenditures before (baseline) and after the cash transfer. This kind of evaluation analysis is labor-intensive and is not often done even though it is important. We could do in a simplified way like asking whether people get what they need after a few days of cash distribution.

DAY 2 -- 17TH FEBRUARY 2011

CALP AND CTP COORDINATION MECHANISMS IN THE PAKISTAN FLOOD RESPONSE

Speaker: Loreto Palmaera from Oxfam GB

Issues discussed

1. **Whether cash distribution is the best solution in the flood situation** (no supplies) [raised by Carla Lacerda--WFP]

In Pakistan case, cash was distributed to the areas that were not badly flooded while food was distributed (by WFP) to the areas that were still heavily flooded.

2. **How the cash was spent** [raised by Carla Lacerda--WFP]

Most was spent on food (60-70%) and the rest on transportation and health, respectively. This could be because the transportation expenses were not covered by voucher programs.

3. **How to target beneficiaries when many of them do not have electronic ID card** [raised by Rajendra Aryal--FAO]

The cash was issued to the head of each family in order to distribute to each household. Also, the government issued new ID cards for a large number of citizens to include them

as beneficiaries. [Answer from Loreto Palmaera--Oxfam and Muhammad Bilal--NDMA, Government of Pakistan]

4. **Complaint mechanism** [raised by Godred Paul--Helpage International] **and its efficiency** [added by Loreto Palmaera--Oxfam GB]

- Oxfam has a complaint mechanism but still not very efficient.
- A more important issue about complaint mechanism is how long it takes to tackle the complaints.
- Most of the complaints are related to voucher programs.

Learning from the case of Pakistan: Complaints help improving the programs. Beneficiaries complained about the limited number of contracted traders. So the program increased them to meet the demand.

5. **Why not just give people unconditional grants as there were so many difficulties in issuing and distributing vouchers?** [raised by Sarah Bailey--Overseas Development Institute]

Cash distribution was viewed as risky business. Also, the transaction capacity of KPK banks was limited. It was faster to use vouchers considering these problems and the difficulties in cash distribution, e.g. setting bank accounts.

6. **How to co-ordinate between working groups** [raised by Nupur Kukrety--Oxfam GB]

Provincial inter-clusters for cash and voucher (ICCV) were set up and fed information to the national ICCV. It was not necessary to have technical working groups whose duties could be overlapping with ICCV.

WFP: CTP IN THE REGION

Speaker: Gerry Daly from World Food Program

Michael Meerdink on implementation of WFP in Bangladesh: Indicators including, child nutrition level, are above emergency thresholds. There are a large number of potential beneficiaries. The government safety net programs seriously need to be reformed according to World Bank studies. There are high inclusion errors due to inefficiency in targeting. We try to pilot new approaches and distribution mechanisms, working with the government. The project is funded by the EU and is in its middle point. We provide not only grant to provide food and house but to create incomes. This kind of project needs time, like a year, to become fruitful. Now we have started to see the results which are more than expected. The people start working and saving together. We were launching a joint study on social safety net transfer mechanism comparison. There will be 5 different groups and provide them with pure cash transfer, pure food, pure voucher, combination of cash and food and combination of nutrition training and cash. This could provide a clean comparison study on interventions and their effects. Emerging issues: How to select the beneficiaries, for example from a large number of similar local shops.

Issues discussed

1. **The reason of a large proportion of money spent for emergency operation** [Nick Mauder--ECHO]
The expanded proportion of expenses on emergency response is on pre-distribution market analysis and post-distribution evaluation.
Large scale usage of cash
2. **Making changes and the speed and scale of changes needed for WFP** [Sarah Bailey--Overseas Development Institute, Giancarlo Stopponi--WFP]
 - To make a good change, we need (1) good strategic plans, (2) many outside donors who agree on what we are doing, (3) in-house analyses, including not only food security analyses but also market analyses and (4) efficient and flexible operational system that could counter bureaucratic systems.
 - One of the critical elements is that how to stay accountable while we change, balancing the risk with the need for innovation.
3. **Co-ordinations** [raised Geraud Devred--CaLP]
We need to work with NGOs in order to understand what is going on the ground. Things change fast in local districts. If we do not work with the NGOs, our money and vouchers could be going in the wrong direction.
4. **Learning and sharing knowledge** [Nicholas Barrouillet--CaLP, Nupur Kukrety--Oxfam]
5. **Targeting and inclusion errors** [raised Vitor Serrano--ECHO]
There has not been enough integration of inclusion errors in the evaluation studies.

SAVE THE CHILDREN EXPERIENCE WITH CTP IN VIETNAM

Speakers: Rosie Jackson and Tuan Doan from Save the Children

Issues discussed

1. **Cash distribution mechanisms in Vietnam** [raised by Asif Nawaz--Oxfam]
 - The distribution mechanisms were cash through local banking which was slow because they could process very limited transactions per day.
 - There are problems on lack of financial structure in some areas.
 - Security is not a big problem in Vietnam.
2. **Targeting issues and cash redistribution** [raised by Vitor Serrano--ECHO, regarding his experience in Myanmar]
 - In Vietnam, there is a social safety net system. Redistribution of cash transfer could occur between family members and neighbors. The scope and intensity of redistribution is still not known.
 - Redistribution occurs less with cash than with in-kind because it is more easily for a person to hide the cash than an in-kind. [Tuan Doan's experience in Vietnam]
 - It is not important if redistribution occurs in this manner, as long as we save the people and we save the society. We respect their tradition. [Tuan Doan's personal opinion]

CTP IN INDONESIA

Speaker: Purpasari Indra from Save the Children

Issues discussed

1. **Overlapping grants** [raised by Michiel Meerdink--WFP]

Some grants seem to be overlapped, for example the unconditional grants, the majority of which people reportedly used on construction and another shelter grant. However, they are actually not overlapped because there was organizational coordination on the conditionality.

2. **Social status and condition: cash redistribution** [discussed by Peter Agnew--WFP, Purpasari Indra--Save the Children]

- There should be social economic reviews before conducting a cash program to learn local traditions about money, e.g. redistribution and thank-you money, and decide on best modality to fit in the social context. Also, Cash programs might affect some of the local tradition on money.
- Results from gender analysis study showed that women do not have power. Therefore, the program targeted the women as recipients.

3. **Cash versus provided commodity** [raised by Carla Lacerda--WFP, sharing experience from the Philippines, Roleto palmaera--Oxfam]

- There should be coordination with the government to provide non-food materials, such as building materials or personal hygiene-related products, so that people do not have to spend the money on non-food items.
- Opinions vary on whether expenses on non-food items should be of concerns. Indra viewed that it was acceptable if the grant was unconditional.
- Studies found that people prefer cash over provided shelter materials.

Experience from Indonesia [Roleto Palmaera--Oxfam]: Studies found that people preferred cash over provided shelter materials. West Sumatra earthquakes destroyed mostly the shelter while leaving behind some livelihood and food. Therefore, the shelter program was set up so that people did not sell their remaining food to buy construction materials.

4. **Problems with local partners** [raised by Marianna Knirsch --GRC]

- The program did internship, capacity building and field education programs with the government and NGOs for two years before the earthquake happened. Therefore, even though it was the first time the government used cash programs, they understood them. It was the result of long-term advocacy work.
- One strategy was to provide the space for the local partners to act while providing them the supports.
- In Yogyakarta, where there were skepticisms, we used EMMA instead of advocating directly on the use of cash. EMMA is an investment we pay to have a successful cash program.

NEWS AND ANNOUNCEMENT

Agnes Dalmau (Spanish Red Cross) on post-tsunami reconstruction in Sri Lanka.

Evaluation of four projects in terms of usefulness of cash transfer. The objectives of the four projects were to start, diversify and strengthen livelihood of the population

- 1) In-kind support (no cash)
- 2) Cinnamon grower both in-kind and cash
- 3) Home construction for those who have been relocated to new areas

Main findings:

- 1) People prefer cash support to in-kind assistance because they could decide the type and the quality of the things that fit their need
- 2) Cash transfer give great flexibility to the project and easier logistic arrangement
- 3) Diversion is less than 4% (mostly spent on house construction which was not completed, so they spent money on, for instance, finishing the roof)

CONCLUSION OF WHAT THE PARTICIPANTS HAVE LEARNED

All groups have overlapping opinions which can be concluded as follows.

They have learned these issues:

- What is the CaLP
- The need to develop systems
- Links to and interests from different sectors including donors
- Coordination and sharing
- What the government and private sectors can do
- Capacity building in both organizational level and regional level

It was generally agreed that the **next step** should include:

- Collaboration and information sharing (including the topics that are not included by CaLP)
 - Linked libraries
 - Use of internet site--boost the D-Group
 - Experience (in the site) sharing
- More researches
 - What have been done by different sectors
 - resources and market analysis (This should be made assessable by the larger community, particularly the regional level.)
- More training events to
 - share tools, particularly those in real practice
 - build capacity
- Develop systems and preparedness for emergencies