

Scaling up CTP in Somalia

A focus on:

CTP options in a changing funding landscape

Improving the use of lesson learning



REPORT FROM AN INTER-AGENCY REFLECTION WORKSHOP

Report by CaLP, November 2017

I Contents

1	Contents.....	1
2	Acronyms	1
3	Introduction	2
4	Highlights	3
5	CTP options in a changing funding landscape.....	4
5.1	Discussion highlights	4
5.2	Potential next steps	5
6	Improving the use of lesson learning.....	6
6.1	Discussion highlights	6
6.2	Potential next steps	7
	Annex: Participants list	8

2 Acronyms

CaLP	Cash Learning Partnership
CTP	Cash Transfer Programme
CWG	Cash Working Group
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IPC	Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
MEAL	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning
MEB	Minimum Expenditure Basket
WFP	World Food Programme

3 Introduction

This report summarises discussions that took place during a half-day event in November 2017. The event built on discussions in September during which a myriad of issues were highlighted and many opportunities for collective action noted. The September discussions, captured in the [‘Scaling up CTP in Somalia: Reflecting on the 2017 Drought Response’](#) report, identified the following priorities for action:

- a) Utilize the work done on coordination to plan and improve next year.
- b) Undertake collective impact evaluation.
- c) Push for improved coordination among donors.
- d) Collectively discuss the changing funding landscape and agree how to proceed re transfer values. Ensure this is linked with strategic discussions at the HCT level.
- e) Use lessons from the CWG to feed into 2018 HRP planning.
- f) Work on common cash delivery approaches e.g. building common understanding and approach, build on and utilise joint work done on joint risk analysis and M&E
- g) Collectively discuss the idea of a single registry between implementing agencies (prepare for discussions along the lines of Lebanon).
- h) Analyse the role of the private sector and opportunities for collective bargaining.
- i) Consider how to link CTP to social protection and state building discussions.
- j) Further strengthen coordination at local level.
- k) Engage in collective discussion with mobile operators to seek better transfer rates and a more harmonized approach to interfacing with the operators.
- l) Continue to share lessons learnt.
- m) Strengthen collective risk management.

This meeting provided an opportunity for more in-depth discussion on two issues that were selected by participants at the start of the meeting namely:

- The changing funding landscape and how to proceed regarding transfer values.
- Increasing the use of lessons learning.

26 people from NGOs, the UN, and donors participated in the event which was convened by CaLP and the Somalia Cash Working Group (CWG) and was hosted by IFRC.

The event was facilitated by Karen Peachey (CaLP), with the report drafted by CaLP and reviewed by Deqa Saleh of Adeso and Rebecka Rydberg of REACH.

4 Highlights

Can we create efficiencies by working better together? There is potential to better leverage the strengths of different agencies and pursue integrated programmes with a common cash delivery approach. Increasing interoperability of systems may offer opportunities to improve efficiency and reduce duplication. First there is need to understand how much duplication exists and assess if potential savings are worth the investment needed to tackle the problem. Equally, the idea that interoperable or common systems will create efficiencies needs to be examined and downsides explored. There is scope to improve engagement with the private sector, not just in terms of collective bargaining but by engaging and capitalising on comparative skills and expertise.

What about changing transfer values and payment frequencies? There is need to be clearer about what we expect to achieve with different transfer values and assess if/how payment frequency changes outcomes. As the funding landscape is changing, there is need to decide whether reduced transfer values should be given to many people or if targeting should be changed more money given to fewer. The question of whether higher value but less frequent instalments would have a greater impact or change the way money is used should be explored. When a common transfer value is agreed, all agencies need to use it otherwise the time invested in harmonisation is wasted.

How should we change plans as needs and resource flows change? There is need to transition from short-term response thinking to long-term resilience programming. Targeting needs to be harmonised to consistently reach the most vulnerable. Making such changes is difficult given different agency mandates and approaches.

How can learning be better applied? In the absence of a theory of change to start with, how can lessons learned be better applied? For example, how does using a MEB to set cash values or giving monthly rather quarterly or weekly transfers contribute towards, or detract from, the theory behind the change we expect? There is need to experiment and answer important questions about if/how outcomes differ when transfer values or payment frequencies change.

What about the role of research? Implementation is mapped but it is often unclear what others are doing in terms of evidence and learning. There may be a need to have more external views with, for example, deeper research on key cash questions such as the theory of change.

What are the next steps? Possible next steps included:

- 1) Consider establishing pilot studies to examine and test different ways of working.
- 2) Explore how to develop a collective theory of change for cash.
- 3) Interrogate concerns about duplication and understand the size of the problem.
- 4) Engage with service providers to negotiate transfer costs.
- 5) Develop an inclusive dialogue to help with difficult decisions on funding, transfer rates and targeting.
- 6) Plan a cash learning event in Mogadishu.

5 CTP options in a changing funding landscape

During the September 2017 workshop, concerns were raised about foreseeable reductions in funding for the Somalia drought response. While individual agencies were reviewing plans, the need for more collective thought on some issues was identified. Questions in this session included: Can we make efficiency savings? Should we reduce transfer values to maintain coverage? Can we advocate for more resources?

5.1 Discussion highlights

Can we create efficiencies by working better together?

There is potential to:

- Better leverage the strengths of different agencies and pursue integrated programmes.
- Develop a common cash delivery approach to avoid duplication.
- Learn lessons from other countries e.g. using multiple wallets in Lebanon.
- Improve interoperability of systems and work better together to ensure smart targeting and reduce duplication. For example, seek to reduce duplication by linking with mobile money transfer systems to sift through the duplication.
- Increase bargaining power by working together to negotiate transfer charges.
- Streamline transfer systems through better engagement with the private sector.
- Engage more effectively with the private sector to create synergies and recognise their experience and skills in different areas.
- Strengthen areas of work that could have benefits for everyone e.g. harmonise transfer values and delivery mechanisms.

But do we know:

- How much duplication there really is?
- If savings achieved by reducing duplication would be more than the cost of making savings?
- If interoperable systems will create efficiencies?
- Whether there are downsides to single systems?

What about changing transfer values and payment frequencies?

- With the funding landscape changing, should lower transfers be given to many people or more money retargeted to fewer people? We need to be clearer about what we expect to achieve with different transfer values.
- There is need for more clarity about the setting of the transfer values and the calculation of the MEB. Why are some things included in the MEB and others not? What are we expecting to achieve?
- When Concern asked local staff about the changing funding situation, they argued that higher transfer values should go to fewer people as beneficiaries can then re-remittance money to inaccessible areas and so reach non-targeted households before displacement happens.
- If we transfer larger amounts less frequently, programmes would be cheaper to manage.
- Why do we usually make one transfers a month? What does the evidence say about the frequency of transfers? There is need for more discussion with communities about their priorities and preferences.
- Explore whether gains would be consolidated by transferring higher values to some people to support recovery.
- When a common transfer value is agreed, all agencies should use it otherwise time invested in harmonisation is wasted.

How should we change plans as needs and resource flows change?

- Given reduced funding, some agencies are making changes e.g. WFP is now only focusing on IPC 4 locations.

There is need to:

- Target those who are most in need and plan based on vulnerability and poverty indicators.
- Harmonise targeting to ensure inclusion of the most vulnerable.
- Transition from short term response thinking to long term resilience programming.
- Focus investment in good quality, well sequenced, resilience programmes that consider seasonality, productive livelihood assets, and include crisis modifiers.
- Design safety net programmes with a surge component - bringing funding streams and different actors together.
- Better define the roles/relationships of government and non-government actors in safety net discussions.
- Use mitigation and response theories of change to test and costs, to adapt and justify why humanitarian funding streams may be best used as mitigation programmes and very early action safety nets.
- Define an exit strategy for cash.

But it's not easy:

- Change sounds easy but it is difficult.
- How do we improve targeting and avoid duplication? Are we using appropriate criteria? Has there been any progress on streamlining targeting?
- Agencies have different mandates, preferences and target groups.
- Humanitarian and resilience teams, even in the same organisation, often use different language and have different visions.

Advocate for more resources?

We could:

- Mobilise funding by highlighting achievements and sharing evidence of the impact of CTP.
- Consolidate lessons and lobby for resources as a joint team.
- Think about linking to other types of donors, including private sector, not just humanitarian donors.
- Improve understanding of diaspora remittances to either leverage funding or, at least, adapt our response to it.
- Be mindful of potential risk of a trade-off between cash and the funding for other modalities.

5.2 Potential next steps

- a) Interrogate duplication concerns and understand the size of the problem. Determine if it is worth the investment needed to reduce duplication further.
- b) Mobile sub-group should engage with service providers to negotiate transfer costs.
- c) Develop inclusive dialogue with district level government, trusted affiliates in communities and local networks to help with thinking and decisions on funding, transfer values and targeting. Consider how to marry aims related to harmonisation and localisation.
- d) Plan a cash learning event in Mogadishu.
- e) Build on information learned from interoperability workshop organised by the CCD on 15/16th November 2017.

6 Improving the use of lesson learning

Previous events resulted in a great deal of sharing and learning. This session questions focused on what questions need to be addressed to improve CTP and how lessons can be better applied to improve the Somalia response.

6.1 Discussion highlights

What are some of the questions we need answered?

- How do we know if any change that is happening is as a result of what we are doing? For example, the radius of displacement in 2017 is less than in the last drought. Is that a result of the response or other factors?
- How long do we give cash, how much, what should cash plus look like?
- There are on-going debates about using a flat versus variable transfer values. There is need to experiment and answer important questions about how outcomes differ when transfer rates change.

How can lessons learning be better applied?

- The use of cash in this response is not guided by a solid theory of change or scenario planning. How can lessons be better applied without a clear theory of change to start with? For example, how does using MEB to set cash values or using monthly rather than quarterly or weekly transfers contribute towards, or detract from, the theory behind how change might happen?
- Joint scenario planning could be done to develop a theory of change with different scenarios for different demographics.
- Flexible/adaptive programming may not necessarily need a fixed theory of change - a more adaptive approach may be needed.

How can we be more connected with communities?

- How can we improve communication with communities? Is a collective communications strategy needed?
- Agencies often visit communities and base discussions on preconceived notions and assumptions. If not careful, they may leave with the same ideas they arrived with.

How effective are our monitoring, evaluation, accountability and learning systems?

- The lack of knowledge of what works suggests that either there is no data or the data does not answer the right questions. This suggests problems with how we develop our methods and share information with others.
- A lot of data is not compatible. This can be improved by harmonising assessments and MEAL approaches.
- There is a lack of data sharing and harmonised ways of assessing and measuring change.
- Preventing hunger is a massive overarching goal, it may be better to focus on measuring small scale impacts more effectively.
- There is need to improve MEAL systems to refine beneficiary lists to deal with issues of inclusions and exclusion, improve accountability systems and strengthen knowledge management.
- There is need to engage more effectively with existing community structures to strengthen feedback systems. Can we better work with trusted community members to assist with this? Village Relief Committees often play this role but can we go beyond them?
- How can we better deal with unplanned affected populations i.e. entering/exiting IDP caseloads?
- Can we improve knowledge and management of the beneficiary list? How can the lists be used beyond the lifetime of the response?
- There is need for “feedback on feedback” along the disbursement chain.

What about the role of research?

- We map implementation but seldom know what others are doing with evidence and learning.
- Some agencies are undertaking research in the current response including:
 - ADESO - empirical research on early action and early warning
 - Concern – cash/non-cash and nutrition; cash plus, safety net piloting
 - NRC - beneficiary research related to unconditional cash
 - Save the Children – mobile payments
 - WVI - nutrition outcomes and cash/vouchers
 - World Bank – second phase of the mobile money survey
- We may need more external views and deeper research on key cash questions such as the theory of change.
- What are the barriers to including pilot actions into concepts and proposals? There is a lot more that could be done but practically, how can we pilot new cash approaches?
- How effectively are we sharing results of ongoing experimentation and pilots?
- How can we plan more collectively? Why doesn't it happen more?

6.2 Potential next steps

- a) Consider developing a collective theory of change for cash.
- b) Consider establishing pilot studies to
 - a. Develop and test ideas related to interoperable systems.
 - b. Test the impact of different transfer frequencies and values.
 - c. Test the impact of larger amounts of unconditional cash, especially during the farming period.
- c) Cash working group to identify priorities and discuss the way forward.

Annex: Participants list

Attended		
	Name	Organisation
1	Deqa Saleh	Adeso-African Development Solutions
2	Timon Owino	African Disability Association
3	Hannah Muiruri	CaLP
4	Justina Mwangangi	CaLP
5	Karen Peachey	CaLP
6	Peter Hailey	CHC
7	Dustin Caniglia	Concern Worldwide
8	Patrick Hayes	Concern Worldwide
9	Claire Okell	Consultant
10	Mark Agoya	DFID
11	Quentin Le Gallo	EU/ECHO
12	Abdifatah Ahmed	EPHCO
13	Kevin Mackey	Food Security Cluster
14	Abdiweli Mohamed Garane	Great Hope Foundation
15	Yasin Salah	IFRC
16	Rashid Mohamed	International Relief Foundation
17	Geraud Devred	UNHCR
18	Urayayi Gregory Mutsindikwa	UNHCR
19	Kaitlyn Scott	Norwegian Refugee Council/BRCiS
20	Sarah Baran	Norwegian Refugee Council
21	Rebecka Rydberg	REACH Initiative
22	Dirie Yusuf	Somatech
23	Delphine Dechaux	WFP
24	Nynne Warring	WFP
25	Simon Makono	World Vision International
26	Nimo Amin	World Bank
Registered but unable to attend		
1	Ahmed	ACF
2	Mohamed Abdale Nur	Action Against Hunger
3	Jamal Ali Tagal	Action Against Hunger
4	Partha Moman	AVF
5	Solomon Ngari	DFAT
6	Paul O'Hagan	DFID
7	Martin Kenny	ICRC
8	Cecillia Chawatama	IFRC
9	Michael Wagner	Mercy Corps
10	Abdurahman Sharif	Somalia NGO Consortium
11	Stephen Shumila	Tearfund
12	Amina Ahmed	Trocaire Somalia
13	Richard Acaye	UNICEF Somalia
14	Francis Omude Emoru	World Vision Somalia