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Introduction.

This report summarizes the discussions that took place during a one-day learning event on 11th June 2019. The event brought together 27 people from national and international NGOs, the UN, and donors to discuss progress, reflect on cash and voucher (CVA) assistance in Somalia and identify priorities for collective action in improving the quality of CVA for the benefit of the affected population.

The event was convened and facilitated by CaLP and costs met from the funds managed by the steering Committee of the Somalia CWG Joint Cash Evaluation 1 of the 2017 response. The event involved presentations by Henry Narangui of Save the Children, Amana Ekeno of FAO, Kaitlyn Scott of the Somali Cash Consortium and Karen Peachey of CaLP, together with group and plenary discussions. The discussion was built on a pre event survey and on findings from a review2 of eight evaluations and studies related to the use of CVA in the 2017 drought response. The review brought together 90 recommendations and key reflections which were then further distilled into six key points3 that need to be addressed going forward. The report was done by CaLP and reviewed by Mary Karanja-Somalia CWG Coordinator and Hatibu Ibrahim, Independent Consultant and CaLP certified trainer.

1.1 Highlights and Actions.

- Overall, the evaluations of the 2017 CVA response were positive. However, a number of issues of concern were flagged by all evaluations – some of which were the same as in 2011.
- CVA remains the primary response tool in 2019.
- A lot of effort was devoted to the revision of the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and discussions of transfer rates in 2017. However, despite this work to harmonize the transfer rates. The following collective actions were proposed:
  - There is need to clarify what the MEB is trying to achieve on both basic needs and resilience.
  - Review the need to change the MEB quarterly as markets in Somalia have been stable.
  - Meta-analysis of data, beneficiary preferences and the need for wide reach need to be considered.
  - Donors are asked to coordinate on a common approach on transfer rates.
  - To implement these actions, consensus and support by all is needed for the MEB revision exercises led by the Cash Working Group.
- Field level coordination on CVA need to be strengthened.
- The CWG should expand its focus beyond Food Security and increase participation by other clusters. Who represents the CWG in the ICCG should also be clarified.
- There needs to be a reporting requirement agreed by the CWG and clusters on projections figures on CVA specifically for proper coordination among actors.
- MPC outcome indicators developed by a sub-group of the Grand Bargain Cash Work Stream led by USAID if used by all might be a step in measuring Impact.

---

2 Reflections and recommendations from evaluations of the 2017 CVA Somalia Drought Response (2019)
3 Six Key points to address; Using learning to Strengthen Cash and Voucher Assistance in 2019 drought response in Somalia
2 Setting the stage

2.1 Cash and Voucher Assistance: Key Global Highlights

Karen Peachey, CaLP Director gave an overview of the key global achievements for 2018/2019 which included:

- **CVA remained a hot topic**: but is talk translating into action?
- **Operational models**: new models like CCD, UN Common Cash System were announced, and the Common donor approach emerged but, for the most part, overall business as usual prevailed.
- There was increased focus on outcomes as a concept and focus on gender and inclusion increased.
- More emphasis was given to putting recipient perspectives at the centre of thinking at least on paper.
- Work focus on the future started. With the aim of putting CVA in broader perspective, CaLP is leading work on the future of financial assistance.
- New evidence and focus on CVA and risk emerged, with growing momentum on understanding data risks.
- The use of CVA has increased substantially, more focus now needs to be given to programme quality

2.2 Issues to be addressed: Using learning from 2017 and survey results from 2019

CaLP reviewed eight evaluations, reports and studies related to the 2017 drought response. Ninety recommendations and key reflections related to the use of CVA were pulled together and six priority issues were identified. The full report and a one page summary with six priority issues are available on the CaLP library4. Further, ahead of the event, those who registered to attend were asked ‘From your experience, please state 3 issues that need to be addressed collectively in order to improve the quality and scale of CVA in the 2019 drought response’ 43 people registered, 39 provided at least one priority and 95 answers recorded in total – full responses are listed in annex 1. The table below highlights the recurrent issues emerging from the evaluations and the issues that participants prioritised as needing collective action in order to improve the quality and scale of CVA in humanitarian response in Somalia.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key points from the evaluations/reports from 2017</th>
<th>Survey responses: priorities for collective action in 2019 (number in brackets indicates number of respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfer values</td>
<td>Transfer values (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination</td>
<td>Coordination (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>Implicit references e.g. verification, protection, duplication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; learning (11) and programme specific issues (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modalities and mechanisms</td>
<td>Modalities and mechanisms (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting, registration and accountability And Lots more......</td>
<td>Selection, identification, verification (9), access (5), interoperable systems (6) and feedback mechanisms (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback mechanisms, culture of sharing, risks, cross sectoral linkages gender, links with social safety nets.</td>
<td>And lots more ... Assessments (4), preparedness (3) other (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reflections on the above included:

4**Reflections and recommendations from evaluations of the 2017 CVA Somalia Drought Response (2019)** and **Six Key points to address; Using learning to Strengthen Cash and Voucher Assistance in 2019 drought response in Somalia**
• Issues related to transfer values arose in the evaluation reports in 2011 and 2017, and were the top issue of concern in the survey in 2019. In 2017, a huge amount of time and effort was devoted to the revision of the MEB and discussion of transfer values. Yet, harmonized values remained elusive and continue to be flagged as an issue of concern.

• The evaluation reports were positive about the work of the Somalia CWG at the Nairobi level but noted that it operated as a semi-autonomous, free floating technical group. Sub national coordination was noted as being less effective. In the pre event survey, coordination was usually listed generically but some people were specific about problems with village level coordination, pre delivery coordination and case load management.

• While the evaluations highlighted a range of risks, no one explicitly mentioned risks in the survey. However, there seemed to be implicit reference to a number of risks related, for example, to inclusion/exclusion errors; protection issues and so on.

• The evaluations of the 2017 drought response were in agreement that the use of CVA was appropriate and unrestricted transfers were mostly used for food and other basic needs. Discussions about impact were less emphatic with, for example, questions raised about increases in malnutrition in some areas. Coming into the meeting, survey respondents raised the need for improved monitoring and evaluation and also highlighted the need to examine a range of programme design issues.

• In 2017 the choice of modality was often linked to donor or agency mandates while the choice of mechanism was linked to questions of accountability, identity and scale rather than recipient preferences. The evaluations found that while views about the relative merits of different modalities and mechanisms varied, there was no comparative evidence to support the views. Fast forward to 2019, questions about modalities and mechanisms are still on practitioners’ minds with, for example, recognition that collective engagement with financial service providers could be more effective.

• Many non CVA specific issues impact on effectiveness of CVA based programmes. Targeting, registration and accountability were three issues that received a lot of attention in 2017. Survey results suggest these remain issues of concern, calls for a more harmonized approach to targeting and several references to issues related to interoperable systems. There were some comments related to feedback mechanisms but none related to more encompassing views of accountability.

There is some consistency between the issues highlighted in 2017 (and to an extent 2011) and the priorities identified in the survey. This raises some interesting questions:

• Is it that we have not improved OR is it that these are fundamental issues and there is always room for improvement?
• Might some of the issues be structural and unsolvable?
• In some cases, is effort needed to solve the problem more than the potential benefit?
• Do we always address the problems in the same ways – do we need a different approach? Are we are planning effectively together?

Finally, while the survey highlights some consistent concerns among practitioners, it was questioned whether there are other issues which are not receiving enough attention. It was notable, for example, that there was little or no mention of data protection/data responsibility, national actors / localisation, protection and corruption.
3 Learning from FAO, Somalia Cash Consortium and Save the Children

In addition to the reflections above, a request was sent to the Cash Working Group Partners to share short presentations. The purpose of the presentations was to reflect on studies and new programs that are ongoing and build on these additional learnings to increase impact and effectiveness of cash and voucher assistance. The presenters were asked to focus on the following areas:

- make changes to your programming as a result of PDMs or other feedback
- the use of community feedback to improve the CVA response
- the use of CVA alongside other forms of intervention
- work to examine the impact of MPCs

3.1 Somali Cash Consortium: Partners’ Complaints & Response Mechanisms (CRM) and Learning from Research

Kaitlyn Scott from The Cash Consortium presented information about partners’ various types of Complaints and Response Mechanisms and some of the current and past research. One study used existing Household Economy Analysis (HEA) data to model a scalable cash-transfer-based safety net program for Somalia. The study made use of a recently completed 15-year (30-season) time series analysis covering 13 livelihood zones in Somalia. This model recommended amounts, durations, timing & frequency of cash transfers for national social safety net & methodology for surging or scaling down safety net transfers.

Two other studies sought to better understand how different amounts and frequencies of cash transfer impact household food security outcomes and non-food outcomes. In general, the studies found significant improvements in core indicators from baseline to end line, but no statistically significant difference in outcomes between the treatment groups, suggesting that varying cash amounts and frequencies did not substantially change the impact of the project on beneficiaries.

A final study sought to understand the impact that UCT is having on HH expenditure patterns and how cash transfers impact households. It found that food was the largest expenditure category, and most expenditure was on basic needs (food, water, fuel, food debt). UCT improved credit access, especially for IDPs, who were overall found to be more vulnerable than host communities.

3.2 FAO and Cash+: How to maximize the impact of Cash Transfers

Amana Ekeno presented the main FAO cash+ findings from a program that targeted more than 150,000 households between 2017 and 2019. FAO’s cash+ programme combined unconditional cash transfers with livelihood packages tailored to households’ livelihood strategies. The combination of consumption support (cash) with productive support (inputs and training) was designed to meet the families’ immediate basic needs while enhancing their livelihoods and productive capacities within the shortest lapse of time.

For farmers and agro-pastoralists, the package included cash plus seeds to grow a variety of nutritious foods. Families received monthly transfers for 3 months – the average time required to plant and harvest a staple crop. The cash+ interventions were timed to coincide with the lean season when food stocks become increasingly scarce until new crops are harvested. By the end of the 3 month programme, thanks to the quality seeds provided, a farming family was able to produce around 2.4 tons of cereals in a good season that is enough to feed 3 households.

---

5 A study by the Somali Consortium Household Expenditure Study, Somali Consortium Cash Impact on food security non-food outcomes Somali Cash Consortium-Mini Study
Somali Cash Consortium Mini study 11 Mini Study 11

6 Cereal, vegetable and legume seeds as well as hermetic bags to properly store the harvest, among other key inputs
for 1 year\textsuperscript{7}. Moreover, the cash disbursed at the start of the rainy season enabled a farming household to cultivate a larger plot of land using hired labour, hence obtaining higher agricultural production.

In riverine areas, FAO provided cash together with fishing kits\textsuperscript{8} to help highly marginalized communities improve their diet in the immediate and longer term. In 2018, FAO introduced a new cash+ livestock package\textsuperscript{9} whereby pastoralist/agro-pastoralist families received livelihood support to improve animal health and milk production. This Cash+ package was specifically designed to support women, children, elders and others who stay behind during seasonal migration periods and are left with small productive animals (sheep and goats) as their main source of food.

3.3 **Save the Children: More Cash, Bigger Impacts? A Field Experiment of Cash Transfers in Somalia**

Henry Narangui presented a study done by Save the Children for Building Resilient Communities in Somalia (BRCIS) consortium. The study measures the economic return of business capital and the benefits of lumping monthly transfers on households as well as child level outcomes.

The study compared various livelihood and child level outcomes of four types of cash transfers at two sites of Somalia (Mogadishu and Hiraan). The four groups are - A) “small unconditional cash transfer” (UCT) of $100 or 250 in two monthly instalments\textsuperscript{1}, B) “small business grant” (a one-time transfer of $100 or $250), C) “medium” one-off business grant of $500, and D) “large” one-off business grant of $1,000. The following are the summary of the findings:

- Despite receiving the same amount as the UCT group, the one-off business grant increases the likelihood of the households earning from non-farm businesses by 11 percentage points.
- The value of business increases with larger business grants.
- In terms of income from business, medium size business grant gives the highest rate of economic return.
- Lumping two months of UCT into one grant increases household savings.
- Despite significant effect on income, additional grants have limited effects on children.
- Larger cash grant does not have substantial direct impact on children, especially on nutrition. The nudge experiment was largely a “failure”.

3.4 **Questions and Answer Session.**

After each presentation above there was question and answer sessions. The presentation generated great discussions and key points include below:

Cash Consortium presentations:

- The CRM presentation underscores the need to think about different peoples’ needs and preferences on CRM channels. Different people like to provide feedback in different ways, depending on the individual and the context. For example, some people may feel comfortable calling a hotline and not knowing the person at the other end, others may be concerned by this.
- There was concern on whether the different CRM methods other than the hotline are used and if so whether these methods’ complaints are triangulated.
- A lack of trust by beneficiaries in some feedback mechanisms and fears that complaining would lead to reduction in assistance was reported informally from field staff.

\textsuperscript{7} Based on average for Gu and Deyr 2018 assessments assuming no post-harvest losses
\textsuperscript{8} Boats, safety and fishing gear; fish drying and processing kits AND fish processing and cooking kits
\textsuperscript{9} Supplementary feed blocks, milk containers and deworming for animals
The feedback mechanisms helped identify and address blocked payments, also questions were raised by non-beneficiaries about targeting decisions, with requests to be added to beneficiary lists.

Post distribution monitoring showed that awareness of feedback mechanisms reduced over time and so the programme had to be adjusted to add more reminders of the mechanisms.

On the research on the different transfer rates, it was a puzzle that there was no statistically significant difference in outcomes between the treatment groups, suggesting that varying cash amounts and frequencies did not substantially change the impact of the project on beneficiaries.

Question was raised about whether lump sum payments would cause protection issues.

This brought the further question on the transfer rate debate is it important for the beneficiaries.

FAO Cash plus presentation:

- The Impact of FAO Cash+ Intervention: A question was asked on the comparison between cash only and cash plus. FAO highlighted that all assessments of Cash+ Agriculture interventions in Somalia (GU 2017, Deyr 2017, Gu 2018 and Deyr 2018) have shown statistically significant differences in food security and crop yields between beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The difference between the Food Consumption Scores of the two groups has continued to increase from what was observed during drought i.e. 48.39 for beneficiaries versus 44.15 for non-beneficiaries (4 points) to recent Gu scores of 53.31 for beneficiaries versus 47.21 for non-beneficiaries (6 points). This outcome was also confirmed by other food security indicators such as coping strategies where beneficiaries consistently showed better coping ability. Delayed disbursements of cash due to insecurity among other challenges hindering money vendors’ access to beneficiaries’ areas ostensibly accounted for the statistically insignificant improvement of beneficiaries’ FCS during Deyr 2018. On the other hand, cash+ beneficiaries benefited from higher crop yields than non-beneficiaries, thanks to the superior quality of the seeds provided.

- Added value of Cash+ with respect to cash and in-kind support alone: The rationale of Cash+ is to enable vulnerable households to address their most immediate consumption and at the same time strengthen the means through which they can support themselves over the medium- and long-period. FAO is preparing to conduct a study to assess the impact of the Cash+ as a package versus input or cash alone. Data from past FAO Cash+ operations in other contexts (West Africa) have already shown/indicated the additional positive outcome of the combination of cash and livelihoods inputs/assets, as opposed to stand alone cash or livelihoods package.

- What is the cost per person of cash plus – Did this mean reduction in the caseloads? The cost of the Cash+ package varies depending on the location and the livelihood zone. Agriculture inputs are adjusted depending on whether the land is irrigated or rain-fed. In rain-fed areas, typically, the input package costs less than the cash transfer (direct costs). In addition, savings are achieved when cash and input packages are delivered together. From a cost effectiveness perspective, the impact of Cash+ is foreseen to be greater than cash and input distributed separately. FAO is planning a research study to provide evidence of the effectiveness of Cash+.

- Was the delivery of inputs and cash done at the same time? The intention was to deliver the cash at the same time as the inputs/services - but given the context, there were some challenges in achieving this. However, even when cash delivery was delayed, positive impacts were achieved. This is in line with findings from the Somalia humanitarian cash-based response evaluation for 2017 which provided evidence that even when the cash is late, beneficiaries enrolled in cash assistance fare better nonetheless - due to their creditworthiness. Benefiting from a cash assistance programme is a promise of cash which in turn promotes beneficiaries access to vendor credit as well as for repaying loans and credit debt.

- The transfer values of the cash component of Cash+ were based on the CWG recommendations
- The transfer values of the cash plus were based on the CWG recommendations
Save the Children presentation:

- The focus of study was interesting
- It was interesting to note that the increased and lump sum grants didn’t have discernable impact on children
- This, combined with some of the reflections from the Somalia Cash Consortia presentation, brought the transfer rate into further question.

4 Multipurpose Cash Outcome Indicators

An update on the development of the Multi Cash Outcome Indicators was given as below:

As part of the Grand Bargain’s commitment to “Increase the use and coordination of cash-based programming,” the need for better and more consistent measurement of the outcomes to which MPC contributes was identified. The work began last year with mapping of existing MPC outcome indicators and their use, which brought a wide variety of responses from across humanitarian stakeholders. A working group was then formed, with experts from NGOs, UN agencies, CaLP and donors, as well as substantial input from relevant clusters and from multipurpose cash programming to date, to refine and organize these indicators. A consultation draft was shared for feedback and circulated widely.

The agreed indicators menu is to streamline reporting and provide more consistent and comparable field-level monitoring. It seeks to gather a core minimum group of indicators that have a minimum level of familiarity and acceptance across humanitarian stakeholders.

There are two categories of indicators:

- **Cross-cutting indicators.** These include one required outcome indicator; multiple process indicators (of which one is required); and two recommended qualitative questions as well as additional outcome indicators that would benefit from further testing.

- **Sectoral indicators.** Three of these sectoral outcome indicators are required when the transfer value includes goods or services related to that sector (or sub-sector). Additional sectoral indicators may be selected based upon affected people’s stated priorities for the use of cash, the implementing agencies’ program objectives or areas of concern, and other factors.

The document is near final and will be circulated and rolled out in the next one month.

5 Deep Dive and building on learning: Looking at four key issues.

This session looked at four key issues picked from the ‘six keys point to address’ document\(^\text{10}\). The objective was to look deeper into the issues with an intent of starting conversations around them. This discourse is ultimately expected to culminate into agenda for collective action.

The participants were divided into four groups. For the first two issues (two groups looking at transfer rates and two looking at Coordination) and like world art café style switched to add to what each group did. For the last two issues of Risk and Impact, the participants were grouped into three groups and each group looked at both issues.

\(^{10}\) 6 Key Points to Address: Using Learning to Strengthen Cash and Voucher Assistance in the 2019 Drought Response in Somalia [https://t.co/BWoCvcIl6g](https://t.co/BWoCvcIl6g)
5.1 Transfer rates/amounts

As noted above, in 2017 considerable time and effort was devoted to revising the MEB and to discussions about transfer values. Yet, despite this investment issues related to the values, questions of harmonization and concerns about the basis of decision making remained. In groups, participants considered what factors influence the transfer value; the relationship between the MEB and the transfer value and what should be done going forward.

a) What factors inform transfer values?

Needs analysis:
- The Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB)
- The percentage of the MEB that households can cover without external support (HEA)
- Seasonality (indirectly) – as it affects need
- Market analysis – whether to use cash or other form of response
- Beneficiary needs
- CWG recommendations – based on market monitoring of the MEB with recommendations of % of the full and food MEBs to be covered.

Programme design choices:
- Programme reach – how many people in need v resources available
- Type of programme – whether humanitarian or development
- Complementarity (voucher/cash/e-money)

Operational issues:
- Donor requirements
- Implementer choices
- Funding available
- Operational challenges
- Time constraints
- Modality cost
- Government policy and leadership (while this is not a major influence at present, it was noted will likely increase in future as new policies are being developed).

b) What role does the MEB play in relation to transfer values?

- Definition of:
  - Food MEB - to enable households to meet their food security needs (Energy needs-2100Kcal)
  - Full MEB / multipurpose MEB – to enable households to meet both food security needs (Energy needs) and non-food items (minimum)
  - What is required to meet basic needs
- We need to be clear about what we really want to achieve? Is it survival of households or more?
- Informs what is required depending on vulnerability, needs, severity & IPC
- How to sustain resilience gains
- What approach should be taken to calculate the MEB - rights based / needs based / other?
- Some impressions- MEB is tiresome not necessary to review quarterly, maybe twice a year or adhoc as needed.
c) What needs to be done?

- Revision of the MEB:
  o Identify what the existing problem is with the MEB.
  o Examine why we are not happy with the MEB and whether a revision will solve the problems.
  o Agree how often the MEB will be reviewed/revised (it was noted that, while the MEB had been reviewed on a quarterly basis – looking at prices trends over time, it seems that (overall) changes were not major. As such, it was questioned whether such regular reviews are needed going forward or whether an annual review would be enough with the option of an ad hoc review based on pre agreed triggers).

- Transfer values
  o Consider if it is worth harmonizing the values / how much of a problem is it in practice? On this point, there was discussion of the fact that different programmes have different goals and a questioning of whether harmonized rates are achievable on the other hand, it was acknowledged that, the lack of harmonization of (at least multi-purpose cash) has been the cause of some tension and confusion at the field level, and has been difficult for field staff to manage in terms of communicating differences in the same locations.
  o Agree on an authority to enforce the use of agreed transfers values.
  o Understand what is operationally possible in terms of the frequency of revising the transfer values (consider polling the implementers). For example, adjustments have impacts in terms of communicating changes to affected communities; there may be systems constraints for some agencies; and existing grants/funding may limit flexibility.
  o Beneficiary preferences should be considered in terms of payment frequency.

- In order to move forward it was agreed that there is need:
  o To build consensus from the outset and continue to do so throughout the process.
  o To build consensus about the approach to be used for revising the MEB e.g. needs, rights, expenditure based.
  o To simplify the process to address needs in the short term.
  o To ensure donors, as well as implementers buy into changes to the MEB and the approach to setting the transfer values.
  o To have consistency among donors about transfer values (examples were given of the same agency using different values in the same area based on funding stream).
  o To build the evidence regarding the impact of different transfer values and frequency of payments. It was noted that the presentations suggested that different transfer values did not make much difference – but this seems counter intuitive and needs further examination.
  o To use evidence to build the case for agreeing transfer values.
  o To agree who has the authority to enforce agreed transfer rates.

5.2 Coordination

Coordination was better in 2017 response compared to previous 2011 response. The Somalia Cash working group has made great milestones but various areas require more work. Field level coordination was pointed as one of the areas that could have been done better. In addition, from 2019 survey a number of the respondent indicated
coordination as a priority area to be addressed and as being a sticking problem. In groups, five questions were provided to guide and distil the issue and point where the problem is as well as provide solutions.

Here below are the key discussion points:

1. **What is the specific problem to be addressed?**
   - Lack of sharing of planned numbers and locations in order to reduce duplication and improve prioritization/covering gaps.
   - Lack of coordination at field level and confusion on who to collaborate with at local authorities’ level due to the many levels/ministries that want to coordinate. There is issue of control of power/resources by each level and some want to Influence targeting.
   - This confusion results in too much time spent and at times noninvolvement by the critical key coordinating body.
   - Lack of donor coordination and specifically on transfer values.
   - Bureaucracy-policies.
   - Confusion of roles and responsibilities, not much on timing +duration.
   - Working in silos by the agencies.
   - Duration of the assistance means a lot of pressure to achieve program objective, increased workload and lack of human resources hinders coordination.
   - Minimal coordination of CVA within the different clusters.

2. **Where are we now in terms of addressing the issue?**
   - Bilateral and adhoc communications between agencies exists
   - Some states have a clarified the entry point ministries e.g. Jubaland Kick off meetings to sensitize authorities on targeting criteria priority locations and reasons for justifications
   - Consortia have also positively contributed to better coordination- Common programming
   - Donor working group now established inclusiveness, the participants were not sure if all donors are in the group
   - Some progress on Transfer value harmonization between some donor- ECHO and DFID harmonized rates using super regions exists.
   - Active Cash working group at the national level in Nairobi, plan to have the CWG meetings in Mogadishu.
   - Inter-agency sharing of information and specifically tools ongoing.
   - Learning events by the CWG and CaLP a step in sharing and creating space for joint commitments.

3. **What are the barriers to change?**
   - Implementation is rushed because project timelines and competing reporting demands.
   - Competition Vs collaboration among agencies.
   - Different priorities between donors while the beneficiaries are the same.

4. **Who can make change?**
   - Cash working group
   - State level authorities
   - Donors
5. **What specifically needs to be done going forward?**

- Actors should advocate with evidence on donor coordination around transfer rates.
- Field level cash working group needs to be created, communication from field to national level CWG to be strengthened.
- Field staff need to be involved, informed and coordination need to be strengthened at that level.
- Senior level staff (champion) for agency to lead in CVA and coordinate with other champions.
- Link/connect with inter cluster group.
- There is need to broaden membership beyond food security sectors.
- There needs to be a reporting requirement to CWG/cluster on projections/planned figures on CVA specifically.
- There needs to be some discussions between clusters and CWG on reporting CVA.
- Advocacy at higher level through combined efforts (e.g. NGO consortium) to confirm entry level for CVA for each state.
- Partners through CWG should advocate for coordination between donors. A Donor coordination group has since been set up (Technical Assistance Facility).

5.3 **Risk**

The CWG joint evaluation 2017 recommends that risks should be reconsidered and specifically to reach more areas, possibly with mobile money and expanding programmes to more areas while ensuring reasonable safety and accountability. This will likely require better risk mitigation and acceptance of more ‘residual risk’ and increased costs on the part of organizations and donors. Exclusion and inclusion, gate keeper and taxation always comes up, nonetheless this mostly appear implicit. To unpack the issue of risk, two questions were provided in the group discussions on risks and summarized below:

1. **What are top three risks specific to CVA to be addressed?**
   - Inclusion and exclusion
   - No service provider regulations
   - Beneficiary verification
   - Impact value allocated/sharing
   - Diversion and Fraud
   - Identification KYC
   - Fraud and taxation
   - Weak supply chain-security limitations remote coordination

Two types of risk were common top two risks among all the groups; Diversion/Fraud, and inclusion and Exclusion.

2. **What specifically needs to be done?**
   a) Strengthening control systems
      - Increased awareness
      - Prevention
      - Risk analysis
   b) Single registry
      - Specific selection criteria for all
- Strong verification systems
  c) Regular assessments
  - Spot-checks
  - Common practices: feedback mechanism, biometrics, hotlines, mobile money voice IDs, ID systems, the World bank is working with the government on this. Advocating with MNOs.
  - Rigorous M&E third party monitors
  - Feedback and complaint mechanisms
  - Staff sensitization
  - Strengthening better coordination
  - Agency commitment towards data protection

5.4 Impact:
CVA is relevant in Somalia, it has a strong market economy and private sector, and a population accustomed to the use of cash and other forms of trade. Malnutrition increased in some areas and the effect of CVA on other indicators was questioned, nonetheless expectations that CVA will solve all problems sometimes leads to evaluation reports not being clear on impact. The evaluations report of 2017 indicate that there was minimum impact of CVA beyond food security. To give more insight to the discussion around impact, two questions were provided for the discussion groups. Below is a summary of the key highlights:

1. Are we clear on what we are trying to achieve?
   - Participants were clear on what CVA is expected to achieve.
   - Different programs have different expected impact/outcomes
   - There is need to clarify to the evaluators on the issue of impact whenever an evaluation is being undertaken
   - Not clear how collective outcome of impact is measured- Is it clear in the HRP.
   - M&E workstream of CWG has developed guidance on recommended harmonized indicators- The uptake of this has not been clear.
   - Impacts are linked to the programs objectives
   - Intervention duration determines the impact- CVA for humanitarian is short term
   - How can we be clear about the impact we aim to achieve?

2. What collectively can we do to increase impact?
   - The HRP having component of MPC- There is an opportunity to report against the multipurpose cash.
   - The Multipurpose outcome indicators that is being developed by the sub workstream of the Grand Bargain cash stream is an opportunity to measure and provide evidence of CVA individually as well as collectively.
   - Build synergies around indicators for multipurpose cash- No clear apportioning the Multipurpose cash to different sectors- Reporting of CVA needs to be enhanced.
   - Being realistic on the intended impact of CVA.
   - With MPC outcome indicators an opportunity to provide evidence on the impact of CVA.
   - M$E workstream guidance recommendations to harmonize with MPC outcome indicators and further interrogate if they are used by agencies.
   - As a community of practice, we can improve on program planning. Know what we aim to achieve needs then design program. Resources to be commensurate. Implementation to be aligned to objective.
Annex 1: Responses from the survey

During the registration for the event that was done using monkey survey link, those who were registering to attend were asked ‘From your experience, please state 3 issues that need to be addressed collectively in order to improve the quality and scale of CVA in the 2019 drought response’ 43 people registered, 39 provided at least one priority and 95 answers recorded in total. Below are the responses:

Transfer values

1. Consensus on transfer values, and transfer modalities
2. Standardizing the amount in same Region.
3. Harmonization of cash transfer values
4. Transfer value recommendations for different IPC phases and based on conditionality
5. Determining transfer values
6. Timely up-dates of MEB values, if possible on quarterly basis.
7. Continuous market surveys to inform of cost of goods and services and their availability
8. Timing and application of the wage rates especially if activities are ongoing
9. Harmonizing MEB for same region.
10. Harmonisation of rates
11. Transfer values
12. Harmonization cash value transfer
13. Harmonized Value of cash transfer
14. Transfer value- address the discrepancies
15. Transfer value- address the discrepancies, regarding hard to reach districts and CFW vis a vis UCT
16. Clearly coordinated unambiguous rates of cash transfers

Selection, identification, verification and access

1. Beneficiary identification and verification
2. Identity of beneficiaries
3. Beneficiary verification,
4. Selection process
5. Selection criteria should be improved.
6. KYC / Identification / Validation of beneficiaries
7. Common approaches - vulnerability criteria
8. The selection of the neediest beneficiaries has proven difficulty in drought response as the host communities always mix up with the drought affected people; thus, would like to collectively discuss and come up with the best strategies to deal with this problem in order to prevent similar difficulties in due course.
9. Biometric registration of beneficiaries

Interoperable systems

1. Beneficiary registration system (inter-operability and access rights).
2. Interoperability of systems applied.
3. Beyond 2019, establish common registration systems
4. Data Sharing
5. Roll out of more efficient cash delivery system (Cash Assist)
6. De-duplication of beneficiary (interoperability of data system)
Access
1. Hard to reach districts
2. Access to beneficiaries
3. Reaching remote areas.
4. Security limitations
5. Expansion to rural areas

Monitoring and learning
1. Key indicators for monitoring CV
2. Strengthening post distribution monitoring (PDM)
3. Monitoring and evaluation of cash transfers
4. Monitoring and evaluation
5. Monitoring and Evaluation of CVAs to improve the overall quality and applicability of evidence collected
6. Monitoring
7. Post distribution monitoring
8. Capture lessons learnt - Ensure collective way forward based on the lessons learnt
9. The use of evidence research to understand gap and give recommendations
10. Promoting cross sharing
11. Capture lessons learnt - Ensure collective way forward based on the lessons learnt

Programme design
1. CFW vis a vis UCT
2. Increase the use of CBA and consider its use in sectors where it is not currently used often. Cash is recommended, though raising awareness, market support or vouchers may also be required to promote appropriate use or supply. Apply conditions only as appropriate to promote behavioral change or ensure standards.
3. Asset Creation and Livelihood Programme
4. Increase the number of CBA towards restoring livelihoods and promoting basic services due to famine.
5. Vocational Skills Training
6. Documentation of socioeconomic impact of Cash on different social groups
7. Cash Based interventions and social protection
8. Consistency of responses to ensure that organisations are following processes laid out by cluster
9. Review cost and market impact of CVAs and their contribution to strengthening/achieving a humanitarian development nexus that works
10. Protection main streaming in CVA

Coordination
1. Overlapping of CTA in the target village
2. Coordination at village level
3. Better coordination mechanisms in 2019
4. Coordination (pre-delivery)
5. Coordinated interventions to avoid duplication
6. Coordination
7. Coordination
8. Coordination
9. Coordinated responses to prevent overlap across clusters with CBI
10. Central prioritization to ensure maximum use of resources to reach those most in need.
11. Better coordination
12. Caseload forecasting/projections by agency and geographic area

Modalities / mechanism
1. Improve mobile money practices as a payment modality for humanitarian actors in Somalia
2. Joint discussions with telecoms and other service providers in facilitating CVA to lower the costs of CVA
3. Harmonized MOU with Mobile Money Providers
4. Increase network coverage to support mobile transfers which have proved efficient in the hard to reach areas
5. Engage phone based money transfer agencies
6. Delivery infrastructure challenges
7. Transfer modalities -- through money transfer, SCOPE, vouchers, or mobile phones. The cost-effectiveness of the selected method
8. Adopt policies and procedures to balance reach and accountability. The use of mobile money can assist in providing reach where network coverage exists, while e-cards provide stronger biometric identification

Assessments
1. Elaborate needs assessment and context analysis to enhance quality, effectiveness and relevance.
2. Market assessments
3. Joint assessments
4. Timely approval of proposal

Feedback mechanisms
1. Improve feedback mechanisms for the affected populations
2. A local complaints mechanism or system should be appropriately put in place. However, these complaints and issues must get logged and reported back into the project, regardless of which location they are dealt with. This would give a better understanding of any challenges or issues experienced,
3. Complaint Response & Feedback Mechanism (CRFM)
4. Feedback mechanism

Preparedness
1. Timely response to crisis and issuance of CVA, possibility of using community early warning systems to trigger CVA and needs assessment to be carried out before issuance of cash, vouchers or in kind goods
2. Preparedness - early warning systems
3. Timing of CVA should be improved

Other
1. Get Government leadership
2. Develop sector wide SOPs
3. Accountability by all partners (Including contracted vendors)
4. Beneficiary communication
5. Timely information provision to all parties (especially on change from the norm)
6. Commitments to ensure long term sustainability after emergencies
7. I am new to the context. Given my role in the Response Innovation Lab, I am keen to join to learn from other so that I can support with finding innovations in the future.
## Somalia Learning Event: Agenda

**11th June 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda</th>
<th>Facilitator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08.15 – 09.00</td>
<td>Arrival &amp; coffee</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.00 – 09.15</td>
<td>Welcome, introductions, agenda</td>
<td>Esther Mbogho-CaLP Regional Program Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.15 – 09.45</td>
<td>CVA progress in 2018/19 – a global overview</td>
<td>Karen Peachey-CaLP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09.45 – 10.30</td>
<td>Presentations by:</td>
<td>Moderated by Sahara Dahir-CaLP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cash+ - Maximising the impact of cash transfers. Amana Ekeno, FAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Partners’ Complaints &amp; Response Mechanisms. Kaitlyn Scott, Somali Cash Consortium</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plenary discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30 – 10.45</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.45 – 11.00</td>
<td>Key issues from the 2017 CVA evaluations</td>
<td>Karen Peachey-CaLP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What you said about priorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00 – 12.30</td>
<td>Focusing on:</td>
<td>Karen Peachey-CaLP Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Transfers - values, frequency and basis for change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Coordination - field level and national</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work and plenary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.30 – 13.00</td>
<td>MPC indicators – an update on the latest thinking</td>
<td>Sahara Dahir- CaLP Regional Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00 – 14.00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00 – 15.30</td>
<td>Focusing on:</td>
<td>Sahara Dahir- CaLP Regional Program Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1) Risk management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2) Impact - using monitoring results and learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group work and plenary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30 – 16.00</td>
<td>Next steps</td>
<td>Karen Peachey-CaLP Director</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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