Cash Learning Partnership

Working together to improve the quality of humanitarian cash and voucher transfer programming

The CaLP aims to ensure that, by the end of 2015, timely humanitarian response will routinely consider appropriate and accountable cash transfer programmes at scale.

Supported by

Adapted from materials provided by

[Logos of ACF, British Red Cross, NRC, Save the Children, Oxfam, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, USAID, European Union]
Module 3
Selecting, designing and implementing CTPs
Session 3.1
Risk analysis and mitigation measures
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Session 3.1 Content

- Definitions
- Risk analysis process and tools
- Mitigation measures
What is risk?

Risk is the possibility that an event will occur and adversely affect the achievement of objectives.
Types of risk

**Contextual risk**
Risk of state failure, return to conflict, development failure and humanitarian crisis. Factors over which humanitarian actors have little control.

**Programmatic risk**
Risk of failure to achieve programme aims and objectives. Risk of causing harm through intervention.

**Institutional risk**
Risks to the aid provider (security, fiduciary failure, reputational loss, domestic political damage etc.).
Managing risk – a process

Identify
What type of the risk? Describe the risk in detail.

Analyse
What is the cause and effect? How should we respond?

Assess
What is the likelihood and impact? What is the overall risk level?

Mitigate
How can we reduce the likelihood and/or impact?

Re-assess
What is the risk level now? Is it acceptable?

Monitor
Take steps to regularly monitor and review the risk.
Responding to risk

- Accept
- Control
- Avoid
- Transfer

Risk appetite: the amount of risk that one organisation is prepared to take before deciding which action is necessary.
# Risk matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Negligible (1)</th>
<th>Minor (2)</th>
<th>Moderate (3)</th>
<th>Severe (4)</th>
<th>Critical (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately likely (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likely (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key messages

- All staff (programme, finance, logistic, IT) should work together from the beginning to design payments, data needs and controls to avoid delays.
- Controls should be appropriate to the amount of transfer and the degree of risk.
- Risks often have simple mitigation measures, best achieved through coordination and inter-agency learning.
Questions?
Module 3
Selecting, designing and implementing CTPs
Session 3.2
Sharing experiences and learning
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
CaLP’s research documents
The overarching question

Are NGOs, UN organizations, donors, governments and policy makers that implement, fund and influence emergency cash transfer programming ‘fit for the future’ (2025)?
Global drivers of change

- Environmental Development
- Technology Changes
- Social & Demographic Change
- Geo-Political Changes
- Increasingly Globalised Economy
- Increasing Inequality

Changing Humanitarian Crises
Changing Humanitarian Landscape
Financing

✓ It is extremely difficult to track funding for CTP.
✓ Funding for CTP is a small % of global humanitarian funding.

▪ Obstacles:
Institutional, systemic and regulatory barriers.

▪ Opportunities:
Crowd and peer-to-peer funding, technological advancements and a focus on cost-effectiveness and resilience.
Towards a new business model for CTP: some recommendations

**Donors:**
1. Develop a harmonised and inclusive donor approach to CTP.
2. Understand the potential to use social protection schemes for emergency cash in a variety of sectors.
3. Promote the use of tools for measuring the results of cash based programmes.

**UN:**
1. Test how to approach social protection as a cross-cutting theme for in-country IASC teams.
2. Map the role of the private sector in CTP and understand its added-value.
Towards a new business model for CTP: some recommendations

World Bank:
1. Provide information on the impact of ICT on emergency cash.
2. Greater efforts to understand the interface between CTP and markets.

Private Sector:
1. Consider convening a small working group to explore what greater interaction with the private sector in CTP means and what it requires.
2. International Humanitarian Actors and governments should engage the private sector to provide advisory services related to looking for alternative ways of monitoring the multiple flow and types of ‘cash’ and in particular, the virtualisation of ‘cash’.
E-transfers in emergencies: implementation support guidelines

Glossary, case studies and tips.

- A: Types of e-transfer mechanisms
- B: Choosing e-transfer mechanisms (Assessment checks, preparedness, partnering with service providers, beneficiary registration)
- C: Using e-transfer mechanisms (Beneficiary training, mitigating fraud risks)
- D: Compliance, monitoring and evaluation, data protection and complaints
- E: Additional guidance (practical tools)
Protecting beneficiary privacy

Challenges:
- There are a multiplicity of actors.
- There is an increasing volume of (sensitive) data with no specific collection process.
- There is a lack of communication with beneficiaries.

Constraints:
- Reactivity
- International / national legal frameworks
- Cost-effectiveness
Protecting beneficiary privacy

Definition of 8 operational principles

Principles for the secure use of personal data in cash and e-transfer programmes:

- Respect privacy
- Protect by design
- Understand data flow and risks
- Quality and accuracy
- Obtain consent or inform beneficiaries as to the use of their data
- Security
- Disposal
- Accountability
Factors affecting the cost-efficiency of e-transfers in humanitarian programmes

Costs depend on the context of the programme. The study identifies some key criteria that affect the overall cost:

- Scale of the transfer and the intervention time frame.
- Negotiation with service providers makes a difference: Is it an attractive proposition?
- State of available infrastructure has a huge impact.
Factors affecting the cost-efficiency of e-transfers in humanitarian programmes

Other conclusions:

- Many costs of running an emergency CTP have little to do with e-transfer or manual payment mechanisms.
- It is unlikely that CTP will drive the innovation in infrastructure that is required.
- Cost is one of the criteria used to select a payment mechanism, but it’s not the only one (e.g. speed, benefit for beneficiary, security and fraud risks, secondary benefits to local markets etc.)

Recommendations:

- Understand the e-transfer environment
- Improve preparedness
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Response analysis
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Session 3.3 Content

- Definitions
- Response selection criteria
- Cost-efficiency and cost-effectiveness
- Response analysis decision making matrix
What is response analysis?

Response analysis is analysis based on available information and strategic thinking that leads to decisions on the types of programmes that are most appropriate and feasible in response to a disaster.
Two steps

Blue sky thinking
No consideration other than the best programming option.

Objective data collecting
Establish a set of criteria to select the option and collect objective and accurate information to assess these criteria.

Response option selection
Consideration of feasibility, realism and appropriateness.

Source: IFRC Recovery Guidance 2012
Factors to consider

- Suitability to objectives?
- Fits with community priorities and capacities?
- With government priorities?
- Low chance of negative impact?
- Feasible – can risks be managed?
- Value for money?
- Are resources available?
- Institutional constraints (delays, budget, capacities)
Cost-efficiency and Cost-effectiveness

- **Input**: Objectives, Agency mandate, Community priorities, Government priorities, Opportunities for sustainability, Feasibility (risks, time), Low chance of negative impact, Value for money, Available resources

- **Output**: Cost of delivering programme:
  - Running costs
  - Operational costs

- **Outcome**: Cost-efficiency and Cost-effectiveness

- **Impact**: Cost-effectiveness
Cost-efficiency and Cost-effectiveness

- Cost-efficiency measures input costs against outputs in monetary terms.
- Cost-efficiency is a key element of cost effectiveness.
- Cost-effectiveness is defined as a comparison of all costs and benefits.
- Not all benefits can be measured in monetary terms, therefore cost-effectiveness is difficult to assess and to gauge.
Key messages

A response analysis matrix is a tool for:

- decision making (discussion on weighting and ranking with key stakeholders)
- communication (justification and documentation)
- coordination between people and functions
- ensuring consistent messages and a coherent and integrated strategy
- collaboration with other agencies and information for donors.
Questions?
Thank you

Adapted from materials provided by International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Supported by
Module 3

Selecting, designing and implementing CTPs

Session 3.4

Delivery mechanisms and new technology
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Session 3.4 Content

- Delivery mechanisms, instruments and new technology.
- Criteria for selection.
- Pre-requisites, advantages and disadvantages of different mechanisms.
Delivery mechanisms

- Direct Cash
- Using Banks
- Using traders
- Using mobile phones
Delivery mechanisms and instruments

Direct Cash
- Cash, Money Order, etc.

Using Banks

Using traders

Using mobile phones
Delivery mechanisms and instruments

- Direct Cash: Cash, Money Order, etc.
- Using Banks: Bank cards, Mobile phones, Sim cards etc.
- Using traders
- Using mobile phones
Delivery mechanisms and instruments

Direct Cash
- Cash, Money Order, etc.

Using Banks
- Bank cards, Mobile phones, Sim cards etc.

Using traders
- Paper Voucher, Smart Cards, Scratch cards, Mobile phones etc.

Using mobile phones
Delivery mechanisms and instruments

Direct Cash - Cash, Money Order, etc.

Using Banks - Bank cards, Mobile phones, Sim cards etc.

Using traders - Paper Voucher, Smart Cards, Scratch cards, Mobile phones etc.

Using mobile phones - Mobile Phones, Sim cards, etc.
Instruments – card types

Main differences: Capacity to store data and ability to perform basic transactions (generally reflected in costs per card).
Instruments – how cards are used

• Can be used:
  – at an ATM
  – by a PoS device
  – by a NFC reader on a phone
• Used to help identify and authenticate the card holder.
• Smart cards can also hold:
  – biometric data
  – transaction details and account balance, and so can be used ‘off-line’
• Smart cards with processors are more secure – in-built encryption helps prevent misuse.
• But they are more expensive than other cards.
Instruments – mobile phones

Mobile Phones: E-Wallet, E-Voucher and Bar Code Reader

Mobile money transfer:
- A service provided by mobile phone companies.
- No need for beneficiary to have a bank account.
- Software application directly installed to individual SIM cards.
- A handset is not always necessary, just a SIM card.

Other uses:
- As a ‘POS device’, for example with NFC reader.
- As an identifier in a voucher programme.
Videos (see session plan)

Can be inserted into PowerPoint
Task

In your group identify the minimum conditions, plus the advantages and disadvantages of the mechanism you have been allocated, from the point of view of the beneficiary and your organisation.

- Mobile money
- Banks
- Direct cash distribution
- Using retailers (electronic and paper vouchers)

Duration: 20 minutes and write your answers on the flip chart provided.
Selection criteria

- The choice of delivery mechanism will depend on many factors.
- Information from the response analysis phase will be critical to support decision making.
Selection criteria for C or V

For cash:
- Availability of mechanisms
- Beneficiary familiarity
- Effectiveness

For vouchers:
- How vouchers are redeemed and reimbursed
- Technology infrastructure
Context

- Consistency with the objectives (relief, recovery)
- Length and scale of the project (efficiency, cost-effectiveness, sustainability)
- Local availability and access to technology
- Agency and partner capacities
Cost and practicalities

- Overhead costs for set-up, management and operations
- Cost of technology (purchase, maintenance, replacements)
- Speed to set up and roll out
- Security, risks and appropriate controls
- Resilience of options and providers
- Flexibility for later changes
- Monitoring and reporting requirements
Beneficiary preferences

- Preferences and acceptability
- Access to shops
- Capacity to use technology and/or instruments
Questions?
Key messages

- Dependent on context.
- Pilots or early review helps to identify pitfalls.
- Assess against objectives and key criteria.
- Where financial services exist there are advantages of scale, reporting and security.
- Speed gained from contingency planning and preparedness.
Thank you
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Session 3.5
Design and implementation issues in CTP
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Cash Transfer Process

Contingency planning

Preparedness

Preparedness activities

Assessment and Analysis

Needs assessment

Modality selection

Cash feasibility assessment

Delivery mechanism selection and programme design

Partner selection and contracting

Monitoring and evaluation

Planning and tracking

Beneficiary identification and registration

Implementation and Monitoring

Programme Design
Session 3.5 Content

- Communication
- Registration
- Setting the value
- Selecting and contracting partners
“Poor information flow is undoubtedly the biggest source of dissatisfaction, anger and frustration among affected people.”

TEC Thematic Evaluation (footnote 2)
Four messages

What's the plan?
You need a plan

- Who is your audience?
- What are the goals for communication?
- What resources do you have? (people, time, money, tools)
- Action:
  - Who?
  - What?
  - When?
  - What platform?
  - What purpose?
  - Outcome?
Key sensitisation messages for beneficiaries

- Be clear about objectives, inclusion criteria and conditions.
- Be precise about what cash is intended for.
- Explain how an amount has been calculated.
- Outline monitoring process and what happens about fraud.
- Explain payment method.
- Show role plays of encashment.

*Source: ACF Learning*
Embrace new technology!
Facts and figures

- Mobile phone use tripled in the developing world between 2005 and 2010 (fastest growth in Africa).
- Mobile broadband access grew by 160 per cent between 2009 and 2010.
- Similar patterns in social media.
- Second highest number of people on Facebook is now India (after the USA).

Source: International Telecommunication Union
Facts and figures

- There are 5.9 billion mobile subscribers (that's 87 percent of the world’s population).
- There are now 1.2 billion mobile Web users worldwide, based on the latest stats for active mobile-broadband subscriptions. Asia is the top region.
- SMS is the king of mobile messaging.
- 8 trillion text messages were sent in 2011.

Source: http://mobithinking.com/mobile-marketing-tools/latest-mobile-stats
“We might not have been able to afford lunch, but we have mobile phones”

Somali refugee in Dadaab - 2011
Web references

Infoasaid: http://infoasaid.org/
- Media and telecom landscape guides
- Humanitarian message library
- E-learning course

CDAC: http://www.cdacnetwork.org/
- Case studies
- Resources, including guidance and policy

Humanitarianism in the Network Age:
http://www.unocha.org/node/11528
Technology and registration mechanisms

Registration creates a **unique identifier** for a person, which is linked to a form of identification:

- National identity card or agency ID
- Bar code
- PIN or password
- Biometrics
- Automated registration

Thanks to technology, registering becomes faster, more secure and transparent. Reporting is also facilitated.
Defining the size of the transfer

Key considerations:

- What is the objective?
- What can households provide for themselves?
- Commodity or service prices?
- Transaction or transport prices?
- Market trends
- Seasonality
- Recovery time frame
- Coordination and coherence
- Budget capacity
Fixed or variable transfer amounts?

- Adapt amounts for household size?
- Prevent reinstating pre-disaster inequalities?
- Should amounts vary depending on value of loss or relative vulnerability?

Practicality

- Often **fixed rate** in an emergency response.
- **Variable rate** during recovery programming.
Common mistakes

- Basing the transfer value on equivalent value of in-kind assistance.
- Not considering what households can provide for themselves.
- Not considering how goods or service prices might change.
- Not including transport costs or other fees associated with receiving the transfers.
- Negotiate on detail or gross price.
New partners

Who are they?

- Financial Service Providers (FSPs):
  - Banks, post offices, microfinance institutions, money transfer companies
- IT & Telecommunication Service Providers
  - Mobile network operators
- Local traders
What can they provide?

• Direct distribution of cash
• Payment of redeemed vouchers
• Software and hardware
• Project database maintenance
• Reporting functions
• Cash in transit services
• Expertise
Selection criteria

Financial and IT & Telecom Service Providers:

- Service network, reach, accessibility, connectivity
- Experience
- Administrative and reporting capabilities
- Value for money
- Risks
- Cost
Selection criteria

Traders

- Proximity (beneficiary access)
- Financial capacity (access to finance or self financing)
- Price competitiveness
- Storage and handling standards
- Accurate weight and measurement equipment
- Connectivity (point of sale machines)
Contracting

Agreements with FSP should specify:

- Partner’s obligation
- Contracting agency’s obligation
- Transaction and/or purchase costs
- Transfer, repayment and reporting requirements
- Delivery mechanism(s) and payments calendar
- Beneficiary identification process
- Supply of agreed commodities
- General terms and conditions
Contracting

Agreements with traders should include:

- Period covered
- Any restriction on commodities to be exchanged
- ID requirements for beneficiaries
- Validity date for acceptance of vouchers
- Agreed quality and quantity of commodities
- Complaints mechanisms / monitoring of the trader
- Reimbursement mechanisms timeframe
- Distribution timetable
- Dealing with inflation / supplier problem
Questions?
Thank you
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Session 3.6 and 3.7
Designing an implementation plan
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
  - Designing an implementation plan (1)
  - Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Considerations for setting up programme implementation

- Considering capital (start-up) costs and operating (running) costs.
- Preparing for and working with surge capacity.
- Selecting your technical partners – considerations.
- Selecting your technical partners – process.
- Building your monitoring framework in advance.
- Thinking about an exit strategy from the start.
- Lots to do: how to begin? Identify focal points.
Cash Learning Partnership
Working together to improve the quality of humanitarian cash and voucher transfer programming

The CaLP aims to ensure that, by the end of 2015, timely humanitarian response will routinely consider appropriate and accountable cash transfer programmes at scale.
Module 3
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Session 3.8
Coordination
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Session 3.8 Content

- Purposes of coordination of CTP
- Coordination architecture
- Function of coordination
- Ways forward
What do we mean by ‘cash coordination’?

Refers to both *technical* coordination (relating to *how* to deliver cash) and more *strategic* or operational coordination (relating to results and impacts, or *the extent to which needs are met.*
Coordination in urban contexts

Some factors are particularly relevant in urban settings:

- More agencies working in a smaller geographical area makes it more difficult to divide responsibilities by village or district.

- Urban disasters are often high-profile and rapid onset, attracting multiple agencies. This results in competition over areas of implementation and confusion over gaps in coverage.
The ‘cluster approach’

- Clusters are groups of UN and non-UN humanitarian organisations in each of the main sectors.

- Designated by the IASC, with allocated responsibilities for coordination.

Coordination architecture in the cluster approach

There are specific, pre-defined responsibilities for coordination under the cluster approach.

Cash coordination – why the focus?

- CTP does not fit into one single cluster.
- Lack of coordination can cause tension within communities, reduced programme effectiveness and security risks.
- *All* humanitarian coordination systems and information frameworks should integrate market information.
- Cash coordination is a platform for advocacy and negotiation.
- Cash coordination can provide greater leverage for negotiations.
What are the expectations/functions of cash coordination for humanitarian agencies?

- To create a **community of practice** sharing successes and failures, and developing guidelines and standards.
- To **harmonise approaches**, transfer amounts, targeting, shared assessment and monitoring, and to negotiate better terms with service providers.
- To **advocate** for appropriate CTP.
- To help ‘lateral’ or ‘upward’ networking, forming consortia and finding funding opportunities.
What are the expectations/functions of cash coordination for donors, governments and the private sector?

- To find gaps and duplications in terms of how needs are being met (outcomes), by both cash and in-kind.
- To harmonise implementation approaches.
- To create ‘downward’ networking, connecting with implementing partners.
- To link emergency, development and disaster preparedness.
Expectations / functions of cash coordination

Strategic-level coordination

- Coverage: identifying gaps and avoiding duplication
- Linking emergency, development and disaster preparedness
- Funding opportunities and implementing partners
- Advocating for appropriate CTP
- Harmonising rates and targeting
- Shared assessment and monitoring
- Community of Practice: sharing successes and failures, developing guidelines and standards

Technical-level coordination
# Functions and activities of CTP coordination

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1.** Identifying gaps / duplication for decision-making | ▪ Detailed 3W or other database  
▪ Combined analysis of cash and in-kind, focused on outcomes rather than outputs  
▪ Joint assessment and monitoring |
| **2.** Advocating for appropriate CTP | ▪ Sharing of information on who does what, where  
▪ Linking up parties with common interests  
▪ Building partnerships and consensus  
▪ Acting collaboratively |
| **3.** Harmonising approaches |   |
| **4.** Networking for funding opportunities and implementing partners |   |
| **5.** A community of practice | ▪ Technical presentations in coordination groups to share good and bad practice, lessons learnt  
▪ Website, D-group, Training courses, Learning Events, Joint field visits |
A possible model for field-level coordination?

**Accountability:** by integrating strategic cash coordination into the cluster system, there is increased accountability to the HC, improved information management via OCHA.

**Strategic Cash Coordination** should be integrated into the cluster system across sectors: assessments, response analysis, monitoring, mapping gaps and duplications, evaluation.

**Technical Cash Coordination** to be either: (1) independent of the cluster system, or (2) a TWG under one of the clusters, (Food Security, Early Recovery, Shelter, etc., depending on an analysis of the context, phase of emergency and capacity of different agencies).

**Leadership:** preferably NGO, to create atmosphere of trust conducive to sharing good practice.

**CTWG** should have technical links with the cash champions and roving technical expert. Should provide support to the clusters.

**Roving Technical Cash Expert** to support all the clusters in CTP and make links between them. Could be involved in mapping gaps and duplications, and also participate in the inter-cluster meetings.

**Cash Champions** to be trained and established in each cluster, individuals who are technical experts in their field but also can bring a cash perspective to cluster analysis. Can link in with CTWG.

**Humanitarian Coordinator**

**Inter-Cluster Coordination**

- **Food Security**
  - Cash Champion

- **Early Recovery**
  - Cash Champion

- **Shelter**
  - Cash Champion

- **Health**
  - Cash Champion

- **Education**
  - Cash Champion

- **Protection**
  - Cash Champion

- **WASH**
  - Cash Champion

**Cash Technical Working Group**
Guiding principles

- To differentiate technical from strategic coordination.
- A need for streamlining cash coordination into the cluster system.
- A recognition of CTP as a cross-cutting modality across sectors, needs to be ‘objective driven’.
- Strong technical leadership.
Setting common CFW rates and conditions

- Slightly below local wage rate.
- Consider CFW plus cash grant where there are exploitative wage rates.
- Vary rates between urban and rural.
- Standard length of day, breaks, perks.
- Maximise participation of vulnerable groups.
- Design to minimise disruption of other productive or waged activities.
Coordination for common CTP approaches

- Wide differences in CTP grants causes confusion and tension.
- Determine whether government local minimum wage will apply.
- Beware of separate CFW and CTP groups.
- It is not often that all agencies are represented.
- Encourage government & CBO participation.
Joint monitoring for CTP learning

- Pick and choose a survey for early impact.
- Free off-the-shelf survey that suits various CTPs.
- Existing data analysis tool.
- Allows findings across modalities, payment mechanisms and agencies.
- Permits sharing lessons learned.
Key messages

- Distinguish between strategic and technical
- Ensure ‘cash’ has a home in the cluster architecture
- Be objective, not modality driven
- Work cross-sectorally
- Share information
- Collaborate...on assessments, monitoring etc.
Questions?
Thank you

Adapted from materials provided by

International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies

Supported by

Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
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Advocacy
Module 3 Content

- Risk analysis and mitigation measures
- Sharing experiences and learning
- Response analysis
- Delivery mechanisms and new technology
- Design and implementation issues in CTP
- Designing an implementation plan (1)
- Designing an implementation plan (2)
- Coordination
- Advocacy
Session 3.9 Content

- Identify key advocacy messages
- Describe an advocacy process
- Consider institutional messaging
Freedonia advocacy messages

**Group A:** Government of Freedonia (GoF) say NO to cash (interferes with their social protection programmes).

**Group B:** Country Director says NO to cash (what’s wrong with in-kind – we already have shelter kits and anyway beneficiaries will use the money for other things).

**Group C:** Hosting family men say NO to giving women cash (they want it).

**Group D:** Finance department says NO to cash (banks are not trustworthy).

**Group E:** Donor says NO to cash (they have a lot of grain they want to shift and cash will cause price inflation).

**Group F:** Head Office says NO to cash (what’s wrong with what we usually do and anyway beneficiaries won’t understand).
Steps for an advocacy process

- Undertake a situational analysis.
- Determine the purpose of the advocacy intervention.
- Identify the target audience.
- Select the approach.
- Develop the approach.
- Find and select evidence.
- Identify advocacy opportunities.
- Be context specific – ground your arguments in reality.
- Remember CTP is a tool – not a new approach in itself.
- Understand the blockages BEFORE making the case.
- Use evidence based arguments and clear messages.
It starts with you!
Thank you