



**East and Southern Africa Regional
Cash Working Group Leads and Co-
leads Workshop Report
17th- 18th May 2023**



Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
SESSION 1: CASH WORKING GROUPS' ACHIEVEMENTS & PLANS FOR 2023/24	4
SESSION 2: EXCHANGE LEARNING ON GOOD PRACTICE IN THE HARMONIZATION OF TRANSFER VALUE	6
SESSION 3: COORDINATING CVA IN CONTEXT OF HIGH INFLATION AND DEPRECIATION	7
CALP Network reflection on the challenges, dilemmas and good practices	7
Recommendations	7
SESSION 4: SHARING EXPERIENCES ON ADVOCACY WITH FINANCIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS (FSPs)	9
SESSION 5: THE URGENT NEED TO ACCELERATE THE USE OF CASH AND VOUCHER ASSISTANCE	11
DAY 1 RECAP	12
SESSION 6: CVA AND LOCALLY LED RESPONSE: STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE LOCAL ACTORS' ENGAGEMENT IN CASH COORDINATION	12
SESSION 7: INTEGRATING CVA IN THE HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMME CYCLE (HPC)	14
SESSION 8: THE NEW IASC CASH COORDINATION MODEL	15
SESSION 9: THE ROLE OF CWG IN ANTICIPATORY ACTION AND ADDRESSING CLIMATE SHOCKS	16
SESSION 10: INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES: DATA INTEROPERABILITY - INCLUDING RISK ANALYSIS	17
Wrap Up	18
Annex 1 – Participants List	19

INTRODUCTION

The CALP Network (CALP) organized a workshop for the Cash Working Group (CWG) Leads and Co-leads on May 17th-18th, 2023. This two-day, in-person annual workshop aimed to foster peer-to-peer learning among CWG Leads and Co-leads within the East and Southern Africa Region. The selection of topics covered during the meeting was informed by suggestions put forth by CWG Leads and Co-leads.

Facilitating the workshop were Sapenzie Ojiambo, CALP Regional Representative for East and Southern Africa, along with Dennis Owano, CALP Deputy Regional Representative. The event featured technical presentations by participants, including Muhammad Usman, CWG Coordinator for South Sudan; Albert Muraisa, Co-chair of Zimbabwe's CWG; Masresha Mitiku, Co-chair of Ethiopia's CWG; Peter Murgor, Co-chair of Kenya's CWG; as well as representatives from organizations such as OCHA (Joy Maingi and Juliet Lang), UNHCR (Maguelone Arsac), GiveDirectly (Violet Teti), and IFRC (Innocent Tshilombo).

A total of 18 CWG Leads and Co-leads, including government representatives, participated in the comprehensive two-day workshop. The represented countries included Zimbabwe, South Sudan, Madagascar, Burundi, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Uganda, Kenya, Mozambique, and Somalia.

Participants had distinct expectations from the workshop, centering on the acquisition of insights from fellow attendees, comprehending the new IASC model, exploring localization strategies, delving into innovative technology in Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA), and aligning Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) values across various agencies. Additionally, discussions extended to topics such as market functionality assessments.

SESSION 1: CASH WORKING GROUPS' ACHIEVEMENTS & PLANS FOR 2023/24

The inaugural session centered on sharing the accomplishments of the CWGs during the preceding year and plans for the upcoming year. During this session, attendees engaged in discussions within breakout groups, organized by country. The discussions were documented on sticky notes.

Below is a succinct overview of select achievements and plans that emerged from discussions.

Country	Achievements	Challenges	Plans for 2023/2024
Somalia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated Sub National CWG structures. Clear work plan for 2023 approved by ICCG Somalia. Review of MEB Established 3W data to avoid duplication. Developed a common M&E indicator guideline. Secured funding for an IM support staff 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing cash transfer value calculation methodology. Developing targeting guidance. Linking humanitarian cash with social transfers/safety nets programs. Set baseline data of cash partners' presence to strengthen Sub National CWG Set up capacity development plans for 2023-24 to build capacity for the sub-national CWG in line with localization agenda
Zimbabwe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documenting and learning about CVA in economic volatility context and webinar plans Contingency planning. Market functionality assessment for rural areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No network coverage in many counties. Resistance from beneficiaries on receiving entitlement via electronic transfers. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Migrating from manual payment to electronic transfers.
Mozambique	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electronic cash transfers done-reached 9,000 beneficiaries during COVID-19. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges of limited connectivity for the electronic cash transfer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improving the systems for monitoring cash transfers.
Uganda	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regular monitoring and update of MEB. Advocacy on interoperability among FSP and harmonization of the KYC documents Individual profiling exercise for refugees to understand their vulnerability and effectively target them 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of the MEB Finalize the common cash approach paper. Transition ongoing to the new IASC model – updating CWG ToRs to match the new model.

Kenya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Improved collaboration between the Kenya CWG and the Government of Kenya Improved localization -local actors are part of the cash coordination agenda Joint Market Monitoring Significant improvement in the harmonization of transfer values 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthening technical working groups. Making social protection social registry a live database which is updated more frequently Joint methodologies for targeting.
South Sudan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cash assistance scaled up from less than 7M (2021) to 40M. (2022/23) 12 Sub-national CWGs formed at state level. Sectoral MEBs finalized 4W Reporting system shifted from Excel to automation. Live data platform for price monitoring with graphical analysis. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans underway for transition to OCHA Co-chairing the CWG by March 2024- Harmonization of tools and approaches. Review National MEB. Linking CVA to social protection in the long run. Capacity building plans for partners, especially local partners.
Madagascar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CWG led by the Ministry of Social Protection. SOPs for CVA developed and validated by government. 		
Ethiopia	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harmonization of transfer values 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Having proper MEB guidelines
Burundi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Currently responding to flood although access is a hindrance. FSP Mapping and better coordination with FSPs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Challenges of network coverage for electronic transfers Low digital literacy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewing transfer value calculation methodology Harmonization of tools and approaches. Capacity building in CVA programming and especially for local actors Plan to shift from cash at hand to e-transfers

SESSION 2: EXCHANGE LEARNING ON GOOD PRACTICE IN THE HARMONIZATION OF TRANSFER VALUE

The session began by seeking answers to these questions:

- How many CWGs can say they have been able to harmonize transfer value? (3/10)
- How many CWGs have been able to review their transfer values regularly? (4/10)
- How many CWGs have a recommended transfer value (3/10)

Afterwards, discussions centred around the below questions:

Why is the harmonization of transfer value such a big issue in different contexts?

- Most organizations have their agendas/strategies and sector-specific activities and not MPCA. For example, providing in-kind and then topping up with cash with limited coordination.
- Different actors with different donors/governments' interests who have different project objectives implementing in different contexts
- Diminishing funding
- CWGs come up with technical guidelines on transfer values however some issues are more political than technical.
- Donors don't respect CWGs recommended transfer values
- Governments advocating for harmonization of transfer values with social protection transfer values
- Inflexibility of partners budgets hence not adapting to the changing transfer values in different contexts

What actions have you taken to ensure harmonization of transfer values

- In Ethiopia there is zonal-level coordination with the Government (Ministry of Disaster Risk Reduction)- partners submit plans to the government and if the transfer value doesn't match the recommended TV from the CWG, the plans are automatically rejected.
- South Sudan: Advocacy to donors at country level to ensure flexibility of partner budgets in relation to the changing market prices
- Zimbabwe: Through WFP plan to pilot a blockchain technology to relay 4W reporting in real time to be able to capture discrepancies and possibly rectify and harmonize transfer values
- To have an inclusive harmonized transfer value where all stakeholders including donor, government and development stakeholders will buy in.
- Review MEBs regularly
- Humanitarian organizations should align with what the government is doing and not have their own parallel programmes

It was pointed out that CALP should advocate with donor to deal with some of these dilemmas

SESSION 3: COORDINATING CVA IN CONTEXT OF HIGH INFLATION AND DEPRECIATION

This session began with a presentation from Zimbabwe and South Sudan cash working groups on their experiences.

Zimbabwe, is one of the countries that has been impacted with the highest inflation and currency depreciation. By end of 2022, the annual inflation rate was 285%. The inflation pressure was caused by increasing global commodity prices and an expansive monetary policy and the introduction of a multi-currency system (the Zimbabwean dollar, US dollar and South African rand are some of the currencies accepted). In order to sustain cash operations, the currency of distribution was changed in accordance with central bank regulations. Transfer value was also adjusted, this was significant in 2020 when assistance was distributed in US dollars, the transfer value increased from USD 9 to USD 12 per person.

Some of the elements of the action plan developed by the CWG with support from CALP earlier in the year were shared as follows:

- CVA actors and CWGs to develop contingency planning for future economic or policy changes.
- Joint market monitoring exercise should include predictive analyses.
- CWG to have a clear decision process highlighted in a SOP that details agreements on MEB and transfer value adjustment.
- Advocate for and include financial and digital literacy actions in CVA responses.
- Continue monitoring beneficiary preferences.

South Sudan, presented a robust system they have put in place to help monitor rapid fluctuations in the MEB as a result of high inflation. This is done via a Joint market monitoring initiative (JMMI) that was initiated by the Interagency Cash Working Group (IACWG) with the support of REACH. The joint exercise is led by REACH in close collaboration with IACWG members. JMMI data is collected every month from traders in several marketplaces. Data is collected via the Kobo app that enables enumerators to record the data offline and upload once an internet connection is available. REACH validates the data that is then updated in the platform.

For more information on the dashboard please click on this link https://impact-initiatives.shinyapps.io/SSD_JMMI_app/

CALP Network reflection on the challenges, dilemmas and good practices

CALP provided an overview of the learning from work done with five countries in Africa (Malawi, South Sudan, Zimbabwe, Nigeria and Burkina Faso) to help develop action plans for tackling issues to do with implementing cash and voucher assistance in contexts of high inflation.

The highlights were as follows:

Recommendations

- 1) Cash Working Groups need to develop clear predictable processes for adjusting transfer values in these contexts. The decision process should detail the procedures including triggers and scenarios.
- 2) Forecasting on the economic outlook could be useful for budgeting, and advocacy to donors. Cash working groups should consider how these could be factored in regular market monitoring
- 3) Contingency planning is needed particularly in situations where frequent or drastic changes to the monetary and sectoral policies can be expected.

- 4) Monitoring and following up on recipients' preference is an excellent indicator of response effectiveness and this information should be collected regularly and factored into decision-making e.g. as part as post distribution monitoring.

Challenges and dilemmas

- 1) Breadth vs Depth: This is a dilemma that needs further insight and consensus building. While depth is ideal in some cases pragmatic approaches may be required to maintain relevance.
- 2) Need for conscious efforts to tackle the administrative burdens that come with efforts to adapt transfer values to maintain recipients' purchasing power in contexts of high inflation and depreciation. Particularly, donor requirements, government bureaucracies and frequency of revision of transfer values by CWGs were touched on
- 3) In kind is not always the solution to the rapidly increasing cost of transfers. Modality choices should be informed by a comparative analysis of the cost of in-kind vs cash assistance in addition to recipient preferences. However, they are not always available.

In general, forward planning and pragmatic solutions are needed. This requires collaborative efforts and candid conversations to find common grounds for some of the dilemmas

Questions/Comments	Answers
<p>Zimbabwe The presentation mentions 3 different currencies that the country uses, how do you manage all the currencies?</p>	<p>Inflation is tracked in both the local currency (Zim dollar) and the USD dollar. VAM WFP does the analysis for the consumption of the CWG members.</p> <p>No official position in regard to the right currency to use but the most preferred currency is the South African rand in the southern part and USD in the northern part of the country.</p>
<p>When negotiating preferential exchange rates, do you mean negotiating the exchange rate vis - a vis the market exchange rate or central bank exchange? Who does this rate favour?</p>	<p>It is best to negotiate a preferential exchange rate that will be beneficial to the recipient. Negotiating something between the official exchange rate and parallel exchange rate..</p>
<p>Is there the opportunity for joint PDM, and advocacy for the CWG budget to be allocated on an annual basis like a potential pilot project in Rwanda?</p>	<p>There is an opportunity to combine joint monitoring and PDM through advocacy from the CWG.</p> <p>What we are waiting for is the full transition to the new model to spearhead some of these advocacy efforts.</p>
<p>How do you handle the dilemma between the black-market exchange rate and the official exchange rate?</p>	<p>As you negotiate with fiscal and monetary authorities to get a favorable rate for recipients you can switch to e-voucher (as much as recipients prefer cash) negotiate with the supplier to be paid in USD and maintain the prices of the commodities as per the agreement.</p> <p>Also, market-based programming was done to support traders to stock during this time of high inflation.</p>

	In addition, humanitarian organizations through the HCT, can negotiate for preferential rates with the government
<p>South Sudan</p> <p>With this live data platform in South Sudan, some organizations plan annually, others after 2 years. How do we use this data to inform our budgeting as a CWG? Is the platform accessible to donors? How do you manage to update it on a regular basis?</p>	<p>Yes the platform is accessible to both organizations and donors.</p> <p>Everyone has to be brought on board. Data collection is done voluntarily by different organizations. Kobo tool has data set linked to the dashboard (automated), every month, the CWG sits with REACH to update it. Data was collected since 2019. Also note that CWG has signed an agreement with REACH to manage it for free.</p>
<p>It is a great challenge in Mozambique to implement CVA in some areas. If we were to engage REACH, are there cost implications? Software, host, who manages/maintains data base, does REACH do the training?</p>	<p>REACH was very helpful in platform design and maintenance. Muhamad Ibrahim to share REACH details in order to contact them.</p>
<p>In terms of breadth vs depth, most governments prefer breath (more people to cover), which favors them politically, common grounds are needed in such cases. There is a need for a consensus to determine the best alternative possible.</p>	
<p>There is also the issue of the frequency of cash transfers. What is the number of people we should cover on a bare minimum in a village should the crisis increase? We also have parallel exchange rates and government rates; how do we align this?</p>	

SESSION 4: SHARING EXPERIENCES ON ADVOCACY WITH FINANCIAL SERVICE PROVIDERS (FSPs)

Three Cash Working Groups shared on work done and plans for closer collaboration with financial service providers. The following were the key highlight:

For Zimbabwe, the CWG is formulating an MOU with Mukuru mainly to provide a framework for cooperation. This will enable CWG members to achieve the remittance threshold required to qualify for reduced service fee by acting collectively as a group. Cash transfers through remittance platforms were first introduced in urban areas using Western Union. Expansions are currently being piloted in refugees' settings by Mukuru, a money transfer provider in Africa and Asia, which is available more extensively in rural areas. The delivery mechanism was introduced after transactions in US dollar became legal again. This allowed people to receive their remittance in foreign currency and be able to choose a convenient place/rate to exchange it. Mukuru will present the MOU model to the National Cash Working Group, a consensus will be established, and the draft group MOU will be shared

thereafter for feedback. Despite the framework agreement, there will still be the need for individual MOUs with Agencies due to differences in organizations contractual agreements, and lack of cooperation among agencies on a few other issues.

In Ethiopia, CWG conducted FSP mapping in 2020. More than 18 FSPs are engaged in humanitarian cash delivery with different partners. The National Bank of Ethiopia regulates mobile and agent banking services such that only financial institutions that are licensed by the National bank are allowed to engage in the services. The CWG is closely working with the National bank of Ethiopia on specific advocacy issues to do with humanitarian CVA , including service charge, liquidity and higher-level coordination systems. In the near future, FSPs and technology companies will be invited to present the key elements of their services to the CWG members. FSP mapping will be done in all CVA potential regions-recruitment of an FSP mapping consultant is underway.

In Kenya, FSP mapping and formulation of MOUs is still done individually by agencies. The CWG, has not made much progress on collective work. Plans include mobilising CWG partners to negotiate for a collective bargain with FSPs like Safaricom (which is the leading FSP used by CVA implementers in Kenya). The CWG has established an advocacy workstream whose main agenda is to map out and establish the collective bargaining framework And process.

Questions/Comments	Answers
<p>Are CWG partners in Ethiopia sharing information on FSP service charge? Many agencies do not share such information. In South Sudan the CCD launched a joint tendering process with the FSPs and managed to negotiate a favorable service charge and reduced the service charge by more than 70%</p> <p>Considering that Ethiopia does not implement electronic payments, how do you guarantee transparency and that money reaches the right beneficiaries?</p>	<p>The FSPs transfer the cash to the beneficiaries who sign confirmation letters. Agencies also undertake spot monitoring.</p>
<p>In Madagascar there is unique rate for CWG, we are expanding and bringing in microfinance. Can Zimbabwe tell us the rates and process of negotiation?</p>	<p>There are no joint agreements established with microfinances since they are private-individual. As CWG we only create awareness regarding the opportunities.</p>
<p>In Burundi we only have 1 FSP for mobile money transfers which has the backing of the government. The rest of the FSPs are being phased out of business due to high taxes. How is Kenya handling this similar issue with one dominant FSP since I believe the dominant FSP is likely to charge higher service charge?</p>	<p>We use Safaricom because of they have infrastructure in most of the geographical areas. Also It's not only Safaricom currently in the market, we are always ready to engage others who have the potential to access the target locations with the needed infrastructures.</p>
<p>Zimbabwe: Who signs the MOU and who is Mukuru?</p>	<p>All agencies have to sign on MoU. Mukuru is the FSP.</p>

Agencies have different procurement requirements. When drafting the MOU, do you agree on a specific TOR to be adopted by all agencies during procurement? How legally binding is such a document?	Yes, and the document is legally binding to everyone who signs it. There are also consequences for FSP who shortchange what has already been agreed on.
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SESSION 5: THE URGENT NEED TO ACCELERATE THE USE OF CASH AND VOUCHER ASSISTANCE

This session was presented by CALP Director and covered two recently concluded research and the actions that need to be taken forward:

- [People-focused, effective aid: The urgent need to accelerate progress on cash and voucher assistance for people in crisis - The CALP Network](#)
- [Where Next? The Evolving Landscape of Cash and Voucher Policies - The CALP Network](#)

The two pieces of research cover the degree to which CVA can be scaled up, what an increase in CVA could mean for the functioning of the humanitarian system and how policy commitments have influenced change. Key findings indicate that there is a huge opportunity to scale up cash, however, the humanitarian system is limiting progress and there is no one primary switch or barrier to unlock the potential of CVA but rather several aspects that could be leveraged.

Participants were informed that CALP and USAID were going to convene stakeholders to develop a new collective vision to drive the development of CVA as a key means of achieving more people-centered and locally-led response.

The role of CWGs in scaling up CVA and some potential policy commitments that could help advance the two outcomes were discussed in breakout groups. Some key reflections from the groups were as follows

We could collectively commit to:

Locally-led Response:	People-centered
Deliberate engagement and investment to local actors. For example in any response x% of the funds to be channeled to local actors including indirect cost	Community based targeting, integrating gender dynamics into work, assisting people who may not necessarily meet KYC criteria.
Moving from contractor relationships to partnerships	Standardizing collection of recipient feedback to feed into broader programmes.
Ensuring capacity development for local actors and also systemize it.	Common complaints response and feedback mechanism across countries that can be used to inform community preferences.

Partnerships and alignment with governments to better understand the context. Also where possible the government should be the lead of the CWG	Committing to implementing what people tell us on the ground
UN and INGO's with resources to train the local NGOs-CWGs should also play a key role.	Reducing the use of in-kind assistance
If possible, CALP should lobby so that the government takes the lead in CWGs.	Pushing for increased amount of CVA in the HRP. Also include MPCA as separate chapter in the HRP
CWG to have identified budget/allocated resources for cash coordination training.	Ensuring we have a needs-based programming

DAY 1 RECAP

What was your big takeaway from yesterday's session? Some key issues mentioned by participants were:

- Working with FSPs and engaging them at the planning level.
- The South Sudan JIMMI platform - other countries were keen to adopt it
- Taking localization to the next level
- In Madagascar, the social protection programme needs advocacy to get more funding and cross-learning with Kenya to improve it.

SESSION 6: CVA AND LOCALLY LED RESPONSE: STRATEGIES TO IMPROVE LOCAL ACTORS' ENGAGEMENT IN CASH COORDINATION

This was a panel discussion on strategies to improve local actors' engagement in cash coordination. Panelists included Ahmed Ibrahim chair of the ASAL Humanitarian Network (AHN) (a network of national NGOs in Kenya), Ibrahim Garba - CCD Manager for South Sudan/CWG Co-chair of South Sudan and Francesca Sangiorgi Somalia Cash Consortium Coordinator/Somalia CWG Co-chair.

The following questions were discussed:

- In your experience, what are the main challenges or barriers local NGOs/actors face in effectively engaging in cash coordination efforts?
- What strategies or approaches have you found effective in overcoming these challenges and promoting greater engagement of local NGOs/actors in cash coordination?
- What are some successful examples of collaboration between INGOs and local NGOs/actors in cash coordination initiatives? Can you share specific case studies or experiences that highlight effective collaboration and engagement?
- If speaking on behalf of other LNGOs, what would be most useful for LNGOs in terms of the support (from different stakeholders) to actualize CVA and locally-led responses

The following main points were shared

In your experience, what are the main challenges or barriers local NGOs/actors face in effectively engaging in cash coordination efforts?

- Most local NGOs are small organizations and sometimes tend to compete with one another whereas INGOs appear to be well coordinated.
- There is a need to create opportunities for LNGOs to also Co-chair in the CWGs.
- Most of the projects implemented by LNGOs have low funding with short durations yet coordination requires longer time to start seeing the results. There is also needed to dedicate resources for capacity building/shared responsibilities for all actors. Collaboration of actors can help identify the gaps that need to be filled.

What strategies or approaches have you found effective in overcoming these challenges and promoting greater engagement of local NGOs/actors in cash coordination?

- Identify the barriers that inhibit LNGOs to participate in these forums. For example, meetings in Somalia take place inside the airport-need (which is sometime difficult for LNGOs to access) for mixed meetings or options for other areas.
- In Somalia, there is no forum for unifying local actors and this is a big gap.
- We need more dedicated resources for capacity building
- In Somalia local actors are also part of the HCT giving them a voice in making key policy decision

What are some successful examples of collaboration between INGOs and local NGOs/actors in cash coordination initiatives? Can you share specific case studies or experiences that highlight effective collaboration and engagement?

- Shifting the narrative from capacity building to exchange learning because national actors already have capacity and experiences that INGOs can benefit from.
- The collaborative Cash Delivery Platform (CCD) tries to ensure equal opportunity for both local and INGOs
- Using communication platforms that are more accessible to them including Whatsapp, Skype, Facebook etc
- Mentorship of local actors on cash coordination in light of the new cash coordination model that mandates local actors to be part of the leadership of cash coordination

If speaking for other LNGOs, what would be most useful for LNGOs in terms of the support (from different stakeholders) to actualize CVA and locally-led responses

- Capacity strengthening
- Inclusion of more local actors in processes such as data collection of market assessments within CWGs

Takeaways from the panel discussion:

- There is a need for radical change in regards to advancing the localization agenda.
- Issues of marginalization and exclusion of certain groups need to be taken into consideration.
- We have the responsibility of ensuring that local actors are engaged at all levels. A good example is ICCG level meetings where LNGOs are not engaged.

Local actors need to be coordinated among themselves. If possible, localization should be demonstrated within the counties.

Need to reach a point where local organization can receive funding directly.

SESSION 7: INTEGRATING CVA IN THE HUMANITARIAN PROGRAMME CYCLE (HPC)

The session began with a presentation from OCHA which gave an overview of Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP) and how CVA can be integrated in these processes.

The presentation focused on:

- What is a Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)?
- Cash in HNOs and HRP and –Information that needs to be included
- Section 1.6
- IASC Model and the HPC

Key takeaways

- CWGs and CVA implementers to engage in the HPC process including the HNO
- Cash feasibility should be part of the response analysis. The new cash coordination model new model underscores the role of CWG in supporting the process.
- Ensure integration of CVA throughout the document,. The MPC section -should include indicators and financial requirements.
- Explain modality choice, why CVA is used or not used, and include accurate reflections on indicators and financial requirements.
- Accountability for Affected Population (AAP) and CVA should be reinforced. Details should be included in response analysis including perception surveys, complains and feedback mechanisms.

(Detailed information on what should be included during cash in HRP and HNO can be accessed in the OCHA presentation)

Questions	Answers
Why is cash not seen as a sector and just as a modality e.g. in comparison to the logistics cluster	Cash shouldn't be classified as a sector. Cash is - a modality that can be used– perhaps what's needed is to elevate its importance in the coordination structure to deliver interventions in any sector
How can we involve local actors in the development of the HRP	Governments are involved in the HNO/HRP process although this may differ from context to context. Some of the baseline information in the HNO/HRPs (e.g population statistics/surveys) come from governments.
In regard to Section 1.6 -In Somalia HRP we have had a discussion for many years on whether this section should be budgeted or not. We receive a lot of pressure from the clusters not to budget for it. At the moment MPCA is budgeted under the Food Security cluster. Could OCHA give us guidance on this?	Section 1.6 can and in some cases should include clear understanding of issues around targeting and financing. There is nothing that should prevent financing for MPCA from being represented here if it is decided within the context. We have examples in Ukraine, Afghanistan and Nigeria, where the HRP contains an MPCA section with financing targets requested. There has been confusion in some contexts, especially with sectoral cash. However, the CAG will also work to unpack this in the coming year.

Even though HNO/HRP is a rigorous collaborative process including agencies and humanitarian organizations, the funding from this process is disproportionately allocated with UN agencies getting a bigger slice of the pie compared to other organizations. Why is this so?	There is no good response for this. I hear the frustration. This is not a cash-specific issue but a much larger issue which UNOCHA is not responsible for.
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

SESSION 8: THE NEW IASC CASH COORDINATION MODEL

The Inter Agency Standing Committee (IASC) has formally adopted a new cash coordination model, setting out the structure, function, leadership and resourcing of cash coordination. The new cash coordination model is an outcome of the Grand Bargain- Cash coordination caucus and was proposed/adopted in the Emergency Relief Coordination.

At the country level, the agreement is a “hybrid model” where OCHA is accountable for cash coordination in IASC & mixed settings and UNHCR is accountable for cash coordination in refugee settings. Existing Cash Working Groups in these contexts will be formalized with standard Terms of References (ToRs).

A global Cash Advisory Group (gCAG) has now been established and has developed the transition plan for the implementation of the model. This group is chaired/ convened by OCHA and UNHCR. The group answers the request for standards global tools, guidance and decision-making protocols.

In regard to localization, it is mainly translating commitment into action. gCAG is planning research to understand the barriers of local actors engaging in cash coordination. In addition, a workstream will be initiated under the Donor Cash Forum regarding sustainable financing for local actors co-chairs.

Some of the transition recommendations to CWGs include:

- Sharing new cash coordination model information with CWG members
- Updating TORs of CWGs in line with the new model
- Building local capacities and engagement within cash coordination mechanisms.
- Ongoing capacity building with emphasis on local actors
- Improving alignment between CWGs in mixed settings and sub- national groups
- There will be Key Performance indicators to help measure what is working and what isn't in the transition to the new cash coordination model

Questions/Comments	Answers
Can CWGs reach out to gCAG for support?	Yes, CWGs can reach out to CAG for support guidance, and sharing of some of the learning from different contexts. Also, Regional CWGs provide another platform for cross-learning. The CAG is also looking for a predictable way to engage with the regional CWGs so that they too can be channels for cross-fertilization at global level.

It would be good for the election process documents to be rolled out as quickly as possible	Most of the gCAG members are “double hatting” in between different roles hence there has been a delay in rolling out some key documents. Nevertheless, the CAG members are beginning to take a stronger look at the time dedication required and also engaging with donors on how to improve that.
Need clarification on who can be a programmatic Co-Chair.	Programmatic co-chair should be locally elected but the role is not limited to local actors. It could be an INGO. Nevertheless, local actor should be given priority
In Ethiopia UNOCHA doesn't have the capacity to take up the non-programmatic co-chair. How can we proceed forward with the transition	UNOCHA is strategically looking into this by reviewing short term and medium-term solutions. UNOCHA will be relying on surge partners such as CashCap for short-term solutions as it develops capacity.

SESSION 9: THE ROLE OF CWG IN ANTICIPATORY ACTION AND ADDRESSING CLIMATE SHOCKS

Give Directly made a presentation on how they leverage technology and building systems for program delivery at scale and anticipatory action.

Mobile money is used and the targeting methods combine both remote techniques (e.g satellite, machine learning) with in person household surveys and partnerships with NGO’s.

With regard to anticipatory action, It was stated that it is key to identify hotspots characterized by vulnerability, climate crisis, armed conflict and economic turmoil. The infrastructure should be tested to deliver well-timed and targeted assistance ahead of a disaster. It was also pointed out the need for better data informing us when to act by understanding how households use assistance leading to a disaster versus during or after.

They shared their experience of delivering cash remotely in settings where there is need to move in rapidly and at scale. The end-to-end process is done remotely using big data sources to identify eligible recipients and encourage people to self-enroll via digital tools. Cash is delivered via mobile money.

The Kenya CWG also presented on the role of CWGs role in anticipatory action. Pre-contracting FSPs, systems for flexible targeting and swift registration, access to functioning markets, and well-defined transfer values require thorough consideration and early planning. In terms of readiness, the following were done prior:

- Pre-crisis market mapping was done to understand the functionality of markets.
- FSP mapping and pre-agreements
- Beneficiary management systems and registration tools.
- Linking with social protection enhanced single registry.

- Review of SOPs and manuals to align with EA for CVA.
- Pre-positioning of cash in the M-Pesa platform.
- Stakeholder engagement.

For more information on this, please see the presentations enclosed

Questions/Comments	Answers
How do you verify the authenticity of data and duplication of beneficiaries?	We invested in data policy in the countries that we are working with. Mitigation measures are in place for those not using the same data i.e Safaricom and other mobile network operators
What is the turnaround time in your emergency response?	Sufficient time and resources are needed to build data algorithms. Therefore around 6 months- 1 year is needed before execution.
Targeting in Madagascar is quite a challenge. Why don't you use the social register to undertake the targeting?	We use social registry whenever it is available. E.g in Togo.
How much do you allocate for anticipatory action versus response in your global budget?	Cost of delivery information to be shared later
How is the use of satellite imagery undertaken what parameters are used? How about exclusion of the most vulnerable with this approach?	Satellite imagery helps you identify the type of community in that locality. Once you get the images, you consult with the government to confirm the same. Anticipatory action can be exclusionary. Pre-project sensitization help people understand what to expect. In Malawi, we use geo-targeting and in-person identification so that the vulnerable are not left out.
How do you reconcile similar names? What about those who do not have mobile phones or poor networks?	We distribute mobile phones to those who don't have. We also sometimes arrange for networks in areas where there is none.

SESSION 10: INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES: DATA INTEROPERABILITY - INCLUDING RISK ANALYSIS

This brief session was led by IFRC and explored the innovative technologies: Data interoperability - including risk analysis. It focused on how data interoperability can be done safely keeping in mind the risks from an innovative angle

The presentation was based on The Dignified Identities in Cash Assistance (DIGID) Interoperability project which aims at enabling dignified humanitarian assistance through safe data sharing between organizations and affected individuals. Pilot countries include Ukraine and South Sudan countries and Use Cases focus on organizational and individual referral and deduplication:

In summary, focused on the following elements

- What is interoperability and why
- Landscape mapping results
- Pilot Countries and Use Cases

For more information, please check out the presentation

Wrap Up

As the session drew to a close, it was communicated that all pertinent workshop documents would be disseminated to the participants for their reference. Additionally, a hyperlink to an evaluation survey for the workshop was provided, with attendees strongly encouraged to take a few moments to provide their valuable feedback.

Moreover, a proposal was put forth to reactivate the Skype group as a platform for communication, while also considering the utilization of Teams for continued interaction and exchange among the CWG Leads and Co-leads. This was adopted by the end of the meeting.

Annex 1 – Participants List

Name	Organization/CWG
Stephen Adeun	Uganda CWG
Peter Murgor	Kenya CWG
Jessa Serna	Somalia CWG
Francesca Sangiorgi	Somalia CWG
Mitiku, Masresha	Ethiopia CWG
Ibrahim Garba	South Sudan CWG
Muhammad Usman	South Sudan CWG
Albert Muraisa	Zimbabwe CWG
Clayton Mafuratidze	Zimbabwe CWG
Robert Okiror	Burundi CWG
Saadia Yahouza Iro Kode	Burundi CWG
Michael Ajwang	Rwanda CWG
Oswaldo de Lubrino	Mozambique CWG
Rindra RAKOTOARISOA	Madagascar CWG
Tsarahita Ghisbert RIVOMANANA	Madagascar CWG
Ahmed Ibrahim	ASAL Humanitarian Network (AHN)
Joy Maingi	UNOCHA
Juliet Lang	UNOCHA
Maguelone Arsac	UNHCR
Caroline Teti	Give Directly
Innocent Tshilombo	IFRC
Dennis Owano	CALP Network
Sapenzie Ojiambo	CALP Network
Maximilla Omengo	CALP Network
Karen Peachy	CALP Network