



**East and Southern Africa Regional Cash Working Group Leads
and Co-Leads Workshop Report**

23rd - 24th March 2021

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
MEB and Transfer Values	2
Questions & Answers Session.....	3
Country’s Experiences on MEB and Transfer Values	3
Available Resources.....	7
Sharing Successes and Challenges in CVA Coordination	7
Linking Humanitarian Assistance to Government Social Transfers	8
Available Resources.....	9
Country Experiences.....	9
Questions and Answers Session.....	9
Digitization of CVA and Data Protection	11
Questions and Answers	12
Cross Learning Session	13
Quality in CVA: MPC Outcome Indicators	13
Increasing uptake of MPC indicators.....	14
Conclusion	15
Annexes	Error! Bookmark not defined.

Introduction

Rationale for the workshop

The CALP Network East and Southern Africa Office closely engages with and supports Cash Working Groups in the region (there are 13 active CWG from 12 countries). Cash Working Group Leads and Co-Leads from different countries in East and Southern Africa came together to exchange learning, share experiences and discuss global and regional trends in cash and voucher assistance. The topics covered were; **Minimum Expenditure Baskets (MEBs) and Transfer values – What works? Linking Humanitarian Cash and Voucher Assistance to Government Social Transfers; Digitization of CVA and Data Protection and Multi-Purpose Cash Outcome Indicators.**

The workshop was participatory with facilitators coming in to guide discussions on various themes. Participants engaged in-group discussions to **share successes and challenges in CVA Coordination and discuss the topics covered.** This virtual event took place on 23rd & 24th of March from 10.00 am – 13.00 pm Nairobi / 11.00 am – 14.00pm Johannesburg.

Workshop Participants

The workshop attendance was an invites only to facilitate peer discussions amongst the CWG Leads/Co-Leads. The topics covered during the meeting were developed based on suggestions made by CWG Leads and Co-Leads

The workshop was chaired by Sapezie Ojiambo - CALP Regional Representative, East and Southern Africa and technical support was offered by Greg Rodwell - CALP Learning Delivery Lead. Julie Lawson-McDowall – CALP Technical Advisor, Rory Crew- Somali Cash Consortium Financial Services Lead, Nynne Warring-WFP Programme Policy Officer, Lena Hohfeld - WFP and Olivia Collins, an Independent Research and Evaluation Consultant, facilitated the different themes discussed at the workshop.

Session 1 – Minimum Expenditure Baskets and Transfer values – What works?

This was a Question and answer session to address participants' questions on MEBs and Transfer Values. Given that in 2020, CALP hosted a series of webinars focusing on the construction of quality MEBs, this session built on the knowledge participants gained from the webinar and provided space to discuss arising challenges. Facilitated by Nynne Warring and Lena Hohfeld (both from the World Food Programme (WFP)), the session aimed to draw collective learning from partners based on their field experiences.

A quick survey to determine if the CWGs represented had worked on an MEB was conducted prior to the presentation. Six out of ten participants confirmed that their CWGs had experience working on a MEB.

Presentation Key Highlights

- The MEB is not the same as the transfer value but we can use it to design the transfer value.
- In some cases, the poverty line has been used to establish MEB.
- The MEB does not necessarily capture all the needs of a household. It is an average consideration and captures the cost of essential/basic needs; it doesn't account for additional requirements of distinct groups such as pregnant women, etc.¹

Questions & Answers Session

Questions were referred from: the Q&A of the MEB webinar series, questions sent in ahead of the workshop and questions that arose from participants in attendance.

Questions	Answers
<p>1. The development of an MEB requires identification and quantification of basic needs items and services that can be monetized and that are accessible in adequate quantities through the local markets and services. How can you practically go about determining an EB?</p>	<p>There are different approaches to how you can construct an MEB. These are seen in the CALP tip sheet as well as the MEB webinar and the WFP guidance.² There are two approaches:</p> <p>Rights based approach which is like putting together a shopping list of what people would need and then pricing them in the local market. It is often a very sectoral approach and guided by international standards such as SPHERE standards. It is important to take into account the views of the people perhaps using a more qualitative approach such as Key Informant interviews, Focus Group discussions to ensure that the MEB meets their needs.</p> <p>Expenditure based approach: This is in line with how poverty lines are constructed. The theory is that, expenditure is the best way to understand consumption patterns and preferences, especially in developing countries. Rather than starting with itemizing, the idea is to start with the consumption patterns. The expenditure</p>

¹ The PowerPoint presentation is annexed to this report

² See the resources section for links

	<p>data is also usually available and can be unpacked for a particular cohort of people to build the MEB. One advantage of this approach is that with the right data one can have a good view of what people consume and what they want to consume because it is not about our view of what is important or if their consumptions fits within the sectors (as we know them). The assessment is not based on the poor people but rather on the general population, identifying those people who are able to meet their essential needs and how they prefer to spend their money.</p> <p>In practice, the two are usually combined to ensure that the MEB is both in line with people’s consumption patterns as well as adopting the rights lens.</p> <p>Data is needed for either approaches.</p> <p>Ground MEB in real consumption patterns and real behaviour. Check your MEB against reality too; - say the poverty line, check it against qualitative information that you already have. Don’t be totally blind to everything else.</p>
<p>2. In Ethiopia we are struggling to harmonize values for transfer for sectors and MPCT. What are the key things to consider to bring consensus mostly for MPCTs? At least we have some cluster guidelines.</p> <p><i>Scenario: The experience relates to response to the Tigray crisis where MEB has been created by different partners based on expenditure patterns. Different partners are conducting their own assessments to determine MEB. Donors have questioned the use of different transfer values in the same area by the different partners responding to the same emergency. The CWG has recommended a transfer value for adaptation by the partners. Another dilemma relates to the frequency of the transfers to recipients keeping in mind other factors like Covid, expenditure patterns, preventing misuse of cash, etc. How can guidelines be streamlined? We are not always able to harmonize but can come up with a few guidelines that can help with the planning and designing.</i></p>	<p>It is important to have a common understanding of what the MEB is. Ethiopia is a vast country and it may be okay that the MEB varies, geographically. We cannot and maybe shouldn’t always harmonize. On the one hand is to have a common understanding of what an analysis reveals (this is easy to obtain because of its reliance on data/evidence) and on the other knowing that programs are designed for different purposes. The gap to be filled might not be the same across organizations; for instance some organizations might be aligned to the social safety nets while others may have more immediate lifesaving objectives. These two do not just align and result in different transfer values. Therefore it’s more practical to talk of harmonizing based on common objectives.</p>
<p>3. How long can a reference MEB last?</p>	<p>There are two parts of the MEB that can change; there is the prices/cost of whatever you have in your MEB, then there is the MEB composition. These two keep changing with changes in the markets; the former should be monitored per month and is comparable to inflation rates</p>

	<p>and enables the CWG observe changes/trends in the market. You could make changes to your programme if you observe high inflation rates.</p> <p>The second, the composition of the basket, could change if say there is a shock or very significant change in prices that completely overhauls the consumption patterns. The changes that affect consumption patterns are not expected to occur on a monthly basis. It's important to remember that if composition of the consumption basket keeps changing, it becomes difficult to monitor trends over time. The composition of the basket could be possibly kept over several years depending on how the situation changes. Very strong justification is needed to review the composition of the basket.</p> <p>Market monitoring should not necessarily translate to transfer value adjustments; a certain threshold should be set to determine when it would be necessary for observed changes to necessitate transfer value adjustment. There is no overall recommendation on what the threshold should be, but it needs to make sense from a programmatic point of view. Frequent changes of transfer values can be confusing to partners, project recipients, etc. Transfer values should only change when there is a significant alteration in prices (inflation). Keeping the same MEB for several years can also help you monitor households that are below/above the MEB.</p>
<p>4. MEB is both food and non-food items. WFP has significantly reduced the quantity of food distribution; the current distribution is 60% of what the assistance had always been. Recipients of food assistance have possible deficits as they try to fill in the gap left by WFP and is bound to change their consumption patterns. Is this a strong justification to change the MEB?</p>	<p>This question is about a gap analysis rather than an MEB analysis because ideally, MEB is not informed by what assistance people are receiving but rather by minimum consumption patterns people would have in order to live a decent life. Think of the MEB as where we ideally want the population to be at. For practical reasons, we sometimes asses what populations are consuming from assistance to help us determine thresholds because some populations are so dependent on assistance. The gap to the MEB threshold may become larger when assistance is withdrawn. It may mean revising the transfer value but not necessarily the MEB.</p> <p>MEB can do much more than inform the transfer values, it can help us understand who falls above/below a certain threshold; help with monitoring inflation, etc but in most cases people are interested in MEB so as to know the transfer values. The effect of this is that most times, we therefore intertwine MEB and transfer values and it becomes difficult to delink what is an MEB/transfer value decision. Separating these two can be very difficult to do, especially within the auspices of a CWG which has various actors and each with their own maybe slightly different understanding of what is to be achieved.</p>

<p>5. In some contexts, needs vary a lot over seasons. How do you take these variations into account when developing the MEB?</p>	<p>There are different approaches to it: one can start by building an MEB whichever way you prefer to build it; it could be from expenditure data or with items. Build it as if it is the base/minimum threshold for the recurring needs of households. You could introduce what is called a season's top-up for the relevant season- e.g. the Syrian response in Turkey when top ups were given in the winter season- decide on when and to what extent the top ups can be given.</p> <p>Tiering transfers for specific populations/specific times could be another solution. It is important to conduct analysis of different population groups at different times so as to determine additional needs not captured in the base MEB that become apparent in different seasons/for different population groups. Cash implementation designs need to be informed by the analysis. However, cash implementation program designs will need to reflect distinctions of people in targeting or months with the different season, etc.</p> <p>It is important to take these season accounts into consideration at the point of data collection. It makes a difference if these are reflected in your expenditure approach - this is if you choose to use this approach.</p>
--	--

Country's Experiences on MEB and Transfer Values

Somalia

FSNAU developed Somalia's MEB in 2008 which was reviewed in 2017. The cost of the MEB is monitored every other month with support from partners who are collecting market data such as WFP VAM, FSNAU and others. The CWG synthesizes these and provides recommendations of two transfer values amounts for MPCA and the food basket. For MPCA, the CWG recommends providing at least 80% of the total cost of the MEB - both food and non-food MEB. However, some donors recommend 65%, sighting the lack of evidence to prove that households are only able to meet 20% of their needs. The CWG recommends providing 100% of the transfer values for the food basket. As much as monitoring is done monthly, recommendations are provided on a quarterly basis. Transfer values do not change every other month and may not necessarily change each quarter. The CWG is cognizant that partners are also guided by their budgets, donor requirements, etc.

Somalia was planning to have an MEB review of the contents of the Minimum Expenditure Basket. The revision process was expected to commence within the following months, and would be developed in consultation with the different clusters to determine essential needs. It was planned to be a HEA study that would look at expenditures at the household level and establish what expenses households were able to meet and based on this provide recommendations on the % MEB costs that transfer values should seek to meet when providing MPCA.

Kenya

The Kenya CWG initially commenced the MEB development process alone but realized the need for expertise and reached out to CashCap. CashCap supported Kenya to develop the MEB over a one year period. At the time of the meeting, Kenya had urban and rural versions of the MEB. Another MEB document, specific to refugee populations, was in the pipeline.

Available Resources

Some of the available resources offering further insights into developing MEB and transfer values were mentioned. These included:

- [CALP MEB Tip sheet](#)
- [Webinar Series – Improving our work on Minimum Expenditure Baskets](#)
- [Webinar Q&A](#)
- [Inclusion of Health Expenditures in the MEB](#)

Session 2: Sharing Successes and Challenges in CVA Coordination

Space was provided for sharing of experiences among the cash coordinators in small groups. 2020 was a challenging year for humanitarian work in the region with the multiple threats including the COVID pandemic, locust invasion, floods and escalating conflict. This session enabled the cash coordinators to discuss how they were responding and share success and challenges. At the end of the session, some of the highlights were shared in plenary. These are captured below.

Challenges	Successes/Solutions
Uganda reported inactive participation by partners/agencies in the national CWG. This could be attributed to the focal points' lack of CVA expertise.	In Uganda, there are efforts to try and reach down to the sub-national CWGs to enhance collaboration.
The South also sighted inactive participation, mainly as a result of challenges with staff retention- in terms of response, operations are scaling down.	Southern Africa could explore the idea of expanding the participant list to include different agency's regional advisors who may be seating in other regions but with mandate to support the Southern Africa region too.
Another challenge related to dealing with a fluid macro economy like that in Zimbabwe. How can inflation be effectively monitored to enable effective delivery of CVA?	<p>A good practice review document is being developed by the donor cash forum which aims to provide some kind of guidance on how to carry out cash and voucher assistance in such contexts. CWG leads were requested to scrutinize the draft and spot omissions, if any, for incorporation into the final document by the experts.³</p> <p>Harmonized market monitoring in cases of inflation; in Zimbabwe, there are instances when markets were monitored weekly due to the high inflation. The monitoring has been key in the design of CVA programming in the country.</p>

³ This is now available [here](#)

<p>CWG focal points in Malawi are employed for specific projects and exit when the projects end. There is therefore inconsistency in the composition of the CWG and knowledge management becomes difficult. Additionally, the District CWGs are not as engaged as the national CWG is.</p> <p>Zimbabwe, Kenya- No one within organizations has specific mandate to lead in cash coordination; many people are double/triple hatted. Sometimes government partners tasked to lead do not take lead.</p> <p>Large countries have a challenge in coordinating cash at regional levels. The uptake is low even when they receive support from the national CWG.</p>	<p>There is a new Leadership in Humanitarian Action: Handbook for the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator, which places the responsibility for resourcing of the CWG with the Resident coordinator. The resident coordinator is to ensure that the CWG sits in the right place in the humanitarian architecture and also that CVA is continually being considered as a modality of choice where appropriate. This could have a bearing on our advocacy efforts regarding the resourcing of CWG.</p>
<p>In Malawi, the lack of cohesion amongst partners to increase bargaining power with the mobile network operators/service providers is observed. Operators are interested to engage in CVA.</p>	
<p>There are communication issues, specifically internet shut down like in Ethiopia making it difficult to coordinate with those in affected areas.</p>	
<p>Burundi- Lack of technical expertise amongst representatives in the CWG.</p>	
<p>Lack of alignment with governmental social transfers.</p>	<p>Work with government to top-up/complement what they provide where harmonization proves implausible.</p> <p>Have donors support advocacy on transfer values with government. Zimbabwe shared successes it has had in maintaining a vibrant CWG including having three donors as CWG members. Zimbabwe developed a rural MEB in 2018 and an urban MEB in 2020, in the next few months, the CWG will finalize a refugee MEB as well as the CWG SOP.</p>

Available Resources

Some of the available resources mentioned included:

- [Cash coordination tip sheet:](#)
Specifically target CWG (leads and Members)
Covers all aspects of Cash Coordination including Management and Key activities of CWGs
Provides Good Practice, Key guidance and Resources

- [Leadership Humanitarian Action Handbook for the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator](#) – Clarifies where CWG sits in the humanitarian architecture and responsibility for resourcing it (yet to understand how this will impact cash coordination and resourcing)

Session 3. Linking Humanitarian Assistance to Government Social Transfers

The facilitator, Julie Lawson-McDowall – CALP Network Technical Advisor, gave a snapshot of the recent trends observed of the use of social protection approaches and cash, especially, in response to the economic impact of COVID-19. Her presentation riveted on the East and Southern regional experiences and concluded with the sharing of useful resources available for possible contextualization by practitioners.

Presentation Key Highlights

- The increasing interest in linking humanitarian assistance and government social transfers is because of greater scale and increased frequency of disasters, and recurring and protracted crises.
- Social protection is a great tool for building resilience in the long term.
- Progress (in terms of longer-term investment in social protection measures and trying to make these more flexible and responsive to shocks) is observed in countries where humanitarians have been active for a long time (e.g Somalia, Sudan, Malawi).
- A caution: it is always important to keep whatever achieves better outcomes for people in crisis. It is not about what is trendy. Assess each context independently – some crises may require a purely humanitarian approach.
- Linking Humanitarian CVA and social protection can be done in many different aspects beyond transfer values and common delivery platforms. Identify which aspects you are trying to link and why, be realistic too. One approach would be to adopt the building blocks designed by the Grand Bargain Sub-Working Group on Social Protection, namely Policy, Programme (design), and Administration.⁴

Available Resources

Useful resources to better understand this theme were shared. These included:

- A webinar from Social Protection.org and the Grand Bargain Sub-Working Group on [Linking Cash and Voucher Assistance and Social Protection](#)- Dec 2019
- [Five practical insights on linking humanitarian assistance and social protection](#)
- SPACES' over 23 resources which include a guide on [Linking Humanitarian & Social Protection Information Systems in the COVID-19 Response and beyond](#).
- CALP's capacity building materials, [Cash Coordination Tip Sheet](#) and [case studies and many other available](#) and upcoming resources on the CALP website.
- Social Protection in Crisis Contexts which recently set up a new D-group that has attracted experts who could offer useful guidance where needed. Follow [this link](#) to join this group.

Country Experiences

Kenya

⁴ The Power-Point is annexed to this report.

- Kenya CWG has had some successes linking CVA with the government social protection and safety nets. The CWG has been coordinating with the Ministry of Labor and Social Protection.
- Some partners used the national single registry to support vertical/horizontal expansion of transfers in their COVID-19 response.
- The National Social Protection Policy was reviewed in conjunction with representatives from the national CWG. Shock-responsive social protection that had been missing was included in the review process.
- Conversation towards harmonizing M&E tools stalled due to disruption by COVID-19 but there are plans to pick up conversations on this.
- The government and the CWG have together reviewed the social registry and are currently developing a single registry for social transfers for use by government as well as humanitarian actors.

Questions and Answers Session

Questions	Answers
1. Would you kindly speak more about the successes Kenya is recording in working with government social registries?	The CWG has worked with government to review the registration tool and looked at the kind of data that needs to be collected by both humanitarian and government actors in the process of registering recipients. Harmonizing of these details enhances cross data sharing as well as data upload onto the single registry. The CWG is working in partnership with the government to develop a single register that will be used for social assistance and CVA delivery throughout the country. Currently, during interventions, the humanitarian actors ask government for data for a given area and verify the list against their target criteria.
2. Could you comment on government registry of populations in need and data protection, especially when it concerns refugees, those who are returning back to their countries? Are there any challenges or concerns experienced?	There are data concerns on single registries. The data responsibility study by CALP (Linda Ranfree and Anna Kondakhchyan) provides some useful insights which could be starting points. ⁵ It is important to analyse the different contexts to determine how to go about data sharing. A risk assessment enables practitioners to ensure that the people at risk get the maximum protection. Share data sets on a need to know basis etc.
3. How involved are the CWG members in the registration of beneficiaries in the Kenya single registry?	It is still work in progress. We have begun by first updating the current data before putting new data -it is phased progress. The Government is taking lead but it is seeking to partner with various members of the CWG.
4. How to engage government social protection. PSNP is focused on food and public work issues - it is a productive	During Covid 19, it is observed that the countries in the region that employed social protection approaches in their response are those that have had long-term engagement

⁵ [Case study: Responsible data sharing with governments, March 2021](#) By Linda Raftree, Anna Kondakhchyan

<p>safety net. How do you engage on CVA within such a setup?</p>	<p>with and to some extent dependence on external funding/actors.</p> <p>PSNP is envisioned by Ethiopia to be a big national social protection system that is different and has flexibility built in. There are tools, concepts and frameworks, but there is also need to always have to be alive to the context, funding stream, main actors and what's appropriate. Approaches cannot be pushed onto a government. One needs to go step by step and build evidence, alliances so as to develop an approach that fits.</p>
---	---

Session 4 - Digitisation of CVA and Data Protection

This session aimed at demystifying the issues around Digitisation of CVA and Data Protection. The chair acknowledged the benefits to digitization of data in CVA and in the same breath reminded the partners of the many risks that require mitigation as we embrace this. The session was formulated around the Data Responsibility Toolkit recently launched by CALP. Rory Crew- Somali Cash Consortium, facilitated the session.

The presenter briefly shared his experiences in digitization in CVA. An overview of the CALP data responsibility tool-kit, and summary feedback from the maiden webinar organized by CALP to get initial reactions from actors on the toolkit were shared.

Key Highlights

- There is increased use of the cash modality, with a greater % of humanitarian assistance moving to cash programming by the year. In addition, centralization of databases, closer government partnerships, and the move to large scale safety nets implemented alongside governments and greater expectations across the world of data protection all contribute to the increased importance of data protection by humanitarian actors.
- There are very few other programmes that collect as much personal data and for such a long period of time as cash programmes.
- The CALP data responsibility toolkit is accompanied by two case studies namely: Responsible Data Sharing with Governments and Data Responsibility and Digital Remote Targeting during COVID-19.
- The toolkit is broken down in 7 tip sheets, each 5 pages long so that practitioners have the ability to refer to whichever section they seek more information on to aid programme implementation.
- There is move to focus on the ethics of the use and management of data beyond data/information security and data protection.
- The toolkit also discusses the lawful basis for processing data, the toolkit considers GDPR as a standard of data protection legislation that we could aspire to even if we may not all be bound by it, especially in operation contexts that lack legislation to regulate data.
- Informed consent as a basis for processing data may not be the best justification to process beneficiary data. As cash actors, the reality is that most people will say yes to cash and many may

not necessarily have the literacy relating to data responsibility. So going beyond consent and embracing legislation informed by years of research and evidence was recommended.

- There is need to undertake due diligence when partnering with private sector actors such as banks and mobile money operators, and find out what it is they intend to do with the shared data, how they store data, etc.
- Think about the role that CWG could play in centralizing the due diligence mandate. Context must be considered
- It is important to prepare for data breaches and test incident protocols.
- Voice IDs, selfies and other biometrics can possibly be adopted other than relying on national systems and FSPs. However, caution is given regarding blanket use of biometrics - important to consider the full implications.
- There are strategies that practitioners can use to manage data-sharing requests from government authorities. See case study on responsible data sharing with governments.

How can the CWGs promote data responsibility?

Participants considered the following question in break-out groups -What role can a CWG play in promoting data responsibility? Summary feedback from the breakout rooms is provided below:

- Conduct trainings including for technical teams and information managers
- Ensure that the information trickles down beyond programme staff in the various organizations
- Cross-function meetings/working is vital- for instance when having discussions around data protection design and planning, have your HQ data protection officer, enumerator, programme manager, IT staff, etc present
- Carry out dissemination meetings with the private sector
- Conduct a webinar on use of the tool (attach previous webinar link)
- Establish sub-cash working groups to ensure data responsibility is systematically discussed
- Harmonized but flexible data responsibility guidelines; for instance the Ethiopia CWG is developing guidelines with the basics of data responsibility for possible reference by different actors with varied frameworks
- Reach organizational leadership with the data responsibility guidelines

Questions and Answers

Questions	Answers
<p>1. One of the things Uganda is aiming to achieve is interoperability also between FSPs so as to enhance cash delivery assistance in Uganda. Have you encountered examples where FSPs share data amongst themselves, for instance mobile network providers?</p>	<p>Interoperability drive in Somalia is large and well-funded but leadership is lacking. Somalia CWG has for a long time been working on interoperability but with much more focus on putting in place data sharing agreements than on the technical side of data sharing which is rather straight forward. The greatest challenge in interoperability is matters around data responsibility and leadership. It takes a long time to build agreements because consent is needed. We may not know what the FSP will do with the data and there is also no national legislation around data responsibility. To achieve interoperability, leadership is needed. Government should ideally take leadership on interoperability with</p>

	the necessary support from stakeholder groups. In most countries, under the social protection mandate, interoperability and data sharing falls with government.
--	---

Country Experience

In Madagascar, the government has strong leadership in data management. The government and partners have experience in social protection that is shock responsive from the recent COVID-19 response. Partners had access to the social registry to cross check beneficiaries and avoid duplication. Madagascar could be a good case study concerning leadership of data management.

Recommended Resources

For this session, a few resources that could offer further insights relating to the theme of data responsibility were recommended.

- [Data responsibility toolkit and case studies – Guidance for cash and voucher practitioners](#)
- Give Directly [Case Study: Data Responsibility and Digital Remote Targeting during Covid-19](#)
- [Case study: Responsible Data Sharing with Governments](#)
- [Why Data Rights Matter by Oxfam](#) – Offers an overview of why data rights is so important to humanitarian and development work

Session 5 – Cross-Learning Session

This session was an open session for CWG leads and co-leads to discuss challenges and identify areas where more guidance or advice may be needed. A shared document, annexed to this report was used to summarize the input. Groups of two to three people explored challenges for 15 minutes. The second part of the session entailed sharing of advice in response to the challenges that were listed.

Session 6 - Quality in CVA: Revisiting Multi-Purpose Cash Outcome Indicators

The session provided space for CWG Leads to discuss and clarify the Multi-Purpose Cash Outcome indicators as well as contribute to their review process by feeding back experiences. Olivia Collins, an independent consultant who was working with CALP to collect feedback on the MPC Outcome Indicators at the time, facilitated the session. The session included an introduction of the MPC outcome indicators and the rationale for their review, as well as collection of feedback on their use from participants.

Presentation Key Highlights

- MPC Indicators can support better and more consistent measuring of the outcomes to which MPC contributes. Comparison of data sets across different contexts may prove to be ambitious, but it can be helpful as a checklist to determine the best way to monitor MPC assistance.
- The adoption of MPC Indicators is important to better understand perspectives of MPC recipients; this fits into the people centered approach advocated for by the grand bargain.

- The requirement is to have at least have three sectoral indicators depending on the objective of the cash programme. This may also be based on what is included in the MEB.
- Instructions on how to use the MPC indicators are contained in the guidance
- It emerged that there had been a challenge in using the indicators in the region. This is in part because there are many areas where MPC was still new.
- Challenges with the formulation of the indicators themselves were reported. These were fed back into the review process as this was in part the purpose of the session.

Why the push for common MPC Indicators?

Group Work

An opportunity was given to participants to discuss the cross cutting indicators and offer any suggestions for improvement. The shared document is annexed to this report.

Role that CWGs can play in increasing uptake of MPC Outcome indicators

The revised MPCA indicators will be finalized during the year. Once this is done, CWGs can play a role in increasing their uptake. The hope was that donors will also sign up to it and encourage their partners to use it.

- Start with where MPCA is being used and disseminate learning as quickly to other contexts.
- Monitoring systems are usually in place where MPCA is already being delivered. Such partners may have contextualized some of the indicators already and could share their experience, including tools/monitoring approaches, with those just starting MPCA.
- Uganda has an Assessment technical working group that could help people understand how to monitor indicators, especially MEAL colleagues.
- Pooling resources together for joint assessment and joint monitoring by CWGs.
- In scenarios of harmonized monitoring systems – for instance, in 2012, a number of organizations in Somalia came together to join their efforts in monitoring MPC with the same tools and to aggregate the data to establish that MPC was having a positive outcome and was appropriate.
- The MPC indicators can be presented in CWG meetings and partners encouraged to determine their own approach to adopting them. This could be a joint approach or individual partners co-opting these into their monitoring efforts.
- CALP could help disseminate information once the indicators are out through brief slides. These will be in addition to a brief presentation with the data responsibility tool kit overview.

Wrap-Up

A recapitulation of the discussions over the two days was done.

Some of the agreed actions included:

- CALP to share links to all the documents referred to during the sessions as well as other relevant want that are deemed useful
- CALP to share the notes and power-point slides
- CWG leads and co-leads to use the existing Skype group to continue with discussions on topics on interest

- CWG leads and co-leads to join the Global Cash coordinators group
- CWG leads and Co-leads to keep in touch with CALP and flag where CALP can support. The following ways in which CALP could support and work with CWGs were shared:

How CALP can support CWGs in the region

- Sign-posting of resources: A variety of resources being developed in CVA and not always easy to find. CALP can point you to existing resources relevant for your work.
- Technical support to CWGs: On specific projects for example development of MEBs PS. This is not surge capacity as provided by CashCap but more in form of guidance
- Addressing evidence Gaps and synthesis of existing information: Support specific pieces of work in countries based on evidence of need and availability of resources
- Facilitating learning and knowledge sharing: Including access to training and experience /knowledge sharing activities
- Facilitating collective action by CALP members and others: For example, towards advocacy on policy issues (at country and regional level)
- Support exploration of practical ways forward on key issues: e.g. CALP is supporting a CVA for health workshop at EA regional level to map responses and identify the key issues

Annexes

Annex 1- MEB Presentation



MEB Presentation,
WFP.pdf

Annex 2- Data Responsibility in CVA



Data responsibility
FINAL.pdf

Annex 3- Cross-Learning Session



Cross-Learning
Session.pdf

Annex 4- Review of MPC Outcome Indicators



Review-of-MP