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CASHCAP IN A MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE WITH COMMUNITIES
CANVAS. How can CashCap be more engaged with, and more accountable to, the communities it serves?

KEY PARTNERS TO ENGAGE WITH
Aligning initiatives to operationalize community engagement and accountability in Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) and market-based programming (MBP) with wider CwC/CEA strategies in Country can amplify efforts and build wider buy-in.

- Identify, map and engage with CwC, C4D, CEAs, or AEP coordination fora, independent organizations, collective initiatives, and Experts to:
  - Increase efforts to shift the current way of working into one that is more effective and practical for working in partnership with communities.
  - Support the setup of inter-agency, collective and independent accountability mechanisms that allows cash recipients and communities to provide feedback on cash and voucher assistance and participate in decision-making.
  - Enable the systematic collection and analysis of evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on program and operational quality in CVA.
- Advocate for the importance of community engagement, involvement and accountability at all stages of the project cycle in cash and voucher responses and market-based programming.
- Strengthen the knowledge and skills of CwC partners on communication and community engagement in a commitment to enhancing program quality, appropriateness and accountability in Cash and Voucher Assistance.

KEY ACTIONS TO ENSURE MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE DURING 2020/2023
CashCap will work towards improving the quality, appropriateness and effectiveness of CVA, and accountability of aid provision, through an increased role of CashCap Experts in promoting meaningful two-way communication, engaging directly with communities and partners, and being accountable to them.

ACTION #1: Strengthen understanding of and capacity to implement community engagement and accountability across CashCap experts
ACTION #2: Integrate community engagement and accountability into CashCap’s ways of working so it becomes a standard approach for all experts
ACTION #3: Build evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on program and operational quality in CVA
ACTION #4: Increase organizational support and resourcing to institutionalize and implement community engagement and accountability in CVA
ACTION #5: Promote a culture of meaningful participation and accountability internally among CashCap Experts and externally with communities and partners.

THE ROLE OF MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE WITH WHO WE SERVE
AFFECTED POPULATIONS AND COMMUNITIES RECEIVING ASSISTANCE SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT THEIR LIVES.

CashCap commits to increase efforts to systematically integrate accountability and community-led approaches across deployments and operations to enhance the way CashCap works when providing multi-agency support and the services it provides. This includes CashCap support to:

I. OPERATIONAL AGENCIES: To United Nations Agencies and INGOs, ensuring that there is special attention to recognize and support the capacity at the local level, which could include community-based organizations, local civil society groups, local authorities, etc.
II. INTER-AGENCY COORDINATION STRUCTURES, such as CwC, Clusters, and ICG
III. NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS
IV. DONORS

WHAT WOULD SUCCESS IN HAVING A MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE LOOK LIKE?
CashCap Experts have contributed actively to:
- Communities having access to appropriate, timely, and coordinated information about cash and voucher assistance
- Affected people having accessible and equitable opportunities to participate and provide input into decision making processes in CVA
- Cash practitioners are consistently listening and acting based on communities’ feedback, voices, and meaningful participation in CVA
- Cash practitioners are consistently listening and acting based on communities’ feedback, voices, and meaningful participation in CVA
- Cash practitioners are consistently listening and acting based on communities’ feedback, voices, and meaningful participation in CVA
- Cash practitioners are consistently listening and acting based on communities’ feedback, voices, and meaningful participation in CVA

CASHCAP’S ADDED VALUE TO MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE WITH COMMUNITIES
CashCap responds only to multi-agency requests, which enables Experts to remain independent of single agency agendas and thus support a broad humanitarian response. This way of working offers a safe space for communities to engage in meaningful dialogue and amplify their voices, sharing their perspectives with the CVA community.

CashCap Experts are well placed to bring people’s voices into Cash Working Groups, fostering key discussions within coordination structures and among decision-makers about listening to and acting on people’s feedback, voices, and meaningful participation in CVA. They have a role as a catalyst for collaboration and coordination among partners and of providing multi-agency support to achieve the goals of planning, coordination, implementation, and MEAL of CVA across sectors putting people at the center. They promote and support inter-agency initiatives that facilitate decision making explicitly informed by the views of affected people.

Community engagement is designed to be context-specific, localized, responsive, and bidirectional. Prescriptive protocols for community engagement risk encouraging top-down approaches that, by definition, do not adequately involve community participation. Therefore, CashCap’s approach towards CEA initiatives and priorities should always be a two-way conversation and enable a bottom-up approach. New initiatives tried and tested at the national level can be taken up as learnings and can contribute to regional and global conversations, bringing the element of flexibility in their approaches and policies.

MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE INTO CASHCAP’S WAY OF WORKING
CashCap strength comes from the services it provides, the procedures in place and the availability of funding. And most of all from our Experts on the ground. It is key to streamline CEA in what we do, how we work, resource it accordingly and strengthen the skills of our pool of Experts;
- CashCap Global Team and Steering Committee members should play a key role in enabling and advocating for CEA activities in Cash Operations.
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KEY RESOURCES
Despite its cross-cutting attributes, community engagement requires systemization, resources, and sound policies to ensure quality and accountability. It requires stable, flexible and institutional human, and financial resources to support activities to engage with affected communities, to enable dialogue with multiple stakeholders about CEA and CwC, and to facilitate training, coaching, P2P learning, lessons learned documentation and advocacy to decision-makers.

KEY BARRIERS IDENTIFIED
Barriers to meaningful participation at the operational level identified by CashCap Experts during interviews (Lack of buy-in; identifying valid community spokespeople; humanitarian architecture; appropriate methodologies and skills). Barriers to meaningful participation at the operational level identified by the two field pilots.

SOURCES: Transcription of Open dialogue with CashCappers (8 CashCap Expert interviewed with more than 6 hours of footage transcribed) and learnings from Participatory Video pilot in Uganda and Colombia. (link)
“I would suggest, for example, that instead of paying us a rent, they could help us with housing, because the conditions of our houses are in very bad shape, especially when it rains, it leaks inside. Our houses are leaking inside. It rains more inside than outside.”

Gladys García de Borges – Venezuelan. Participant -Cash transfer program - Action Against Hunger, Maicao, Colombia
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If you have any questions, feedback or suggestions, please contact:

Maria Jimena Peroni Galli, CashCap Response Team, jimena.peroni@nrc.no
KEY CONCEPTS

Many terms are currently in use to refer to communicating with communities including; communicating with disaster-affected communities, communicating with communities, #commisaid, Communication for Development (C4D) in Emergencies, beneficiary communication, Communication, Engagement and Accountability (CEA) (link). The following definitions for key concepts are proposed in this document, based on a review of the resources related to the subject. It is expected these definitions can be further refined in line with increasing progress and evidence base, whilst ensuring terminology is acceptable to national governments, CashCap’s hosting agencies and Working Groups,

• ACCOUNTABILITY to affected populations (AAP) is an active commitment to use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people humanitarian organizations seek to assist (IASC, 2011 and revised Commitments 2017).

• COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES, refers to activities where the exchange of information is used to save lives, mitigate risk, enable greater accountability and shape the response, as well as supporting the communication needs of people caught up in conflicts, natural disasters and other crises (CDAC).

• COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT includes processes to systematically listen to, engage and communicate with people and communities to better understand their diverse needs, vulnerabilities and capacities; to gather, respond to and act on feedback and input about their priorities and preferences; and to provide safe and equitable access and opportunities to actively participate in decisions that affect them (IFRC, 2020).

• CORE HUMANITARIAN STANDARDS ON QUALITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY (CHS) has nine commitments underscoring the need and drive to a more systematic and coordinated approach to communication and community engagement with affected people. In particular, three out of the nine commitments focus on increased community engagement.

Commitment no. 4: Communities and people affected by crisis know their rights and entitlements, have access to information, and participate in decisions that affect them;

Commitment no. 5: Communities and people affected by crisis have access to safe and responsive mechanisms to handle complaints, and

Commitment no. 7: Communities and people affected by crisis can expect delivery of improved assistance as organizations learn from experience and reflection.

1 IASC Revised AAP Commitments, 2017, (link)
2 CDAC, Definition and key advocacy messages for Communication with Communities (link)
3 Movement-wide Commitments for Community Engagement and Accountability, 2019 (link) and CLOSING THE GAP: A strategy to strengthen community engagement and accountability in Africa. A joint product of the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC) in Africa and CDA Collaborative Learning Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability, 2014 (link)
4 Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability, 2014 (link)
• **LOCALIZATION.** There is no single definition of “localization”. In the Grand Bargain\(^6\), signatories committed, under the heading of “more support and finding tools to local and national responders,” to “making principled humanitarian action as local as possible and as international as necessary” while continuing to recognize the vital role of international actors, in particular in situations of armed conflict. Other actors have developed their definitions and localization objectives. Links between localization and the Participation Revolution are strong and should be promoted\(^7\).

• **TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION** engages communities in a dialogue, by managing the information both sent to and received from assistance recipients and integrating their feedback into the decision-making process of programmes (IFRC, 2011)

• **PARTICIPATION REVOLUTION.** Includes people receiving aid in making decisions that affect their lives. It seeks to integrate meaningful participation in practice. It seeks to support permanent and sustainable change in the way we do business, promote the link between effective participation and the quality and effectiveness of humanitarian response and promote the evidence that participation is happening at the agency level through Grand Bargain Annual reporting (IASC) through Work Stream #6\(^8\).

---

\(^6\) The Grand Bargain – A Shared Commitment to Better Serve People in Need (link)

\(^7\) CDAC, ACF, Start Network Localisation in practice: emerging indicators and practical recommendations (link)

\(^8\) A participation revolution: include people receiving aid in making the decisions which affect their lives (link)
THE ROLE OF MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE WITH WHO WE SERVE

Affected population and communities. Affected populations have greater choice and can cover their needs in a dignified, effective, and efficient manner (Source: CashCap Strategic Document).

CashCap commits to increase efforts to systematically integrate accountability and community-led approaches across deployments and operations to enhance the way CashCap works when providing multi-agency support and the services it provides. This includes CashCap support to:

- **Operational Agencies.** To United Nations Agencies and INGOs, ensuring that there is special attention to recognize and support the capacity at the local level, which could include community-based organizations, local civil society groups, local authorities, etc.

- **Inter-agency coordination structures,** such as CWG, Clusters, and ICG

- **National governments**

- **Donors**

Current data shows “that people generally do not feel included in decisions that affect them”. This is a far cry from the commitments of Participatory Revolution “to include people who receive aid in making decisions that affect their lives”. Findings from opinions collected from over 10,000 individuals from crisis-affected countries in different parts of the world, by Ground Truth Solutions, captured that people said aid is fairer and they feel more respected when decision-making is participatory. However, the way people’s views are taken into account remains limited and people have limited clarity over why they do or do not qualify for aid, what they receive, and for how long.

CashCap aims to ensure that CVA meets its potential, to be an effective and efficient tool at all stages of a crisis response. In doing so, it promotes the benefits of cash assistance where appropriate as an effective and people-centered modality that systematically considers recipients’ choices and preferences. Recent evidence reveals CVA recipients are generally more positive when asked if their needs are met, on average, responding higher on a five point Likert scale compared with those receiving only in-kind aid. They have also been found to be more likely to say that aid helps them to become self-sufficient when compared with people not receiving CVA.

---

1 Humanitarian Voice Index, Policy Brief: Participation Revolution (link)
2 IASC, Participation Revolution Workstream 6, Co-conveners: USA and SCHR.
4 Ground Truth Solution, Policy Brief, Cash Barometer.
humanitarian assistance more tailored to individuals’ needs. This can span across into the development sector too.

**CashCap believes in ensuring appropriate and better quality CVA.** CashCap’s Participatory Video with Venezuelans and Colombian returnees who received cash transfers, clearly shows how lack of timely information and community engagement in exiting CVA interventions can diminish the impact of Cash Assistance. This concern of inadequate information is also picked up by Cash Barometer data collected by Ground Truth Solutions. While CVA recipients are more likely to say they feel informed about aid than those who do not receive CVA, there is still much work to be done to ensure the focus of CVA delivery shifts from scaling up CVA to better quality and appropriate CVA. Furthermore, despite its capacity to improve choice and respond to recipient’s preferences providing cash and voucher assistance, this alone does not ensure dignity. Timely and adequate information is part of the answer to better quality CVA. It must be accompanied by good communication and community engagement on key issues such as eligibility, number, and frequency of transfers, for how long, etc. Lack of information and participation is not, of course, a challenge specific to CVA, but offers a conduit for promoting best practice across sectors.

**CashCap is committed to strengthening the links between two key workstreams of the Grand Bargain – effective participation and appropriate use of quality CVA.** Acknowledging that humanitarian agencies do not go far enough to engage assistance recipients in humanitarian programming and decision-making; community engagement, and greater participation can enable in the building of trust and acceptance. This enhances the relevance of assistance, which in turn improves the quality of programming.

**Ground Truth Solutions, Cash Barometer**

Awareness of eligibility. Do you know how aid agencies decide who receives cash support and who does not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>YES (%)</th>
<th>NO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OECD, Live in Crises, p. 10–11.

Their average response is a small but significantly higher, statistically, on a five-point Likert scale (0.2 points). This pattern holds true in all countries surveyed except Iraq. This could mean that CVA tends to go to people who understand the aid system better, or that CVA providers are comparatively better at explaining the assistance on offer (Ground Truth Solution, 2019).

The Participation Revolution in Grand Bargain commitments call for deeper community engagement and stronger accountability, through continuous contribution to the following actions:

- **in-country collective leadership and coordination mechanisms to demonstrate that operational decision-making is explicitly informed by the views of affected people, disaggregated by sex, age, and vulnerabilities.**
- **providing essential and life-saving information to affected people and systematically collecting, reporting, and acting on feedback from affected people at key decision points in the program cycle, as well as sharing with communities how programming has been adapted to reflect their feedback and perspectives.** When possible, the feedback from affected people is complemented and verified by affected people’s views and perspectives collected independently from the organization providing assistance. Aid recipients who reported giving feedback on aid programs “were 3.5 times more likely to say that they had been treated with dignity and respect” than those who did not, and “data shows that where people do feel their views are taken into account, they find aid fairer.”

**Ground Truth Solutions, Cash Barometer**

Do you know how agencies decide who receives cash or voucher assistance to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES (%)</th>
<th>NO (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*OECD, Live in Crises, p. 10–11.

Ground Truth Solution, Cash Barometer, Kenya, Iraq.
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**Ground Truth Solutions, Cash Barometer**

Do you know how long you will be receiving cash or voucher assistance for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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ensuring that all segments of the affected population can engage in effective participatory processes\(^2\), enabling “unfiltered representation of aid recipients’ perspectives” across multiple levels of humanitarian decision-making.\(^3\)

- donors requiring and enabling aid organizations and the Humanitarian Response Plans to provide evidence of how affected people’s input has been considered and how information about the response is being fed back to affected people\(^4\). Collaboration and agreements reached by donors through the Common Donor Approach (CDA) and Joint Donor Statement on Humanitarian Cash Transfers\(^5\), give clear instructions that donors want cash programs provided in a way that maximizes accountability to people affected by crises. They commit to support (and prioritize) interventions which include effective and inclusive and actionable feedback mechanisms, and in which affected people have meaningful inputs into program design.

\(^{1}\) Grand Bargain, Workstream 6, Participatory Revolution: Success indicators against good practices related to participation of people affected by crisis in humanitarian decisions, September 2019.


\(^{3}\) Grand Bargain, Workstream 6, Participatory Revolution, p.3

\(^{4}\) Konyndyk J. and Worden R, p.7

\(^{5}\) Grand Bargain, Workstream 6, Participatory Revolution, p.3 and 4

\(^{6}\) The following donors EU/GD ECHO, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are signatories of the Joint Donor Statement, March 2019. In addition, Australia, Canada and Denmark have agreed to the common Donor Approach.

"That the message that we discuss here, it appears there. which means that it becomes from the world. It goes up to here. these people from this meeting here, are discussing about what we talked here"

Refugee Women from South Sudan, Participatory Video, Adjumani, Uganda, February 2019. You can hear it at [link]
CashCap responds only to multi-agency requests, which enables Experts to remain independent of single agency agendas and thus support a broad humanitarian response. This impartial role means CashCap Experts serve a combination of high-level decision-makers, coordination structures, cash and market working groups, and technical projects at Country, Regional and Global Level (link). This way of working offers a safe space for communities to engage in meaningful dialogue and amplify their voices, sharing their perspectives with the CVA community (i.e. without agency-specific visibility and operational linkages).

CashCap Experts are well placed to bring people’s voices into Cash Working Groups, fostering key discussions within coordination structures and among decision-makers about listening to and acting on people’s feedback, voices, and meaningful participation in CVA. They have a role as a catalyst for collaboration and coordination among partners and of providing multi-agency support to achieve the goals of planning, coordination, implementation, and MEAL of CVA across sectors putting people at the center. They promote and support inter-agency initiatives that facilitate decision-making explicitly informed by the views of affected people.

Community engagement is designed to be context-specific, localized, responsive, and bidirectional. Prescriptive protocols for community engagement risk encouraging top-down approaches that, by definition, do not adequately involve community participation. Therefore, CashCap’s approach towards CEA initiatives and priorities should always be a two-way conversation and enable a bottom-up approach. New initiatives tried and tested at the national level can be taken up as learnings and can contribute to regional and global conversations, bringing the element of flexibility in their approaches and policies (link).

Barriers to meaningful participation in humanitarian response have been well documented by many stakeholders including ALNAP, CDA Collaborative Learning Projects, IASC Accountability to Affected People Workstream, IFRC, CDAC and ODI. We sought to understand barriers from the perspective of CashCap Experts and engaged with them for the first time, in an open dialogue with a CwC Expert to discuss the topic. We applied the very same tools piloted in Colombia in our interviews with CashCap Experts, to allow them to directly experience methods of dialogue themselves (link). The interviews were organized on the spot, during the CashCap Learning Event in Doha, November 2019. Eight CashCap Experts volunteered to be interviewed. The Meaningful Dialogue with Communities Initiative wanted to hear from CashCappers about their realities and challenges around community engagement, participation, accountability, and overall people-centered approach. Some of the questions that guided the open conversation are referenced². All the interviews were transcribed and the interviews created almost 4 hours of footage. Unedited material was shared with CashCap peers after obtaining consent, allowing them to listen to the interviews. The 2 pilots on Participatory Video in Uganda (link) and Colombia (link), provided insightful learnings on challenges also.

² What is your opinion about the approach of putting people in the center of cash programming? Do you have a practical example in your deployments of this concept put into practice? What is your view on Accountability to Affected Population, do you think it’s an important theme? Do you perceive it’s becoming more and more a reality on the ground or is it still more a global level discussion? Have you had any practical experience with listening directly to the affected communities views on Cash programming? Have you ever had the opportunity for example to ask a community member how Cash was affecting his/her life and if they had a suggestion to give to the Cash community? Would you like to have more of this kind of opportunity in your day-to-day? Do you think that in general, agencies and partners implementing Cash are listening to communities’ feedback and recommendations on ‘how to better assist them’?, Have you ever utilized data that raises and brings communities’ voices and perceptions during Cash Coordination Groups to guide your decisions? Can you tell us about any related experience? What do you think are the biggest blockers for putting communities in the center of Cash response? Do you have any recommendations moving forward? Open mic – space for interviewees to speak freely what’s important to them.
BARRIERS TO MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION AT THE OPERATIONAL LEVEL IDENTIFIED BY CASHCAP EXPERTS DURING INTERVIEWS

Lack of buy-in

- Community engagement and accountability is not well understood, including why it matters, what is its role in CVA programs and operations, and how to implement it in practice.
- Targeting mechanisms and methods, tend to overlook the importance of accountability and how fair the method is perceived by the affected people. Targeting surveys can generate anxiety, more rumors and concerns, and reinforce an environment of distrust of each other.
- Lack of investment, willingness or use of the data when participatory, qualitative and less extractive approaches are used in assessments, M&E, and mechanisms to include communities in decision-making fora.
- The use of community participatory methods and the use of self-perception data across the different CashCappers is not homogeneous in terms of skill sets, of perceiving it as a priority or integrating into their daily basis workplan.

Identifying valid community spokespeople

- The question of who legitimately speaks for the local population(s) can be complex for international agencies to navigate. Political economy analysis in the humanitarian sector remains weak and uneven³⁵.
- People need to trust the interlocutor, to share key information about their priorities, needs, and suggestions. There is an underestimation of the time, the skillset and the resources needed for this open dialogue.

Humanitarian architecture barriers

- Coordination structures in humanitarian work can be far removed from reality, with more and more professionals without enough time or priorities to do fieldwork during deployments.
- Little scope for affected people navigating through the humanitarian system, with clear information about programming options to make an informed decision about the modality of assistance preferred and to participate in the design of the response.
- Lack of space for grassroots organizations in the CWG and decision-making platforms which might be better placed than international partners to bring people’s voices into discussions and decisions.
- Unpredictable funding limits the capacity of affected people to understand how much, when, and for how long, they will be receiving CVA.

Appropriate methodologies and skills barriers

- Bringing affected people voices into the CWG is not being done systematically, regularly and it is not well resourced and prioritized.
- Community engagement and participation is not explicitly included in CashCap request, which sometimes might limit the time, the resources and the capacity of the Expert to carry these activities in the field.
- Challenges to measure the linkages between participation and program quality and build evidence to make the case.
- Risks of creating silos again with the discussions of CEA, MEAL, and Program.
- The complexity of the CVA ecosystem. It’s not only a dialogue between the humanitarian community and communities. Direct dialogue is needed with all the stakeholders that are around the cash program that goes beyond the field worker (i.e money agent, banks, traders), which implies a wide range of information needs, channels of communication, and formats.

Barriers to meaningful participation at the operational level identified by the two field pilots

- **Participatory Video in Colombia.** (link) From a community perspective, I. the lack of information from CVA in a context of high unmet needs and an environment prone to rumors, “mouth to mouth communication”, generating many rumors, false messages, the bombardment of questions to field workers, disagreements, and risks of bribes, etc.
- II. Closure events or meetings are essential at a programmatic stage to be accountable to the community, share monitoring data. This gives closure to the community with the opportunity to share all the doubts and questions, but above all to understand the exit, avoid rumors and false expectations.
- III. The key messages generated at Capital Level, by the different actors of national or local CWG, must be adapted with the community (understand activities, location of the message, change of words to words used by the community, type of adapted formats community, etc.) Listen and watch Save the Children field staff discussing information needs in Arauca. (link)
- **Participatory Video in Uganda** (link) The essential aspect of listening to communities and inviting them to the center of the dialogue is to turn their voices and feedback into action. How prepared are we to attentively listen to what they are saying and transfer it into programming? How flexible is the system to enable communities to influence decisions that affect them? Do we put the people we serve in the center of
the conversations in coordination meetings? More questions than answers. We ensured to fit the video into every agenda in coordination meetings to contribute to this discussion. We used the original PV, to reaffirm messages that were delivered in written reports, such as transfer value suitability and/or expenditures. We ensured sending it to key decision-makers and reflect on these issues and to advocate for investing in independent initiatives to seek feedback and hold agencies into account. Is that enough? For sure it is not. We shall go back and show how (and if) their messages were heard, explain to the PV participants where their film was screened, to what audience and in what country, and how their concerns and suggestions were received and taken into account. That is an important step in a participatory video exercise. Now, closing the loop can only happen if there are concrete actions by the humanitarian community, based on what was heard. That is another whole story, perhaps one of the greatest challenges across all listening to communities’ initiatives (link).

CashCap will work towards improving the quality, effectiveness, appropriateness, and accountability of cash and voucher assistance, through an increased role of CashCap Experts in promoting two-way communication, engaging directly with communities and partners, and being accountable to them.

The Initiative would succeed if CashCap Experts have contributed actively to

I. Communities having access to appropriate, timely, and coordinated information about CVA.

II. Affected people having accessible and equitable opportunities to participate and provide input into decision-making processes in CVA responses.

III. CVA practitioners are consistently listening to, and acting based on, communities’ feedback, voices, and meaningful participation to continually adjust and improve response, and these decisions are shared back to the communities concerned.

In order for this to happen, CashCap needs to be able to monitor its contribution to the Participation Revolution Grand Bargain Workstream 6. This requires institutionalizing a Monitoring and Evaluation Framework that integrates systematic monitoring of the role of CashCap Experts in promoting two-way communication, engaging directly with communities and partners, and being accountable to them. Annually, CashCap should be able to report based on the actions proposed in the present document. The framework is based on Success indicators against good practices related to the participation of people affected by the crisis in humanitarian decisions, Participatory Revolution Workstream 6 - link).
CashCap’s strength comes from the services it provides, the procedures in place, and the availability of funding. And most of all on from our Experts on the ground. It is key to streamline CEA, CwC, and AAP in what we do, how we work, resource it accordingly and strengthen the skills of our pool of Experts.

Aligning initiatives to operationalize community engagement and accountability in Cash and Voucher Assistance with wider Community Engagement and Accountability strategies in Country and at Global level can amplify efforts and build wider buy-in.

CashCap Global Team and Steering Committee members should play a key role in ensuring hosting agencies and stakeholders in the country, support and enable Experts’ Initiatives to implement CEA activities; in participating and connecting the global discussions of CEA in Cash and Voucher Assistance with each country’s operational needs; and in advocating for the allocation of flexible funding to Community Engagement and Accountability in cash operations.

ENHANCING OUR SERVICES.

I. Advocate with high-level decision-makers why it matters that CashCap and the cash community engage with communities and be accountable to them, what is CEA’s role in CVA programs and operations, and how to implement it in practice.

II. Enable the systematic collection and analysis of evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on the program and operational quality in CVA.

III. Jointly with CEA experts and agencies, provide technical capacity and capacity development to CWG partners in Community Engagement and Accountability.

IV. Ensure that CWGs partners actively collaborate, including with local and national organizations and host governments, in coordinated approaches to effective participation, the outcomes of which are integrated into Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNO), Humanitarian Response Plans (HRP) or other Humanitarian Plans and complement agency-specific activities.
ADAPTING OUR PROCEDURES.

V. Enhance understanding about the impact of stronger engagement with communities on CVA program and operational quality and document lessons learned to enhance Cash Community’s understanding and ownership of community engagement and accountability.

VI. Strengthen the capacity of Experts in Community Engagement and Accountability.

VII. Increase joint deployments (twinning, shadowing, etc.) with CwC NORCAP Experts and highlight the importance of hosting organizations with CEA, AAP background, experience, and resources to be able to work together with CashCap in the country. It is suggested to add to CashCap Request Guide: How is the deployment going to contribute to localization and participation revolution agenda and/or add the 5 actions proposed and link it to Experts duties towards CashCap (ToR, workplan, deliverables or PER).

INVESTING IN OUR PEOPLE.

VIII. CashCap Experts have access to Community Engagement and Accountability online and Face to Face training, coaching, and peer to peer support and learning, tools, and guidelines to meet the evolving needs.

IX. Meaningful engagement with communities requires long-term interaction and trust-building that goes beyond a project cycle. The ability to carry out joint missions with CwC/AAP/CEA Experts is key, it can be from the NORCAP pool of experts and/or strategic partners.

SECURING FUNDING.

X. Despite its cross-cutting attributes, community engagement requires systemization, resources, and sound policies to ensure quality and accountability.

XI. It requires stable, flexible and institutional human, and financial resources to support activities to engage with affected communities, to enable dialogue with multiple stakeholders about CEA and CwC, and to facilitate training, coaching, P2P learnings, lessons learned documentation and advocacy to decision-makers.

XII. It requires explicit allocation of flexible resources (by CashCap and partners) to support core activities (for example, planning processes, particularly for emergency operations, often lack the time or financial resources required for proper consultation with communities during the design phase).

WORKING WITH PARTNERS.

CashCap in-country should identify, map, and engage with CwC, C4D, CEA or AAP coordination fora, independent organizations, collective initiatives, and Experts to:

XIII. Increase efforts to shift the current way of working into one that is more effective and practical for working in partnership with communities.

XIV. Support the setup of inter-agency, collective, and independent accountability mechanisms that allows cash recipients to provide feedback on cash and voucher assistance and participate in decision-making.

XV. Enable the systematic collection and analysis of evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on programme and operational quality in CVA.

XVI. Advocate for the importance of community engagement and accountability at all stages of the project cycle in cash responses.

XVII. Strengthen the knowledge and skills of CWG partners on communication and community engagement in a commitment to enhancing program quality and accountability in Cash and Voucher Assistance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT WE DO</th>
<th>Services we provide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocate with high-level decision makers for better use of cash.</td>
<td>Provide evidence based guides and procedures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW WE WORK</th>
<th>Systematic procedures to provide services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enhance understanding of cash and market programming through collection and analysis of data.</td>
<td>Develop and maintain a skilled experienced community of experts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUR PEOPLE</th>
<th>and their development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CashCap experts have access to diverse support and development opportunities.</td>
<td>CashCap’s community of experts has skills and tools to meet evolving needs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FUNDING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient funding to fulfill expected requests.</td>
<td>Explore new funding streams to promote new development areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WHY DOING PARTICIPATORY VIDEO MATTERS?

Guided by the CashCap MDC Initiative and CwC, CE and AAP principles, in support to the Cash Working Group, using Participatory Videos in deployments aim to:

1. Generate meaningful and innovative community-driven dialogues on Cash and Voucher assistance with affected communities in the country.

2. Demonstrate in practice to the Humanitarian Response, a complementary approach to CwC, CE and AAP.

3. Implement the PV activity in a collaborative manner on the ground and exchange learnings-by-doing.

4. Build communication capacity on communities to video document their voices and perspectives on Cash and Vouchers Assistance.

5. Present jointly, the communities’ “video-voices” at the Cash Working Group and other coordination fora in country, regionally and globally to trigger further reflection and discussions on cash and vouchers interventions from a bottom-up people-centered angle.

6. Collect, document, and share the experience and its learnings across the humanitarian system.

7. Package the communities’ “video-voices” into original audiovisual products that can support cash and markets programming advocacy at the local, regional and global levels.

Main guiding principles: - Bottom-up * People-centred * Creative * Meaningful Dialogues -

- An innovative modality of visual qualitative assessment, but less-extractive.
- Highly engaging: a participatory method that promotes ownership.
- More than an assessment, it’s community-led and centred, and dialogue-oriented.
- Focus on process, not on product outputs as it builds community communications skills, strengthens community participation and promotes active engagement: “to do, to go, to lead instead of to observe, to receive and to be led”.
- Triggers community conversations, consensus building, collective thinking and creation.
- Storytelling-oriented that evidence suggests can increase audience recall, deeper emotional engagement and empathy from the receivers/listeners and decision makers.
- The stories and testimonials filmed by the communities themselves are a powerful portable and visual way to deliver key messages to the coordination and programming fora.

On the other hand, it is important to note that PV is not an appropriate method for:

- Working with large groups/ samples.
- Assessments led by researchers and structured questionnaires focused on the outputs.
- Producing scripted videos, directed and edited by filmmakers and communications Experts;
- Easy scaling-up.
- It is not a Communications activity for agency/programme visibility. Not to be filtered by PI strategy. Not to be led by the traditional top-down orientation of Communications and Public Information units.

Recommendations by Fernanda Baumhardt, CwC NORCAP Expert. For more information on Participatory Video Pilots in Uganda (link) and Colombia (link) and watch this channel https://vimeo.com/dialoguewithcommunities. Visit: https://insightshare.org/ for access to guidance, toolkit, and tutorials.

2 Shaw & Robertson (1997)
3 Mandler and Johnson (1977)
4 Haven, K. (2007)
**KEY ACTIONS TO ENSURE MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE DURING 2020/2023**

CashCap will work towards improving quality of CVA, effectiveness, appropriateness, and accountability of aid provision, through an increased role of CashCap Experts in promoting meaningful two-way communication, engaging directly with communities and partners, and being accountable to them.

**ACTION #1:** Strengthen understanding of and capacity to implement community engagement and accountability across CashCap Experts

**I.** At least 70% of CashCap Experts have increased their capacity in streamlining Community Engagement and Accountability in Cash and Voucher Assistance, through attendance to CEA/CwC/AAP training, peer to peer learning (i.e. learning visits), and mentoring.

**II.** At least two collaborations with training partners specialized in CEA/AAP/CwC to deliver training, mentoring or peer to peer support to Cash Cap Experts

**III.** In collaboration with global partners, develop and roll out a briefing note for senior leadership on why it matters that the CVA community engage communities and be accountable to them, what is its role in CVA programs and operations, and how to implement it in practice

**IV.** Establish a group of MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE WITH COMMUNITIES (MDC) CHAMPIONS in NRCAP and CashCap who can advocate for the present Initiative during Management Meetings and Cashcap Steering Committee and build buy in and support amongst peers.

**CDAC: BUILDING CASHCAP’S CEA CAPACITY**

In May 2020, CashCap signed an agreement with CDAC to provide remote and face-to-face training and mentoring support to CashCap Experts on deployment to improve their understanding of community engagement and accountability and its application in practice. Over the course of 2020, CDAC will be providing the following:

- **Online training in Community Engagement and Accountability** for CashCap experts, specifically adapted to CashCap’s role and to cash and voucher assistance.
- **Mentoring support** to around 9 Experts on deployment to ensure that this training is translated to meaningful actions on the ground. This is a first for both CDAC and represents an exciting opportunity to capitalise on their expertise and ensure that the training can be applied in practice.
- **Face-to-face learning event** to provide Experts with an opportunity to share learning and discuss experiences in person, as part of CashCap’s annual learning event.

http://www.cdacnetwork.org/

**ACTION #2:** Integrate community engagement and accountability into CashCap’s ways of working so it becomes a standard approach for all Experts

**I.** At least 10 Experts implement core CEA activities during their deployment. Special attention to the use of Participatory Video, facilitating and documenting, if possible, at least 1 Participatory Video per year- Refer to WHY DOING A PARTICIPATORY VIDEO MATTERS?

**II.** At least 70% of the CashCap requests, explicitly describe deployment’s expected contribution to Participation Revolution.

**III.** At least 70% of CashCap Experts report systematically on their contribution to Participation Revolution and the Initiative

**ACTION #3:** Build evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities on CVA program and operational quality in CVA.

**I.** At least 5 deployments participate in quantitative and/or qualitative data collection and analysis of evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on program and operational quality, and appropriateness of, CVA.

**II.** At least two collaborations with partners specialized in CEA/AAP/CwC to collect and analyze evidence about the impact of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on program and operational quality in CVA.

**III.** At least 3 case studies, lesson learned or success stories about the role of stronger engagement with communities and accountability on program and operational quality, and appropriateness of, in CVA.
I. At least 5 deployments from CashCap are supported by a Community Engagement and Accountability Experts from NORCAP and/or partners.

II. At least 5 MDC champions are trained and supported (i.e. learning visits) to advocate for CEA/CwC/AAP in Cash and Voucher Assistance

III. At least 10% of the time of 50% of deployments are dedicated to CEA/CwC/AAP/Localization in Cash and Voucher Assistance

IV. At least 10% of CashCap’s annual funding is allocated to CEA in Cash and Voucher Assistance

ACTION #4: Increase organizational support and resourcing to institutionalize and implement community engagement and accountability in CVA

I. Integrate Community Engagement and Accountability into the induction process (i.e. briefing)

II. Integrate core behavior (such as empathy, listening, respect), skills and knowledge of CEA into CashCap Capability Framework

III. Put in place mechanisms where CashCap Experts can share stories, challenges, and successes on meaningful participation, engaging directly with communities and partners.

ACTION #5: Promote a culture of meaningful participation and accountability internally among CashCap Experts and externally with communities and partners.

I. Integrate Community Engagement and Accountability into the induction process (i.e. briefing)

II. Integrate core behavior (such as empathy, listening, respect), skills and knowledge of CEA into CashCap Capability Framework

III. Put in place mechanisms where CashCap Experts can share stories, challenges, and successes on meaningful participation, engaging directly with communities and partners.

A capability approach has therefore been chosen, which includes core knowledge and behaviours required for CashCap deployees to succeed in their role, with an emphasis on CashCap ways of working including its neutrality and its nascent people-centred approach. A Capability Framework defines the behaviours, skills and knowledge your organisation and people need to succeed. It establishes a common language, so you can communicate easily across diverse teams. A Capability Framework also expresses an organisation’s culture, by describing expected behaviours and values (source: [link]).

Miss Gabriela was part of the Eligibility Survey. She has suggestions to share about the process to Save the Children, Arauca, December 2019.

© Photo. Fernanda Baumhardt
KEY PARTNERS TO ENGAGE WITH

Up to the end of 2019, CashCap has worked closely with multiple partners deployed to the inter-agency coordination group, as well as being hosted by eight UN Agencies and eight INGOs (link). In addition, CashCap works closely with Clusters, which are committed to integrating and promoting Accountability to Affected Populations in their responsibilities. Working side by side with our partners allows CashCap to have access to a whole range of expert support within the organization, in different thematic areas (Protection, Shelter, Health, Education, Nutrition, Gender, etc.). Also, operational agencies working in the frontlines are doing an amazing job in engaging with communities, which CashCap can tap into (Learnings from field missions in Uganda and Colombia with implementing partners and CWGs).

In addition, given the important role of independent accountability mechanisms that collect affected people’s views and perspectives (different from the organization providing assistance), as well as the need for technical expertise in CEA/CwC to support this initiative, we have identified the need to expand the level of collaboration to other partners whose expertise is related to Community Engagement, Communication with Communities and Accountability.

Up to date (June 2020), we are collaborating with NORCAP CWC, CDAC and GROUND TRUTH SOLUTIONS. New collaborations and partners will emerge, especially local partners at country level, when we implement systematically the Actions proposed.

The following stakeholders and initiatives are identified as a part of the mapping exercise.

I. NORCAP, COMMUNICATION WITH COMMUNITIES. In 2015, NORCAP (link) formed a collaboration with the network Communicating with Disaster-Affected Communities (CDAC) to offer a range of appropriately qualified, experienced and trained communication personnel who can deploy to any emergency and contribute towards more effective humanitarian action.

II. CDAC, COMMUNICATING WITH DISASTERS AFFECTED COMMUNITIES. (link) Established in 2009, DCA is a growing network of more than 30 humanitarian, media development, social innovation, technology, and telecommunication organizations, dedicated to saving lives and making aid more effective through communication, information exchange, and community engagement. It brings together local, regional, and global actors to catalyze communities’ ability to connect, access information, and have a voice in humanitarian emergencies. This enhances the effectiveness of aid; fosters greater accountability, transparency, and trust; and improves the outcomes experienced by affected people.

III. CDA COLLABORATIVE LEARNING. (link) CDA helps policymakers, practitioners, and organizations improve the quality, effectiveness, and accountability of humanitarian, development and peacebuilding programs through better tools for joint analysis, participatory program design, feedback loops, listening and accountability mechanisms. CDA’s work on aid effectiveness, accountability, and feedback loops began in 2005 with the launch of the Listening Program. To understand these gaps in application, the IFRC in partnership with CDA Collaborative Learning (CDA) undertook joint research, which investigated the practical experience of Movement members to institutionalize community engagement approaches across their programs and Operations (link)

IV. RED CROSS MOVEMENT. IFRC, CEA UNIT. Most recently, the Movement has increased its efforts to meet its commitments to improve how it engages with and is accountable to local communities through the Movement Commitments on Community Engagement and Accountability presented at the 2019 Council of Delegates. Furthermore, over the years the Movement has developed a robust set of resources, such as a guide and toolkit, that seek to support National Societies to strengthen their practices of engaging with local communities NORCAP and the British Red Cross collaborate as part of their Cash Practitioner Development Program “The Cash School”

V. GROUND TRUTH SOLUTIONS. (link). It is an international non-governmental organization that helps people affected by crisis influence the design and implementation of humanitarian aid. Ground Truth’s work to date has identified numerous ways to improve cash programming based on the Cash Barometer. (link)

VI. Relief Watch allows aid recipients to provide qualitative feedback on the assistance and services they receive and collates their responses to provide useful and actionable feedback to humanitarian staff and donors. (link)

VII. Research-based organizations, contributing actively to research on Engagement with Affected People. ALNAP (link) and HUMANITARIAN PRACTICE NETWORK. (link)

VIII. CALP. (link) CaLP currently has over 80 members who collectively deliver the vast majority of CVA in humanitarian contexts worldwide. CaLP members include UN agencies, Red Cross Red Crescent Movement, local and international NGOs, donors and private sector organizations.
IX. INSIGHT SHARE (link). Insight share amplifies unheard voices and brings people together to focus on change. They work with communities around the world to address key issues through Participatory Video.

X. AFRICAS VOICES. (link). Listening to citizens is at the heart of effective development and governance. Using citizen engagement, digital media, and innovative data analytics, they listen to citizens at scale and amplify their views, beliefs, and priorities.

XI. WORLD VISION. Citizen Voice and Action, World Vision’s social accountability approach, equips communities to hold their own governments accountable for the promises they make. Increasingly, governments are seeing the value of ensuring citizen voice in their planning processes and responding when communities speak up (link).

XII. THE CASH MONITORING, EVALUATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, LEARNING ORGANIZATIONAL NETWORK (CAMEALEON) is an NGO-led network of partners conducting independent research and analysis of the World Food Programme (WFP) multi-purpose cash (MPC) programme for Syrian refugees in Lebanon. Established in December 2017, CAMEALEON complements WFP's existing monitoring and evaluation activities through independent research, learning, and recommendations. It is part of a ground-breaking collaboration between donors and agencies trialing a new approach to providing humanitarian aid in line with the Grand Bargain commitments (link).

XIII. KUJA KUJA collects, analyzes, and helps our partners to take action on real-time customer feedback. (link)

XIV. FEEDBACK LABS is a non-profit organization that believes people are the best Experts in their own lives, and they should ultimately drive the policies and programs that impact them (link).

XV. SIGNPOST DIGITAL INITIATIVE (link). Since 2015, a global partnership between the International Rescue Committee and Mercy Corps has provided critical information services to people affected by crisis and conflict.

CASHCAP WILL PURSUE A MEANINGFUL DIALOGUE WITH THE COMMUNITIES WE SERVE

As CashCap we want to invest our efforts in two-way communication and gathering independent feedback from the affected people we serve. We emphasize the importance of listening to and understanding communities’ concerns, priorities, and recommendations on how they would like to be better assisted. We want to contribute from a different angle, providing safe spaces and opportunities to affected people to engage in meaningful dialogue with the cash community we are part of. We want this dialogue to be participatory, relevant for the affected people, bottom up and ground based. We learned that making the case for accountability and stronger community engagement is more successful when it is framed around issues that are relevant to the decision-makers that we can influence and trigger a response to an action. We will continue promoting evidence-based decision-making, underscoring the importance of complementary approaches based on both quantitative and with the capacity to scale up approaches (such as perception surveys) as well as qualitative, less extractive, and unfiltered¹⁹ methods, which focus on the story, building capacity and empowering participants, such as Participatory Video, User Journeys, etc, helping to build empathy and change of mindsets²⁰.

We truly believe that an increased role of CashCap in promoting meaningful dialogue, engaging directly with communities and partners, and being accountable to them is possible and necessary. We want to work towards improving the quality, effectiveness, and accountability of Cash and Voucher Assistance and can influence both practitioners and decision-makers to uphold commitments on more meaningful participation. With this Initiative, we are taking a concrete step forward to our commitment to a people-centered approach and wish to be held accountable for this. The diagram below encapsulates our thinking on the value of meaningful dialogue with communities.

¹⁹ To overcome the fundamental power distribution in the humanitarian sector, accountability and participation reforms must be integrated across multiple levels of humanitarian decision-making, enabling unfiltered representation of aid recipients’ perspectives in these spaces Konyndyk J. and Warden R.: People-Driven Response: Power and Participation in Humanitarian Action, September, 2019, p.5  https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/people-driven-response.pdf

²⁰ Sundberg A, Beyond the Numbers: How qualitative approaches can improve monitoring of humanitarian action, 2019
“Information needs on humanitarian assistance from the ground-level perspective. Taken during a Venezuelan community town hall meeting at El Refugio Asentamiento located less than 2km from the Venezuelan border. Community members wrote questions on post-its to humanitarians working in the area, collected by volunteer community mobilizers. Using a microphone and a sound system, NGO staff directly replied to them on the spot. More than 250 people gathered around to listen. The most popular concern? The continuation or not of Cash Assistance locally known as “las Tarjetas”.
(9/12/2019, Arauca, Colombia), by Fernanda Baumhard, NORCAP Expert