

3rd Grand Bargain Cash Work Stream Workshop – Co-Conveners' Report
Rome, 16th – 17th May 2019

Contents page

Section	Page numbers
Acronym List	3
1. Executive Summary	6
2. The role of the Grand Bargain Cash work stream	7
3. The third Grand Bargain Cash work stream Workshop	8
4. The Grand Bargain Cash work stream and the global state of play and progress in 2018	8
5. Cash Developments in 2018	9
6. Cost-Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness in Humanitarian Assistance (CE2HA) sub-work stream update	11
7. Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash sub-work stream: discussion on guidance note and key issues	12
8. Joint Donor Efforts sub-work stream update	13
9. Cash and Gender sub-work stream update	14
10. Update on the Collaborative Cash Delivery Network (CCD)	16
11. Cash and Risk sub-work stream: panel session on data responsibility	16
12. Tracking Cash and Vouchers sub-work stream update	18
13. Panel discussion - What are we missing?	18
14. Breakout session: areas for priority action and critical issues	20
15. Reflections from Global Clusters	21
16. Looking forward - priorities and key areas of work for 2019	21
17. Workshop Evaluation	23
Annex A: Workshop Agenda	24
Annex B: List of Participating Agencies	27
Annex C: Pre-meeting Survey	29

Acronym List

Acronym	Full Name
BRC	British Red Cross
CaLP	Cash and Learning Partnership
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere
CASHCAP	Cash and Markets Standby Capacity Project
CCD	Collaborative Cash Delivery Network
CE2HA	Cost-Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness in Humanitarian Assistance
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
CVA	Cash and voucher assistance
CWG	Cash Working Group
DFAT	Australia's Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DFID	UK's Department for International Development
DI	Development Initiatives
ECHO	European Commission's Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FTS	Financial Tracking Service
GB	Grand Bargain
GBV	Gender-based violence
GCCG	The Global Cluster Coordination Group
GDPR	General Data Protection Regulation
GHD	Good Humanitarian Donorship Initiative
GTS	Ground Truth Solutions
HPC	Humanitarian Programme Cycle
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
IASC OPAG	The Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Operations, Policy and Advocacy Group
IATI	International Aid Transparency Initiative
ICCG	The Inter Cluster Coordination Group

ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IFRC	International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies
IMWG	Information Management Working Group
IOM	International Organization for Migration
IPV	Intimate partner violence
IRC	International Rescue Committee
LSHTM	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
MPC	Multi-purpose Cash
NFI	Non-food items
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCHA	The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
SADD	Sex and age disaggregated data
SCAN	Systematic Cost Analysis tool
SIDA	Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USAID/FFP	USAID's Office of Food for Peace
USAID/OFDA	The Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
VFM	Value for money
WASH	Water, sanitation and hygiene
WB	World Bank
WFP	World Food Programme

WHO	World Health Organization
WVI	World Vision International

1. Executive Summary

The third Grand Bargain (GB) Cash work stream Workshop was held at WFP Headquarters in Rome on 16th-17th May 2019, hosted by WFP and DFID. Over 85 participants attended the workshop, representing 60 donor and humanitarian organisations and multilateral agencies, and including representatives from the global clusters, research institutes and specialist agencies and organisations.

The workshop focused on the progress made to date on delivering against GB commitments, and ensuring the group is on track to deliver against these commitments going forward. Participants were also updated by co-leads of the cash sub-work streams, which cover '*cost-efficiency, cost-effectiveness in humanitarian assistance and value for money (CE2HA)*', '*social protection and humanitarian cash*', '*joint donor efforts*', '*cash and gender*', '*cash and risks*', and '*tracking cash and vouchers*'. Participants were also updated by co-leads of the cash sub-work streams. The workshop concluded with sessions on determining priority action areas for the work stream going forward.

Next steps

1. DFID and WFP remain committed to convening the work stream.
2. DFID and WFP to explore the two proposed additional priority action areas: i) tackling political blockages to effective cash sub-work stream, and ii) partnerships with local actors sub-work stream.
3. The '*CE2HA*' and '*Tracking Cash and Vouchers*' sub-work streams are to be merged. They will work to develop a joint work plan by end of July.

2. The role of the GB Cash Work Stream

The World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016 prompted the launch of the GB and marked the commitment of a select group of donors and humanitarian agencies to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian action through various commitments grouped under ten work streams. The third work stream pertains to *'increasing the use and coordination of cash-based programming'* under which aid agencies and donors commit to¹:

1. Increase the routine use of cash alongside other tools, including in-kind assistance, service delivery (such as health and nutrition) and vouchers. Employ markers to measure increase and outcomes.
2. Invest in new delivery models which can be increased in scale while identifying best practice and mitigating risks in each context. Employ markers to track their evolution.
3. Build an evidence base to assess the costs, benefits, impacts, and risks of cash (including on protection) relative to in-kind assistance, service delivery interventions and vouchers, and combinations thereof.
4. Collaborate, share information and develop standards and guidelines for cash programming in order to better understand its risks and benefits.
5. Ensure that coordination, delivery, and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers.
6. Aim to increase use of cash programming beyond current low levels, where appropriate. Some organisations and donors may wish to set targets.

These commitments provide the overarching framework of the GB Cash work stream, under which priority action areas (sub-work streams) were established during the first workshop (30th May-1st June 2017), and are revised yearly as necessary. During the second Cash work stream Workshop (4th-5th June 2018), the *'Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash'* and *'Cash and Gender'* sub-work streams were created, whilst the *'Mapping Cash'* priority action areas were discontinued in the remainder of the year. A decision to disband the *'cash coordination'* priority action area was taken in the first part of 2019. As such, at the start of the third workshop (16th-17th May 2019) the priority action areas consisted of:

1. Efficiency, Effectiveness and Value for Money (co-leads: USAID, IRC)
2. Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash (co-leads: DFID, UNICEF, IFRC)
3. Joint Donor Efforts (co-leads: Norway and Germany)
4. Cash and Gender (co-leads: UN Women and CARE)
5. Tracking Cash and Vouchers (co-leads: ECHO and CaLP)
6. Cash and Risks (co-leads: CaLP and WFP)

In late 2018, at the request of the GB Secretariat, WFP and DFID established the Cash work stream's core-commitment: *"Increase the routine use of cash, where appropriate, alongside other tools - ensure that coordination, delivery and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms are put in place for cash transfers"*. The indicators that will be used to track progress against this core commitment during the yearly self-reporting exercise are:

- i. *Total volume (USD value) transferred through cash, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs*
- ii. *Total volume (USD value) transferred through vouchers, transfer value only, excluding overhead/support costs*

These indicators are high-level indicators that mirror the critical decisions taken in the *'Tracking Cash and Vouchers'* sub-work stream.

¹ Source: <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/increase-use-and-coordination-cash-based-programming>

3. The third GB Cash Work Stream Workshop

The third GB Cash work stream Workshop was held at WFP Headquarters in Rome on 16th-17th May 2019. The agenda², which was established in collaboration with the sub-work stream co-leads in the run up to the workshop, was divided into two key themes. The first day focused on the progress made to date and included the sub-work stream updates, while the second day looked ahead to priorities in the years to come.

Over 85 participants attended the workshop representing 60 donor and humanitarian organisations³ and multilateral agencies, mostly GB signatories. This included representatives from the Shelter, Health, Food Security, Education, Nutrition and WASH global clusters, research institutes and specialist agencies and organisations.

Background reading and a survey⁴, which sought to understand priorities, intentions and expectations of the work stream as a whole and the upcoming workshop, were circulated to all participants in advance of the workshop. 14 individuals responded to the survey.

Progress to Date

16th May

4. The GB Cash Work Stream and the global state of play and progress in 2018

ODI – Wendy Fenton, Research Fellow, Humanitarian Policy Group

CaLP – Sophie Tholstrup, Policy Coordinator

The Overseas Development Initiative's (ODI) research has found that progress was made across the entire GB during 2018. There is growing evidence of shifts in norms and operational practice, greater engagement at a country level, progress on gender, and greater conviction amongst signatories that the GB could fulfil its potential in the next few years. However, progress remains uneven across the work streams and constituent groups are not collaborating to help achieve the overall goals. There is also a lack of dialogue at the political level and transaction costs remain high.

Going forward, ODI recommend that all GB work streams use their annual meetings to advance on substantive issues, rather than reporting progress. They should also clearly define what 'success' looks like and use political dialogue to resolve key problems. Finally, all work streams should review the incentives for change and consider further consolidating work streams/commitments.

For the second year running, the Cash work stream has made more progress than the other GB work streams. ODI emphasised that while the high level of energy around cash, and progress associated with it, was largely independent of the GB, the work stream acts as an important catalyst, bringing together a range of actors to address key issues. The ODI report welcomed the collaborative approach that has included clear and actionable priorities, defined roles, and targeted efforts to address areas identified as receiving less attention in 2017. The remaining challenges in the work stream include resolving responsibility for operational coordination and linking to other work streams (particularly localisation).

² See Annex A

³ See Annex B

⁴ See Annex C

The Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) presented the major developments in the cash work stream during 2018, based on their own observations, the State of the World's Cash report 2018, and on the results of the pre-workshop survey. They summarised recent developments by noting an overall shift from a focus on scaling up cash to an increased focus on quality and outcomes, though noting that capacity to implement cash and voucher assistance (CVA) interventions remains limited with 7/10 organizations lacking adequate staff. The recent development of new and collaborative operational models suggests a further shift towards focusing on adapting our ways of working to deliver CVA.

CVA is being used at much greater scale. Development Initiatives presented preliminary findings that there has been a 60% scale up of total cash and voucher delivery from 2016 to 2018, with an estimated \$4.5Bn in CVA (including programming costs) delivered in 2018. These figures are preliminary only and subject to revision – final figures will be published shortly.

CaLP noted a sharper focus in the last year on the outcomes of CVA, with a wealth of new evidence on sectoral outcomes of cash assistance. There has been a significant investment in new and collaborative operational models, with the Collaborative Cash Delivery network now operational in two countries with 11 further pilots planned, and the UN Statement on Cash Assistance planning to pilot in six countries. Ensuring the development of these models is driven by impact and recipient preferences, that we learn from these developments and tracking and comparing effectiveness and efficiency across contexts and models will be critical.

They also welcomed: the increased focus on gender and inclusion; the significant progress on understanding risk, including a growing focus on responsible use of data; progress on tracking cash and vouchers, and increased efforts to understand recipients' experiences and preferences.

However, there is still no shared outcome indicator, making meaningful measurement of quality challenging. Despite investment in new operational models, we have not adapted our ways of working – the inclusion of multi-purpose cash, for example – to support the most effective use of CVA.

Finally, as highlighted by almost all survey respondents, the coordination of cash remains ad hoc and unclear, which is having serious operational impacts.

5. Cash Developments in 2018

CaLP – Sophie Tholstrup, Policy Coordinator

OCHA – Juliet Lang, Humanitarian Affairs Officer - Cash Coordination

WFP – Tahir Nour, Chief, Market Access Programmes Unit

Earlier this year, after consultation with sub-work streams, there was a decision to discontinue the '*Cash Coordination*' sub-work stream as it had no associated workplan and was mainly being used as an information sharing platform. Additionally, as the GB was not considered a 'decision-making' forum, it was suggested that discussions would be better placed in other fora. This session looked at the developments around cash coordination over the last year.

It was noted that there are still many areas lacking agreement on cash coordination, such as questions of responsibility for cash coordination and cash working group leadership, which remain unresolved. There is similarly no clear agreement on the planning, coordination and reporting of multi-purpose cash. Resourcing for cash coordination remains low, and there is

often double hatting of Cash Working Group coordinators. Cash coordination was mentioned as a key challenge by almost every respondent in the GB survey.

The Global Cluster Coordination Group (GCCG) reviewed the Inter Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) terms of reference (ToR) in late 2017. A Task Team under the GCCG has further developed a draft standard CWG ToRs and a guidance document for cash coordination (drafted by CashCap and CaLP). Currently, the addition of the placement of cash working groups, as a sub-group of the ICCG, facilitating the coordination of multi-purpose cash, and ensuring strategic and streamlined cash coordination throughout the response at the ICCG level is included in the draft guidance document.

CaLP held four regional workshops to seek feedback from coordination and cash actors in the field on these documents. These were held in Somalia, South Sudan, MENA and West Africa. Colleagues in these regions welcomed the documents, in particular the stronger role of clusters, but contended that more clarity was needed, in particular around multi-purpose cash and responsibility for, and resourcing of, cash coordination. A clear need for more and better-resourced intersectoral space in the response to treat a range of issues, including but not limited to cash coordination (including response analysis, targeting, AAP etc), was highlighted.

OCHA introduced the new Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) template, which will be rolled out for the 2020 planning cycle. This is now approved by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee's Operations, Policy and Advocacy Group (IASC OPAG). Key changes for the HPC include a stronger focus overall on multi-sectoral approaches, including an emphasis on the importance of the perspective of affected people. Cash and multi-purpose cash (MPC) are increasingly integrated into the new template with a strong focus on feasibility throughout the document and opportunities to identify multi-sectoral approaches including MPC. There is an optional section to also include MPC formally in the planning document. Additionally, CVA has been integrated into the inter-sectoral templates with the inclusion of modality, restriction, transfer value and an optional field for conditionality.

In the Q&A, ECHO emphasized the need to have a cross-cutting work stream looking at coordination as an issue. This was taken up in the breakout sessions that looked at the ways ahead.

WFP updated on the UN Statement on Cash Assistance that they are piloting in six countries: Yemen, Ecuador, Afghanistan, Bangladesh, CAR, and Niger. There are three work streams: interoperable systems, financial service provider procurement, and operational collaboration. The purpose of the statement is to gain efficiencies to better support the people we are trying to reach. They noted that this is not an "exclusive club" and, as the statement says, they are open to collaboration with all partners and have already reached out to IOM, ICRC, IFRC and the Collaborative Cash Delivery network (CCD).

USAID noted that it is a shame that the majority of donors and NGOs in the room have placed formal requests to IASC to resolve the issue of cash coordination and yet they have failed to identify an authorized entity to provide routine and predictable coordination of cash activities. Alongside limited capacity, this remains one of the primary barriers to scaling up quality CVA.

Next steps

- Define the key asks regarding cash-coordination and then elevate the issue to sherpas, GB new eminent person and senior organizational representations to facilitate unblocking the political barriers preventing progress.

6. Cost-Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness in Humanitarian Assistance (CE2HA) sub-work stream update

USAID/FFP – Ruco Van Der Merwe, Food Security and Markets Advisor

IRC – Caitlin Tulloch, Senior Technical Advisor, Best Use of Resources

USAID/OFDA – Laura Meissner, Economic Recovery Advisor

CRS – Dina Brick, Senior Technical Advisor, Food Security and Markets

CaLP – Ruth McCormack, Senior Technical Officer

The sub-work stream's session was divided into two parts. In the first part, USAID/FFP and IRC provided an update on the cost-efficiency analysis of basic needs programmes, its best practice guidance, and the Systematic Cost Analysis (SCAN) tool roll out. USAID/FFP reflected on the CE2HA Phase I (2017-2018), and the three main outcomes of the workshop in Washington D.C. that have led to the CE2HA Phase II (2018-2019). These include: a) the financial piece, b) related monitoring and evaluation activities, and c) the need to build evidence and to fill the evidence gap.

IRC presented the different elements to frame cost efficiency analysis and outlined the types of costs. Direct costs, shared costs, and indirect costs, which were relevant for basic needs, and the market value of in-kind/societal contributions for those goods going to beneficiaries, are to be included. The best practice guideline recommends factoring both shared and indirect costs into the analysis, even when they differ between agencies. Some agencies also cover indirect-type costs from 'core' funding, it is however not possible to view core funding from grant data. The best practice guidance also offers advice on how to deal with depreciation, exchange, inflation and discounting. In terms of counting outputs, it recommends separating cash from vouchers wherever possible to determine which is more efficient, and to separate out complementary services rather than trying to estimate their value. A key question, which requires further discussion among agencies before finalising the best practice guideline, concerns ocean freight, transportation and/or handling and whether it should be reflected in the numerator or denominator of cost efficiency calculations.

The subsequent discussion noted several challenges to the methodology, including the difficulties for implementing partners to break down their costs and the high amount of estimations required, as cash is usually just one component of other programmes. It was also debated whether recipients' costs should be included in cost efficiency analysis. While it is important to look into these costs, the value and feasibility to do so alongside the cost-efficiency analysis was contested.

At the end of the first part, the SCAN tool (version 2.0) was introduced. It was designed particularly for non-experts and field staff in low-resource settings, in order to quickly and consistently calculate costs-per-output. The participants were encouraged to pose questions they would like to have answered about SCAN 2.0 during the piloting phase.

CaLP opened the second part of the session with a brief outline of the development process of the MPC outcome indicators, before CRS and USAID/OFDA presented the near-final draft. The multi-purpose cash outcome indicators support harmonisation among donors and implementers for measuring the impact of multi-purpose cash interventions. Their development was guided by a set of principles, e.g. focus on the main objectives why multi-purpose cash is given, as defined by affected people (often multi-purpose cash is one component of a broader programme); focus on the outcomes to which multi-purpose cash can most clearly contribute; and simplify reporting (GB commitment). The indicators are broken down into crosscutting and sectoral, and required and optional. The set minimum standards are balanced with a people-centred approach.

The sub-work stream discussed the development of indicators with sectoral representatives from the global clusters/sectors, including food security, shelter/NFI and WASH (closely related to MPC) as well as health, nutrition, and protection (outcomes are likely not changing

based on multi-purpose cash transfers alone). This process recognized that sectoral outcomes are not determined by the modality, but sought to identify key sectoral indicators which are most relevant to the use of MPC. In the case of protection, a process indicator has been proposed, while possibilities of developing an outcome indicator are still being explored.

Finding an appropriate psychological/well-being indicator is an ongoing exercise and its proposed that the testing phase for the draft indicators can be used to build learning on this topic.

Next steps

- Finalisation of the best practice guidance on the cost-efficiency analysis of basic needs programmes;
- Field pilots of SCAN 2.0 (provide feedback on questions during pilot phase, and requirements your organisations has in order to adopt SCAN);
- Finalisation of the near-final draft of the MPC outcome indicators (open to final inputs by GB members, clusters and others until the end of May before it will be released for testing at the beginning of June);
- Provide links to other guidance and support, such as indicator definitions and/or reference sheets (expected calendar year 2019);
- Determine whether and what sort of testing and sharing process is needed and of the most benefit;
- Merge '*Tracking Cash*' work stream with the CE2HA sub-work stream in the summer of 2019;
- Develop joint work plan for '*CE2HA*' and '*Tracking Cash*' work stream by the end of July 2019.

7. Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash sub-work stream: discussion on guidance note and key issues

UNICEF – Claire Mariani, Humanitarian Cash Transfer Coordinator

IFRC – Caroline Holt, Manager – Global Cash Transfer Programming

As this sub-work stream has recently completed their first workshop, this session was designed to socialise the outcome of this meeting with the wider group and cross reference priorities. It contained a facilitated discussion on the pending guidance note, plus a discussion on other key issues.

At this event last year, there were conversations around a need for a sub-work stream on humanitarian cash and social protection. Stakeholders from these two groups came together at a workshop in Geneva in April 2019, to produce a set of key priorities for enhancing linkages. These priorities included: better understanding the existing context, greater coordination to link actors on the ground, identifying common communities of practise to bring stakeholders together, advocacy, establishing common positions, developing a strategy, knowledge development and sharing, and a call for further guidance. A list of actions was drawn up to help deliver these, many of which can be achieved in the next 6 months.

Participants were split into groups to discuss the work stream and provided topics for further discussion. The group suggested considering how private sector and national governments can play a role in reviewing the intended outcomes, and that development and humanitarian outcomes could be different. Workshop results suggested a need to articulate what a successful cash and social protection engagement looks like and consider how to measure

this, to apply lessons to other contexts. Additionally, a common glossary will need to be designed to help social protection and humanitarian groups understand each other's language, as well as getting people up to speed on the existing cash/social protection linkages.

Furthermore, the group suggested to do more to engineer coordination amongst donors and with governments at national and local levels. Cash and social protection engagements should be assisted by a support team that represents the different actors/sectors and works with partners on the ground during design phase. A mapping of existing social protection systems will need to be commissioned, to see where there is already involvement from humanitarian partners and assess where the gaps are. Common positions and an advocacy approach should be developed, particularly during external consultations (for example with governments), and buy-in from national societies and the donor community should be obtained. Finally, the group suggested that when considering cash/social protection links, greater consideration should be given to exit strategies, the concept of multi-year funding, and ensuring that preparedness is considered.

Next steps:

- Clarify the scope of the work stream (i.e. linking short term to long term use of humanitarian cash transfers versus linking international and national stakeholders), and assess/undertake the following activities through this lens: glossary, mapping of programmes, focus on knowledge and experience exchange on practical implementation of these linkages.

8. Update on Collective Donor Efforts

Norway – Mette Tangen, Senior Adviser, Section for Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Germany – Angela Schwarz, Desk Officer, Division for Humanitarian Assistance: Operations German Federal Foreign Office

Donors have made significant progress when it comes to developing a common understanding and joint approach to cash programming. Under the umbrella of both GB and GHD (Good Humanitarian Donorship) cash work streams, commitments made through the GB and the findings from a joint donor mission to Jordan and Lebanon in February 2018 were utilized to develop a '[Common Donor Approach to Humanitarian Cash Programming](#)'. It was presented in draft form at last year's annual meeting and officially endorsed by ten donors in February 2019.

With this, donors recognize the need for improved donor coordination and coherence, but also wish to signal that changes are needed. Donors want to see an approach to cash programming that is people centred, maximises efficiency and effectiveness, and has greater coherence to reduce fragmentation and parallel ways of working. Programming should be planned on the basis of joint and impartial needs assessments that select the most appropriate modality based on evidence. Where possible and appropriate, delivering cash should link to local and national mechanisms, including social protection.

Following the Strategic Dialogue on Cash in Brussels on the 1st March 2019, where a group of senior officials from key donors (ECHO, Germany, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, UK and USA) met, the '[Joint Donor Statement on Humanitarian Cash Transfers](#)' was issued. Building on the 'Common Donor Approach', which lays out a vision for the use of cash in

humanitarian action and sets forth general guiding principles to guide programming, the Joint Donor Statement now offers further clarification and identifies nine areas where donors want to focus their work in order to set expectations and accelerate action.

The 'Common Donor Approach' and 'Joint Statement' will be used to guide funding decisions by the donors who have signed up. There is an agreement to trial the approach jointly in two humanitarian contexts. While these elements have been developed at a global level (based on joint donor field missions), the actual roll out will be country-led and context specific. The Donor Forum on Cash, which met for the first time on 15th May 2019, will offer backstopping as appropriate. It also provides a platform for donors to come together at a technical level and will be used as a vehicle for coordination and consultations going forward.

The Q&A in this session revealed that the donors are aware of the need to liaise with other work streams (particularly localisation), though many of their staff are working on multiple issues to capture linkages. The Joint Donor Statement represents priority areas that are the best place for donors to *start* with in relation of how to accelerate change.

9. Cash and Gender sub-work stream update

UN Women – Hiba Qasas, Chief, Humanitarian Action and Crisis Response Office - Geneva
CARE – Holly Welcome Radice, Cash and Markets Technical Advisor

Panel of Researchers:

ODI – Rebecca Holmes, Research Associate, Social Protection and Social Policy Programme

London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine (LSHTM) – Dr. Ana Maria Buller, Deputy Director – Gender, Violence and Health Centre (on behalf of the Cash Transfer & IPV [Intimate Partner Violence] Research Collaborative)

IRC – Kathryn Falb, Senior Researcher

CARE and UN Women committed to lead a sub-work stream dedicated to advocate for and support the development of the gender incorporation guidance, operationalisation approaches, and policy and research.

UN Women opened the session by informing on recent events: CaLP, CARE, UN Women, WRC and ActionAid UK organised a half-day session during the 'cash week' in October 2018 in London with forty participating NGOs, UN, donors and researchers. CARE and UN Women co-hosted a workshop in Washington D.C. exploring the potential of cash and voucher assistance to empower women and reduce violence, which led to recommendations for the Cash work stream. The reports, including links to the presentations, can be found on the CaLP website.

The sub-work stream, funded by CARE, also translated into Spanish and French the WRC, IRC and Mercy Corps '*Mainstreaming GBV Considerations in CBIs and Utilising Cash in GBV Response*' toolkit, so that they will be useful in other contexts, especially where there is limited evidence. CARE, on behalf of a group of 15 organizations, led the development of a practical guidance for humanitarian practitioners on how to integrate gender-based violence (GBV) risk prevention and mitigation into CVA, and integrate CVA into GBV prevention and response, when appropriate. UN Women set out to produce the operational guideline on how to promote gender equality in humanitarian cash and voucher assistance, which is currently under peer review.

Following the introduction, three members presented their research:

- ODI looked into promoting gender in cash transfer programming, and its implications for the humanitarian-development nexus. Research found that there is increasing attention

to gender equality and women's and girls' empowerment in humanitarian contexts and cash transfer interventions, and in development contexts and social protection interventions; however limited attention is given to gender in programming in the humanitarian-development nexus. ODI has developed programme cycle suggestions for integrating gender into cash transfer programming to bridge the divide.

- LSHTM, on behalf of the Cash Transfer & IPV Research Collaborative, presented on its mixed method review and programme theory linking cash transfers and intimate partner violence. The programmes reviewed demonstrated an overall reduction in intimate partner violence, however most of them addressed physical and sexual violence, and there are gaps regarding other types of violence (emotional, psychological etc.). The study looked at three main pathways: (1) Economic security and emotional well-being (household level impact); (2) Intra-household conflict (marital dynamic impact); (3) Women's empowerment (women specific impact). It found that intra-household relationships are key in programme design, and that there is need to understand programmes designed specifically for gender-transformative effects; the study found strong evidence suggesting cash transfers are proven 'structural' interventions to reduce intimate partner violence at scale, across settings.
- IRC developed a conceptual framework and evidence on cash and gender-based violence based on an unconditional and multi-purpose three-month cash intervention in Raqqa Governorate, Syria. Although IRC could not confirm causality, the findings suggest a change in intimate partner violence and less negative coping strategies as secondary outcomes to the cash transfers. Based on the results, IRC came up with three learning priorities: (1) Design cash programming to monitor, minimise, and prevent risks to women and girls throughout the cash transfer cycle; (2) Test different design and delivery elements to maximise potential positive impacts for women; and (3) Test how to take programming at the early stages of an acute crisis to scale and how best to transition from short term emergency cash to longer term livelihoods opportunities for women.

Next steps

- Finalisation of operational guideline 'How to Promote Gender Equality in Humanitarian Cash and Voucher Assistance' (currently under peer review);
- Work with sub-work stream members to prioritize actions for next year.

Recommendations

- Encourage 'gender mainstreaming' across the cash and voucher assistance programme cycle to create as a minimum 'gender responsive' programmes;
- Advocate for inclusion of research and study funding as part of the regular cash and voucher assistance approach to understand impact and effectiveness, and expand on tools and resources for the diverse operating contexts;
- Recruit donor 'champions' that will co-lead the gender and cash agenda, and reinforce relations to pursue impact at scale;
- Encourage mechanisms for globally operating cash working groups to translate the GB outcomes into operational approaches;
- Strengthen possible linkages with social protection and recovery/development programmes;
- Adopt Sex and age disaggregated data (SADD) indicators in all analyses, reporting, monitoring and evaluations;
- Improve gender and gender-based violence capacity for the humanitarian actors and cash practitioners.

Ensuring we are on Target

17th May

10. Update on the Collaborative Cash Delivery Network

Save the Children UK – Dominic Courage, Head of Emergency Cash and Economic Programming Unit

CRS – Dina Brick, Senior Technical Advisor, Food Security and Markets

World Vision International – Kathryn Taetzsch, Global Director, Humanitarian Cash & Voucher Based Programming

This session was used to introduce the Collaborative Cash Delivery Network (CCD), which has 15 NGO members and is co-led by CRS, Save the Children and World Vision. The CCD has been exploring collaboration in 15 countries of which two are fully functioning (Colombia and Ethiopia) and two are in start-up phase (Ecuador and Uganda). It aims to improve collaboration in the system between actors by facilitating collaboration and applying its Response Builder platform to realise normative standard, that harness our collective capabilities in a complimentary and systemic way. This addresses inefficiency, ineffectiveness and fragmentation in the current system.

To encourage a healthier and more collaborative ecosystem, CCD envisages that the collaboration should have a set of agreed standards based on previous responses, which includes ways to make these standards work operationally. It is also striving to create new opportunities for a local network to engage in cash collaborations, and new analysis to increase the visibility of different actors' capabilities. The services that the CCD offers has a lot of potential and are already functioning in Colombia and Ethiopia.

The Q&A section revealed that having the physical presence of somebody in country to work with the actors on the ground is a big help to enabling successful collaborations. NGOs use different systems, and the development of shared approaches and system interoperability helps the sum to be more than its parts. Another lesson learned from CCD's work is that collaboration is incremental and it takes time for members to get to know each other, as principles are based on trust and ceding some ground where necessary to deliver the best service for affected people.

CCD's plans to engage widely, including with government bodies, local and national organisations. A CCD presence in country adapts to fit the context and can generate a range of collaborations that serve different needs but are linked by shared principles, standards and ways of working together. Where there are UN common delivery systems and humanitarian responses in the same country, they should coexist and share standards, and discussions have started about how to facilitate this.

11. Cash and Risk sub-work stream: panel session on data responsibility

CaLP – Anna Kondakhchyan, CaLP Programme Coordinator (moderator)

WFP – Tahir Nour, Chief Market Access Programmes Unit

ICRC – Jo Burton, Cash Transfers and Markets Specialist

WFP – Samir Wanmali, Deputy Director WFP Policy and Programme Division

Red Rose – Hakan Buyukbayrak, Chief Technical Officer

CRS – Dina Brick, Senior Technical Advisor - Food Security and Markets

This session introduced data protection as a topic, the aims of the sub-work stream and its progress to date. It then moved to a panel discussion on digital risks, data protection, how to avoid data breaches in the future and how partnerships can help.

CaLP outlined that CVA involves more personal data than other modalities. Awareness has been heightened in recent years and high-quality guidance has become available, but not many field colleagues are able to meet the ethical and legal standards that we aspire to; some of this is down to lack of evidence around actual harms to affected populations stemming from mishandling of data and lack of clear critical incident reporting procedures.

ICRC outlined that the need to pass data to third parties such as financial service providers can bring risks to affected populations as well as to humanitarian action, and that we need to balance the risks to affected populations against agency interests for efficiency, speed etc. The sector needs to discuss digital and data risks directly with communities, to understand what they are and to build trust with communities. There should be a greater focus not only on responsibilities related to personal data protection, but also around metadata, which is a growing area of risk and potential harm. The idea of recipients consenting to provide data during a crisis needs to be reconsidered, as people in need are often not able to consent in a meaningful way, and provision of assistance should not be conditional on provision of personal data. The sector should also focus on operationalising existing standards, engaging with the private sector with appropriate levels of due diligence, and hold the relevant parties accountable for the weaponization of information in armed conflict. Finally, ICRC emphasised that we need to rearticulate what 'Do No Harm' means in the digital age.

WFP want their experiences on the ground lead to a WFP-wide digital policy that is enforced through operational directives. There should be a deliberate and systematic attempt at cross-functional planning between cash and in-kind food aid.

Red Rose touched upon the beneficiary data breach that they were involved in with CRS in 2017. As a service provider, they build the guidance on data protection into their platform, using the GPDR as their baseline, because it is the most established standard globally. They have found that on data issues there is often a disconnect between HQs and country programmes as well as a sliding scale of awareness and ability to address data protection concerns among their client agencies.

CRS explained that the 2017 incident happened despite safeguards, policies and trainings in place to prevent it. There are data risks at every stage of the user chain and the biggest challenge is at the user level. As most data is on spreadsheets, passwords for these are an important issue. Better awareness of where the risks come from is needed, alongside analysis for every context via tailored Data Privacy Impact Assessments as one instrument.

CRS also shared recent initiative by the Collaborative Cash Platform member agencies to establish a template and guidance on data at the global level, setting out the rules around consent and the GPDR-compliant commitments at the local level, outlining *who* has access to the different elements of data. This template is being reviewed by legal organisations and translated to local contexts.

There are remaining challenges, including the need for quality standards that align actors' interests on data responsibility issues. Data protection is also not fully resourced as an area and further training is required at the local level. Finally, further thought should be given to issue of beneficiary consent, as their ability to make a choice is often limited. The humanitarian sector should work with existing systems that beneficiaries are already comfortable with.

Next steps (apart from continuing organisation specific work):

- Conduct quarterly calls and continue facilitating knowledge sharing;
- Create a workplan with action points on data protection and data responsibility, as a follow-up to the workshop organised by OCHA and CaLP (hosted by ICRC) at the beginning of April;
- Link-up with various clusters to understand how to best build risk related evidence around sectors aside from food security.

12. Tracking Cash and Vouchers sub-work stream update

ECHO – Chloe de Soye, Policy Officer

CaLP – Ruth McCormack, Senior Technical Officer

ECHO and CaLP updated the group on this sub-work stream's progress. It has been agreed that cash and vouchers should be disaggregated when tracking at the global interagency level, that conditionality should not be tracked, and that there is no need to track restriction as a separate category. Additionally, a separate reporting category which transcends sectors is needed, with it being recommended at this stage to use 'multi-purpose' as that cross-sectoral category. It has also been agreed that the value of transfers made to recipients should be used as the primary basis for tracking cash and vouchers. In the medium-term it is recommended that both the value of transfers, plus associated programming costs, should be tracked. It is recommended that reporting on all humanitarian assistance should be disaggregated by modality, recognizing that this would require wider buy-in and engagement, along with additional technical work, to become a reality.

Next steps:

- Merge '*Tracking CVA*' with the '*CE2HA*' sub-work stream in the summer of 2019 and develop a joint work plan by end of July;
- Develop, launch and disseminate tracking cash and vouchers guidance from summer 2019;
- Liaise with the IATI Data Standard and OCHA (Financial Tracking Service/HPC) for the integration of agreements into these reporting mechanisms;
- Finalize Tracking CVA guidance by end of July and disseminate;
- Build evidence and gather learning from cost-efficiency analysis and SCAN;
- Apply to operational where possible (UN/CCD/Donor pilot);
- Ensure uptake of Tracking CVA guidance via FTS/IATI.

13. Panel discussion - what are we missing?

CaLP – Karen Peachey, CaLP Director (moderator)

Ground Truth Solutions – Louisa Seferis, Senior Programme Manager

Former National Coordinator for Social Protection at the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs in Liberia – Gabriel Fernandez (in absentia)

Lebanese Red Cross – Lama Chamaa, Basic Assistance Manager

MasterCard – Sasha Kapadia, Director, Markets and Partnerships, Government and Development

The panel discussion aimed at identifying what is currently missing from conversations at the Cash work stream by including a broader range of voices. The former National Coordinator for Social Protection at the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs in Liberia, and representatives from Ground Truth Solutions, the Lebanese Red Cross and MasterCard provided reflections on the key gaps and challenges they see in CVA responses, and the asks they have for people in the room.

Mastercard, representing private sector actors, said they don't see a healthy partnership between humanitarians and private sector actors. They called for both sides to come together with common objectives, common goals and a common roadmap, and for genuine co-design and co-implementation of humanitarian responses, with shared accountability for outcomes. It is expected that technology will be a major part of the transformation of the humanitarian sector; however, the humanitarian sector is not equipped to build technology in-house. Private sector businesses such as MasterCard have built expertise in data protection and moving money over decades and want to work with humanitarians to share this knowledge. Humanitarian actors are still hesitant when it comes to cooperation with the private sector for fear of losing control, reputational risks, and compromising humanitarian principles. MasterCard does not share this perspective and emphasises that the private sector is understanding and willing to find solutions. MasterCard's interest in cooperating with humanitarian actors lies primarily in learning to develop products for vulnerable people in order to build markets for the future.

The Lebanese Red Cross urged participants to think about what localisation actually means: integration (routing existing programmes through local partners) isn't real localisation, it's about inclusion (co-design, mutual learning and thinking about assistance from the local perspective). There is a need to change the perspective from 'building capacities' of local actors to 'exchanging capacities' in local contexts and trust existing local solutions. The Lebanese Red Cross emphasised the need to be realistic about what humanitarian assistance can deliver in different timeframes. There is a lot of pressure on short-term interventions to achieve resilience. At the same time, it was a difficult endeavour for the Lebanese Red Cross to gain support and longer-term investments of donors when they wanted to build a cash preparedness system. Cash should never be used for its own sake – it's about understanding the policies, partnerships and problems faced by recipients and designing the best tool for the job.

Ground Truth Solutions aimed to reflect what they have learned about the perspectives of cash recipients. They argued that while we often think of cash as a user-centred approach, we still deliver in a project-based and supply-driven manner. Efforts to be accountable to affected population are often carried out as a 'box ticking exercise'. Cash recipients, particularly in contexts where there is no stable phone connection, consider hotlines and call centres difficult to access; they prefer face-to-face conversations. Ground Truth Solutions has also established that cash recipients need the right information to make appropriate decisions. This includes knowing the different steps to receive cash, their rights and obligations, so that they can report a private sector service provider in case of abuse of power. Cash beneficiaries are most concerned about the lack of predictability in the assistance provided; humanitarian actors do not properly inform how long recipients will receive cash and in what amount.

The former National Coordinator for Social Protection at the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs in Liberia⁵ shared some key messages around the need for better coordination between humanitarian actors and host governments. Effective coordination with host governments is key but comes at a cost (financing) and may require investment in capacity building. Coordination needs to be incentivised, as government and humanitarian partners need to see value in participating. Coordination is also made more difficult by the fact that international response staff with cash transfer programming experience come and go fast in response to multiple crisis, which leads to repeated work. In addition, there is need to invest in supporting national efforts for preparedness, as not only is this critical for the response, but it also builds trust for better coordination. To overcome these barriers, donors should make coordination a requirement of support and request that the reports they receive include information on how coordination is supported. Finally, dynamic delivery mechanisms need to be flexible and part of adaptive social protection systems.

Participants concluded by highlighting that mistrust still undermines real partnership between humanitarian and private sector actors, stressing the need to invest in preparedness and reiterating the importance of real participation of cash recipients, ideally through face to face conversations.

14. Breakout session: areas for priority action and critical issues

DFID and WFP introduced a break-out session designed to determine areas of priority action for the work stream and highlight critical issues that need consideration in work planning.

Participants discussed:

- 1) *Within the existing work of the GB Cash work stream (the priority actions) – what are the most time critical actions for 2019/2020?*
- 2) *Are there any additional areas that you believe the GB Cash work stream should work on? Why the GB and why now? What challenge does this overcome?*

Participants recommended the following:

1. Cash coordination needs to be solved. A political barriers/influencing group should be formed to overcome political barriers and link better with coordination and needs assessment.
2. While tracking global humanitarian use of cash remains important, we need to move towards having a single measure of quality and impact.
3. The work stream should be refocused to look more into digital delivery and data protection, to ensure it gets ahead of the curve on these issues.
4. There should be consideration given to merging the 'Tracking CVA' and 'CE2HA' sub-work streams and to taking up IATI standards in our work.
5. The existing guidance is too heavy and is proliferating. The work stream should do something about operationalising it and providing a mechanism to do so.

⁵ Not present at the meeting due to visa issues

6. The humanitarian and private sectors should improve their partnership, including by working collaboratively in specific contexts on, for example, data collection and data protection, and ensuring greater private sector attendance at events.
7. Cash should increase and formalise its links to other work streams, particularly localisation and needs assessment. We need greater representation from local partners at these events and to develop an approach to localisation for this work stream, which includes co-design and local capacity strengthening.

15. Reflections from the Global Clusters

UNHCR, Shelter - Brett Moore, Chief, Shelter and Settlements, UNHCR, and co-lead Global Shelter Cluster

UNICEF, Nutrition, Education and WASH - Dana Cristescu (CashCap) – Cash Advisor to the Global Education, Nutrition and WASH Clusters

WHO, Health - Elodie Ho (CashCap) - Cash Advisor to the Global Health Cluster-Cash Task Team

The cluster leads reflected that the power of cash to cut across sectors is creating new programming opportunities and greater than each of the cluster and sectoral approaches on their own. Those that work on cash understand their own issues, but as it is still an emergent topic they should better inform and work together with technical people from the clusters, including by developing additional guidance and processes and well as inclusion in existing guidance. The cash experts should work to prioritise collaboration across sectors with their technical colleagues for greater sustainability of interventions. Equally, there is growing capacity and appreciation of cash modalities in technical programs and greater collaboration is evident. They should be aware of the large amount of technical and thematic issues on the agenda of clusters, but positive progress is being made on cash and is a growing focus of the clusters. Cash experts should develop approaches with sector colleagues for stronger evidence-based data on the outcomes of cash programs and how they can contribute to sectoral goals. Finally, there are many other ways to reduce financial barriers to access basic needs and services through modalities other than cash, including in-kind and services. It is crucial to keep a bigger picture in the response option analysis and consider all modalities when designing a program. Clusters' have a long experience in in-kind and service delivery that cash experts can build upon when designing tools and guidance documents in cash.

16. Looking forward - priorities and key areas of work for 2019

This session used active guided work to shape the work stream's priorities going forward and the key areas of work for the coming year. The groups discussed priority areas and the new/emerging areas identified earlier that day.

Each priority action area discussed:

- 1) *How does this priority action contribute to the overall commitment?*
- 2) *What is the overall objective of this priority action within the GB Cash work stream?*
- 3) *What will success look like over the coming year?*
- 4) *What are the main things the work stream will achieve over the coming year?*
- 5) *How approach risks and challenges*

The new/emerging areas discussed:

- 1) *Why has this been prioritised? How does it contribute to the overall commitment?*
- 2) *Why is this a priority for GB Cash work stream as opposed to other fora for working on cash?*
- 3) *What are the next steps on this proposed action?*
- 4) *Which areas were not considered priorities and why?*

During this session, participants drew up a range of next steps and priority areas of work for each sub-work stream. These are detailed in the body of this report, under the 'next steps' section for each sub-work stream.

The participants also discussed forming two additional sub-work streams that had been proposed for consideration in an earlier session. These were:

1st Proposed additional priority action area: Tackling political blockages to effective cash

What?

A group of signatories working to identify and elevate the political blockages to the effective scale up of cash. The work of the group will be light touch and will focus on identifying key messages and opportunities to influence the broader issues affecting cash by working with other work streams, such as coordination, joint needs and localisation.

Why?

Advancing the cash coordination agenda; joining up with other work streams; recognising the progress made at the working level and the opportunity for our Sherpas to raise issues with a broader set of influencers; responds to recommendations from the ODI GB review.

How?

Allocating nominated co-leads, establishing a work plan/strategy, focusing on simplifying messages to promote uptake inclusive of the GCCG and other relevant actors.

Next Steps:

A vote to move forward with this sub work stream.

2nd Proposed additional priority action area: Partnerships with local actors

What?

Scale up of cash must build on effective partnerships with local organisations, including the private sector at national level. This priority action area would leverage the experience of 'downstream' signatories to ensure that partnerships are meaningful, two-way and supportive of the adequate inclusion of local actors. Success would look like: increased involvement of local actors in finding solutions at national level and greater engagement of local actors in next year's GB meeting.

Why?

The way that local partners (including private sector) are engaged in cash programming fails to recognise the two-way benefits to effectiveness in cash. Too often the power in partnerships is unbalanced and local actors are still not linked to global discussions, policy

and fora. This impacts on the strength and effectiveness of cash programmes by failing to incorporate local solutions.

How?

Guidance / tip sheets – focus on inclusion. Possible case studies.

Next Steps:

A vote to move forward with this sub work stream.

17. Workshop evaluation

After the workshop, the co-convenors distributed a short evaluation survey to participants, designed to gather feedback on the third workshop and collect suggestions for the 2020 workshop. The respondents broadly felt the workshop had been positive, with all rating it as 'satisfactory' or 'excellent' overall. Specifically, respondents commented favourably on the inclusivity of the workshop, the emphasis on group work and discussion, and the useful technical material presented by a number of the work streams. Overall, the balance between updates and forward-look was felt to be well struck.

Respondents would have liked to have covered linkages with other work streams (such as localisation) and common approaches to risk, and to have looked at how cash sits in the humanitarian architecture. They suggested that next year's workshop include a wider pool of participants and speakers, including more local organisations, governments and voices from the field. They also felt there should be more time for break-out sessions and group work, and more discussions on wider topics.

Annex A: Workshop Agenda

Third Grand Bargain Cash Work stream Annual Workshop

Date: 16th-17th May 2019

Location: Aula Delegatis, WFP HQ, Rome

DAY ONE: PROGRESS TO DATE		
	Session	Leads/panellist
8.45 – 9.30	Registration and welcome coffee	
9.30 – 10.00	Opening remarks	DFID – Terri Sarch, Permanent Representative of the UK to the UN Agencies based in Rome
10.00 – 11.15	The GB Cash Work stream and the global state of play and progress in 2018	ODI – Wendy Fenton, Research Fellow, Humanitarian Policy Group CaLP – Sophie Tholstrup, Policy Coordinator
11.15 – 11.30	Coffee	
11.30 – 12.00	Cash developments in 2018	CaLP – Sophie Tholstrup, Policy Coordinator OCHA – Juliet Lang, Humanitarian Affairs Officer - Cash Coordination
12.00 – 13.00	Lunch	
13.00 – 14.30	Efficiency, effectiveness and value for money work stream	USAID/FFP – Ruco Van Der Merwe, Food Security and Markets Advisor IRC – Caitlin Tulloch, Senior Technical Advisor, Best Use of Resources USAID/OFDA – Laura Meissner, Economic Recovery Advisor CRS – Dina Brick, Senior Technical Advisor, Food Security and Markets
14.30 – 15.30	Cash and social protection work stream: discussion on guidance note and key issues	DFID – Rosie Jackson, Humanitarian Cash Policy Lead UNICEF – Claire Mariani, Humanitarian Cash Transfer Coordinator IFRC – Caroline Holt, Manager – Global Cash Transfer Programming
15.30 – 15.45	Coffee	
15.45 – 16.30	Joint donor efforts	Norway – Mette Tangen, Senior Adviser, Section for Humanitarian Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs Germany – Angela Schwartz Desk Officer, Division for Humanitarian Assistance: Operations German Federal Foreign Office

16.30 – 17.30	Cash and gender	UN Women – <i>Hiba Qasas, Chief, Humanitarian Action and Crisis Response Office - Geneva</i> CARE – <i>Holly Welcome Radice, Cash and Markets Technical Advisor</i> CARE – <i>Tamara Shukakidze-Demuria, Humanitarian Director of Practice, Partnerships & Innovation</i>
17.30 – 19.00	<i>Reception – Peace Garden</i>	
DAY TWO: ENSURING WE ARE ON TARGET		
9.00 – 9.30	Welcome and recap	DFID
9.30 – 10.30	Cash and risk Panel session on data responsibility	CaLP – <i>Anna Kondakhchyan, CaLP Programme Coordinator (moderator)</i> WFP – <i>Tahir Nour, Chief Market Access Programme Unit</i> <i>Panel discussion:</i> ICRC – <i>Jo Burton, Cash Transfers and Markets Specialist</i> WFP – <i>Samir Wanmali, Deputy Director WFP Policy and Programme Division</i> Red Rose – <i>Hakan Buyukbayrak, Chief Technical Officer</i> CRS – <i>Dina Brick, Senior Technical Advisor - Food Security and Markets</i>
10:30 – 10:50	Tracking cash and vouchers	ECHO – <i>Chloe de Soye, Policy Officer</i> CaLP – <i>Ruth McCormack, CaLP Senior Technical Officer</i>
10.50 – 11:00	<i>Coffee</i>	
11.00 – 12.00	SESSION 1: Panel discussion- <i>What are we missing?</i>	CaLP – <i>Karen Peachey, CaLP Director (moderator)</i> Ground Truth Solutions – <i>Louisa Seferis, Senior Programme Manager</i> Former National Coordinator for Social Protection at the Ministry of Planning and Economic Affairs in Liberia – <i>Gabriel Fernandez</i> Lebanese Red Cross – <i>Lama Chamaa, Basic Assistance Manager</i> Mastercard – <i>Sasha Kapadia, Director, Markets and Partnerships, Government and Development</i>
12.00 – 12.45	SESSION 1: Break Out/ Group Work	WFP/DFID <i>Introduction – Rosie Jackson, Humanitarian Cash Policy Lead</i>

12.45 – 13.45	<i>Lunch</i>	
13.45– 15.00	SESSION 2: <i>Looking forward- priorities for 2019</i>	WFP / DFID Group discussions
15.00 – 15.15	<i>Coffee</i>	
15.15 – 16.15	Presentations from Session 2 Closing- key areas of work for 2019	Sub Work stream Co-leads WFP – Kenn Crossley, Global Coordinator of Cash Transfers
16.15 – 16.45	Closing remarks	WFP – Valerie Guarnieri, Assistant Executive Director

Annex B: List of Participating Agencies

Action Against Hunger
Action Aid
British Red Cross
CaLP
CARE
CASHCAP
Christian Aid
CRS
Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade Australia
Development Initiatives
DFID
ECHO
Education, Nutrition and WASH Clusters
FAO
Federal Department of Foreign Affairs Switzerland
Federal Public Service Foreign Affairs -Belgium
Global Food Security Cluster
Global Health Cluster
Global Shelter Cluster
German Federal Foreign Office
Government of the Kingdom of Sweden
Ground Truth Solutions
Handicap International
ICRC
IFRC
IMPACT Initiatives
IOM
IRC
Lebanese Red Cross
Liberia
London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medical
Mastercard
Mercy Corps
Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Finland
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Norway
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark
Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Czech Republic
Ministry of Foreign Affairs Spain
NRC
OCHA
ODI

OECD
Oxfam
Plan International
PRM
Red Rose
Relief International
Save the Children
Shelter Cluster
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency
UN Women
UNDP
UNHCR
UNICEF
USAID/FFP
USAID/OFDA
WFP
World Bank
WVI
ZOA International

Annex C: Pre-meeting survey

1. What is the most significant progress made in cash and voucher assistance overall since 2016?
2. What is the most significant remaining challenge related to CVA?
3. Reflecting on the past year of the Cash work stream's work, what do you think we have done well or gotten right?
4. What could have been done better?
5. How could the work stream coordinate and work better with external actors (other work streams or otherwise)?
6. How could internal coordination in the work stream be improved?
7. What are the key priority actions for the workshop? What outcomes would you like to see from the workshop?
8. What would be the most interesting panel discussion topic for you?
9. Looking ahead, what should be the key areas of focus for our work in the coming year?
10. Linked to these key areas of focus, please give 3 key outputs we should be aiming for in the coming year.