US/Canada Cash Working Group Meeting
December 6, 2016

Location: Relief International and remotely by WebEx

Attendees:
<u>In-Person</u>
John Lamm, USAID/FFP
Ruco Van Der Merwe, USAID/FFP
Laura Meissner, USAID/OFDA
Nick Anderson, Save the Children
Alex Gray, Relief International
Rebecca Quick, Relief International
Ann Koontz, Relief International
Sam Crago, Relief International
Adam Riddell, World Vision
Ben Phillips, ChildFund International
Jenny Coneff, Cash Learning Partnership
Blake Stabler, Cash Learning Partnership
Keith Preciados, Cash Learning Partnership

<u>Via WebEx</u>
Debra Olson, ADRA International
Emily Lyles, John Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health
Kayla Casavant, American Refugee Committee
Jane Bloom International Catholic Migration Commission
Ben Ball, CrossMatch
Altaf Abro, Plan International Canada
Khandker Hossain, Plan International Canada
Umair Ashraf, Islamic Relief Canada
Tenzin Manell, Women's Refugee Commission

Agenda:
- Advocacy corner
- Updates
- Other business
- Coordination functions and models discussion for input into [Global Public Policy Institute](#) white paper

Advocacy Corner:
- United States
  - The United States advocacy community is awaiting further news on the transition of the executive and legislative branches
- Canada
  - GAC is undergoing review, conclusions anticipated in January
- Global
  - CaLP working through Geneva and InterAction to get cash on G7/G20 agendas

- o Refugees and Migration: sustained effort to include cash in 2016 compacts
- o Coordination and risk/feasibility likely to be subjects of discussion in 2017

Updates:
- Women's Refugee Commission discussed CBI and GBV research: goal is to develop and test guidance, tools and frameworks to help CBI practitioners ensure the protection of beneficiaries from GBV risks throughout the program cycle. link
- USAID's Learning Labs, through NetHope funding cash preparedness activities for Mercy Corps in DRC and Mali and for CRS in Somalia link
- Save the Children is working on a Basic Needs Assessment and Response Analysis Framework to support the 2015 Multipurpose Cash Grant toolkit. They will test the work in Nigeria. link
- The Financial Inclusion Forum was held on Thursday, December 1, 2016. link It was hosted by the U.S. Department of the Treasury and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). The event was followed by a Financial Inclusion Practitioner's Day hosted on Friday, December 2, 2016. The event focused on better preparedness by humanitarians, clearer expectations of FSPs, and wider range of potential private-sector partners for humanitarians.
- Food for Peace Annual Program Statement (APS) coming soon; includes responses to every single comment received.
- Technical Advisory Group (TAG) Activities (to be revised in 2017)
  - o Digital payments: Cash delivery mechanism collaboration models, training/capacity building on digital payments
  - o Markets: market-support programming standards/guidance, adapting minimum standards for market analysis with SPHERE
  - o Social protection: developing online trainings, inventory of case studies
  - o MEAL: Develop cash MEAL guidance/standards, piloting, 1-day training
  - o Peer review of CaLP capacity building materials, research, etc.
  - o Develop repository/map of evidence for cash programming

Other business
- Future topics of interest: explore linkages between humanitarian assistance and social protection work
- Next CWG in February
- Possible North America CWG meeting in Canada in 2017

Coordination attributes and models discussion

What are the desired attributes of cash coordination?
- Operational:
  - o Coordination with private sector
  - o Understand and document market context (market strengthening role??)
  - o Map and broker with vendors
  - o Share vendor cost/market assessment info (not limited to commodities, but also different types of services)
  - o Focus on analysis being good enough to meet objectives
- Technical:
  - o Practical issues that are also strategic: (grant value, whether to condition/restrict, where are we working, what are our goals)

- o Overlap with operational
  - How do we handle different currencies/multi-currency areas (especially as existing country-specific coordination systems may not be dealing well with many cross-border responses now)
  - Establishing data protection standards
  - Establishing usage/access for shared systems (data systems, identity systems whether digital or national, etc.)
  - o Needs assessment (multi-sector)
  - o Establish transfer value processes/standards
  - o Quality control (i.e. shelter standards)
  - o Aggregate and prioritize needs from different clusters (broader coordination role, not often being met)
  - o Aligned with/respect for clusters'/sectors' technical expertise, ensuring cluster/sector-specific qualities are incorporated into the response
  - o Confirm that needs are being met/where gaps exist
- Strategic:
  - o Response analysis (whether/not to cash/voucher/in-kind, transfer values & graduated baskets, support application of market analysis)
  - o Strategic issues that are also very practical:
    - Which sectors should be using cash?
    - Where are we working?
    - What are our goals?
    - Should we be conditioning and/or restricting transfers?
    - Which needs are being covered in multisectoral responses?
    - How are we working with actors working in other countries/from other countries? (Increasingly possible, for example, using Orange Money in West Africa)
  - o Resource identification, assistance for members to support resourcing of responses
  - o Donor coordination to cover unmet needs, identify where additional resources are required
  - o Response analysis requires engagement with multiple groups, not just cash technical coordination groups
  - o Information sharing:
    - Vertical: between local/country/regional/international coordination mechanisms
    - Horizontal: Across sectors, organizations, departments
  - o Link relief and development

What are the undesired attributes of cash coordination?
- Operations dictates technical decisions (whether/not cash/voucher/in-kind, transfer amount).
- One sector dictates response objectives, actors
- Cluster coordination serves one organizational mandate, instead of apolitical/neutral
- Often not timely; need coordination mechanisms that are both timely and adaptable

What are the advantages and disadvantages of different models for coordination?
1. Under existing operational cluster
   a. Most common current model (legacy), most often under food security or shelter

      b. May make one large U.N. agency the lead agency, eliminate new ideas about how to provide cash

      c. May exclude cash from being used in other sectors

      d. Likely not to be multisectoral in focus

      e. There are many reasons why this doesn't work well; too many to list!

      f. Pro: It is linked to cluster system.

2. Embedded within service cluster
   a. Logistics doesn't "judge" (express a preference on modality)
   b. Multi-purpose/multi-sector is challenging for logistics
   c. May reinforce WFP's leading role within the system, as they lead most existing service clusters
   d. Logistics brings skills and knowledge of markets, financing, negotiating contracts
   e. Wrong people in logistics meetings; might need separate group/meeting
   f. Telecomms (one of the other service clusters) is too specific, doesn't involve enough of the relevant players
   g. Competition between operational and technical coordination attention
   h. Pro: It is linked to cluster system.

3. [Cash and markets] Mainstreamed into all clusters
   a. Still requires a "hub"-type of group
   b. Benefits from sector space and knowledge
   c. May be easier in places where government has a leading role in coordination, for example in Sudan or Ethiopia, and thus the government can lead on mainstreaming cash
   d. Potential to share market assessment and response analysis across sectors
   e. Fear that "mainstreamed" = no-one's job
   f. Still may not work for multipurpose/multisector grants
   g. Local governments, community-based organizations, and smaller faith-based organizations may have difficulty participating, especially if not clear with whom to coordinate
   h. If led by host/affected government: Will not be cash specific as with all coordination systems
   i. Some clusters may be resistant to mainstreaming. Other times, may not learn about cash if not currently going on in cluster (such as in health or education)
   j. Would work best when all clusters are doing some cash; not necessarily great if lots of multisectoral programming
   k. Pro: It is linked to cluster system.

4. Common multi-purpose delivery mechanisms
   a. Potential efficiency gains for time (reduced procurement time) and money (based on higher volume of transactions).
   b. May reduce duplication.
   c. May link to social protection systems
   d. Reduced competition may increase costs due to monopoly powers, particularly if a global solution; reduce potential for accountability
   e. Likely very context-specific
   f. May be more difficult for community-based organizations and smaller faith-based groups to participate (unless they become part of these systems ahead of time)
   g. Slow (getting multiple large actors to agree on 1 platform sufficient for all needs)
   h. Must be done at preparedness phase

      i.   Advantage of being able to plan to use new technologies (biometrics, national id systems, etc.) in areas where this would be appropriate and data protection can be agreed upon ahead of time;

      j.   If done ahead of time, can decide whether a single identity platform could be used by multiple actors to increase competition or whether more efficient/desirable to be run by a single actor/competitor

      k.   Unclear link to cluster system

5. Independent body outside cluster system
   a. Likely faster without formality
   b. Strategic functions weak without formal connections to IASC or government
   c. Exclusive
   d. Unpredictable
   e. Some groups likely to complain that they support more than their "fair share" of this function
   f. Con: Not linked to cluster system

- NOTE: We need to know more about models to give feedback and positions. There isn't a lot written about the subject. Need guidelines on functions, roles, best practices, examples; many groups felt too little documentation about what works/doesn't at this point; also, lack of agreement on which examples of cash coordination worked well and which did not work well.

Global vs. context-specific models
- Contextual allows links to social protection as appropriate
- A single, adaptable global foundation is predictable, and predictability increases speed
- Adaptability is important for a global solution
- Context-specific models are slow because it takes time for people to figure them out (example Haiti 2016 Hurricane Matthew response where unclear who would lead and which parts of government needed to remain informed); each context will have different people who bring different lessons
- When you share technical guidelines with a country, stakeholders should elaborate on how they will operate on a national level.
- It seems like there are some things that can be on a global level, to prepare guidance, etc. However, many things will be context specific, including the market analysis, response analysis, etc. If there is a lot (or not much) cash in a given response, a different model may be necessary for coordination, dependent on the size of the response.
- At what level, would we like things coordinated? And what are other items?
  o We want collaboration at country level.
  o Some global coordination/predictability of coordination is desirable
  o Want information to move both vertically and horizontally
- We would want a coordination system that will be cost-effective both in financial and human resource requirements (skill, time)

Miscellaneous Notes
- Cash coordination can serve as a good means to approach volatile governments.
- Digital identity: The Electronic Cash Transfer Learning Network for electronic payments in humanitarian situations did webinar on digital identities.http://www.cashlearning.org/elan/elan-webinar-recordings
- Recommended next step: define roles and responsibilities of each model.