PART 2

MPG Transfer Design
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What It Is

Bringing together information on needs as defined in the Needs Assessment, Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), Vulnerability and Gaps Analysis to inform transfer amount, frequency of distribution and other characteristics of transfer design.

Essential Checklist

Together with cash, protection and sector-specific experts, take into consideration the results of the Situation and Response Analysis (SRA) to determine net need and, of that need, what can be met by providing unrestricted cash (Figure 7).

Take into consideration households’ prioritisation of other needs. Households may spend less on food if in a given month there is a need to buy seeds and tools or pay rent and other resources are not available. Consider a “top up” of cash to meet additional predictable cash needs.

Estimate what portion of total needs households can make up themselves through income, including remittances and production. Income sources may change, particularly when the crisis-related impacts on livelihoods change, e.g. when floods recede. Some people can cope better with displacement, employing their skills and other capacities (Figure 8).

\[
\text{Total need (or MEB)} - \text{Needs met by affected population} + \text{Needs met by other actors} = \text{Gap in needs}
\]

Some assistance will be provided by government and other sources. Some will be in-kind. Calculate the gap.

**FIGURE 7. Factors affecting cash needs**
FIGURE 8. Calculating the MPG Transfer Value

Take into consideration the necessity of a different MPG value based on geography, livelihood, degrees of vulnerability, availability of aid, etc. Some regions or livelihood groups have been less affected by the crisis or have different policies that influence livelihoods of affected persons. Other regions may have more or fewer agencies providing complementary assistance.

Do No Harm/Do More Good

Particularly at the beginning of the crisis there are many competing demands; therefore the delivery of complementary activities, either within your MPG or alongside it, will be essential to address multiple competing priorities.

Capacity to cope and recover during a crisis will differ between vulnerable groups and at different points along the crisis timeline. Factors affecting differences include wealth and vulnerability prior to the crisis, and how the crisis affects different livelihood groups and their assets/capacities. Wealth ranking is a useful tool to distinguish socio-economic differences.

- Clearly state assumptions about coping capacity and the availability of complementary assistance provided by other agencies, e.g. food assistance, and test through Response Monitoring. Reassess transfer size if something changes.

- Set a threshold where changes in the gap would trigger a different MPG value, e.g. a change in prices by +/-10%.

There is clear evidence that crisis-affected households prioritise available funds wisely.23 The less money and resources a household has, the more likely it is to spend money on pressing basic needs.24 But programme design can also influence the way households spend their money, e.g. money provided in September is likely to be spent on school supplies. Conditionalities can also work, e.g. second payment for shelter materials is only provided when the foundation has been laid, or small business grants are provided upon completion of livelihoods skills training. In Malawi, Concern used SMS campaigns to encourage families to buy nutritious foods with their transfer.25 Complementary programming is also essential to meet those needs that can only partially be met by cash (Box 9).

Through your problem and causal analysis and the Response Analysis it may be clear that socio-economic vulnerabilities are not the only cause of the problem, and cash is not the only response. In some cases affected populations might need information, education and communication (IEC) or technical assistance to meet their needs. Or, through the market assessment, it might be clear that some goods and services are not available and need to be provided in-kind, e.g. direct delivery of nutrition services or specific shelter materials. What we are aiming for is a people-centred approach wherein operational efficiencies can be gained when many agencies/sectors use cash to meet needs (inter-sector coordination of CBIs, including MPGs) and within-sector coordination to ensure the provision of a holistic approach, e.g. moderately malnourished children and their families targeted with public health services, IEC, specialised foods such as corn-soya blend (CSB), AND cash to meet other basic food needs. Agencies in Nigeria distributed cash with CSB as a “protection ration” so that food-insecure families were more likely to give the CSB to the malnourished child and not share it with other members of the family.26

---

26 https://www.wfp.org/sid-professionals/blog/fighting-malnutrition-niger

---

RESOURCES

See Annex 3 Standard Operating Procedures: Appendix G to this Toolkit: Transfer Value Worksheet (digital only)

Cash in Emergencies Toolkit (IFRC)

Setting the transfer value. UNHCR CBI Guidelines

Determining the Value of Cash Transfers – Preliminary Insights from LIME

Household Economy Analysis

Complementary Interventions to Cash-Based Interventions, DFID (2011) Cash Transfers Literature Review, Chapter 3

Guide to Protection in CBIs (UNHCR), p.11