Mapping of FS Country Clusters Cash Activities & Working Groups

Introduction
The gFSC Cash & Markets WG (CMWG) main purpose is to support Food Security clusters through development of tools and guidance and global advocacy for country level needs. In view of this, in April 2015 the CMWG mapped and gathered information on cash activities and cash WGs at country-level in which the FS clusters are involved. This information was also used to shape the agenda of the first Cluster Coordinators’ Retreat held in Rome in July 2015.

Given the momentum gained by cash transfer activities in different countries, and in order to continue and improve the support to the countries, the gFSC Cash & Markets Working Group was reactivated in December 2015 during the Global Partners’ meeting. The findings of this questionnaire thus aim to further update the information received earlier, further explore Food Security Clusters related needs and concerns in CTP and inform the activities of the CMWG in support of country needs.

The survey was sent to all active Food Security Clusters and Sectors and feedback was received from 20 countries out of 25.
Main Findings

Presence of Cash WG/TFs in Country & Participation

- In the majority of countries responding there is an active Cash WG/Task Force – only in 3 countries out of 20 a Cash WG does not exist
- Among leading agencies there are: CaLP; NGOs (ACF, Save, Oxfam, Mercy Corps, CRS, NRC, WVII); UN (WFP, OCHA, UNICEF, UNHCR) – national NGOs also participate in some countries (e.g., DRC, South Sudan, Somalia)
- In some WGs private companies such as mobile companies are also participating (e.g., CAR)
- The CWG in some countries functions as a sub-group of the FSC (e.g., Chad)
- In some cases FSC/Sectors lead the groups but often for a limited period with the aim to transfer leadership to an organization covering multi-sectoral programmes and tackle multi-sectorial and multi-purpose cash grants (e.g., Nigeria, Afghanistan)
- In some cases the CWG acts as a “sector” with own funds and assistance activities (e.g., Iraq) while more specific task forces/groups are established within FSCs (e.g., market mapping Task Force in Iraq)
- In some countries there can be separate groups one covering only the multi-purpose cash assistance component (e.g., Lebanon - Basic Assistance Working Group) and one focusing more specifically on targeting (e.g., Lebanon) or entirely on FS sector (e.g., Ukraine)
- Some countries have WGs at both national and sub-national levels (e.g., Somalia, Nigeria, DRC)

Good Practice – South Sudan

The Cash & Markets WG in Juba is co-chaired jointly by WFP and a local NGO Community Agribusiness Development Agency (CADA) implementing agricultural and livelihoods projects throughout South Sudan. Leadership of implementing partners and local NGOs in such WGs is significantly important to ensure an effective coordination in CTP and an adequate awareness of C&V interventions among local NGOs.

Purpose of Cash WGs & Role of the FSC

- The results show that the roles of the WGs/Task Forces vary from having more for information sharing objectives and coordination on basic standards of CTP to more operational ones, planning to conduct joint work
- Among some activities of the assessed WGs there are:
  - Conducting market analysis
  - Planning of joint market and needs assessments
  - Planning of post-distribution monitoring assessments to assess impact of CTP
  - Monitoring and evaluation
  - Agreement on transfer values
  - Harmonizing of SMEB; questions for cash PDM; vulnerability criteria and targeting tools
  - Document best practices on CTP
  - Develop capacity budding modules for local NGOs
  - Regular update on basic commodities (both food and NFI) in USD values
Good Practice – Somalia & Pakistan

In 2015, the Somalia FSC established a Cash & Market Task Force with the aim to develop specific guidance on determining cash transfer values for food security programming in Somalia. In particular, guidelines were developed on cash transfer value logic for both unconditional and food security conditional programming; monthly labour/time requirements for relevant food security conditional programs; a logic framework for determining transfer values than absolute values in order to allow for geographical, seasonal, economic and livelihoods variations.

In 2013 the Pakistan FSC also developed guidelines for Cash & Vouchers interventions with the specific aim to assist partners of the FSC in the appropriate planning and implementation of C&V interventions; assist in deciding when C&V interventions are the most appropriate; and provide guidance on all stages of programming from assessment, decision making, operational planning and implementation to monitoring and evaluation.

- In terms of the role of the FSC in the WG/Task Force, in the majority of countries the FSC is an active participant attending regularly the meetings and sometimes acting as Co-Chairs
- Generally the FSC shares with the CWG information and updates from partners’ activities, FSC and ICC meetings and suggests agenda items
- The FSCs often provide sectorial technical guidance (i.e., contribution to setting the Minimum Expenditure Basket and agriculture packages; FSC and other indicators; vulnerability criteria; analysis of market prices; etc.)
- Other specific inputs from the FSCs to the CWG include:
  - Providing data on CTP of the FS sector through 4Ws and maps (e.g., Afghanistan);
  - Contribution to revision of the cash package in the contingency plan (e.g., Bangladesh);
  - Participation in development of strategies linked to Government policies on CTP (e.g., oPt)
  - Information management – FSC IMO supporting communication and visibility of the WG (e.g., South Sudan)

Good Practice – Nigeria:

The FSC in Nigeria organized a Cash Transfer Symposium in Abuja with the support of the CashCap experts seconded to the FSC. The aim of the Symposium was to bring together all relevant stakeholders to share experiences and discuss challenges of humanitarian cash transfers in the North East of Nigeria and propose recommendations for improving the CTP responses in the area.
### General Strengths and Weaknesses of WGs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Useful for identifying all stakeholders implementing CTP and understanding who is doing what where</td>
<td>✓ Challenging to receive timely updates from partners on their cash transfer activities – 3/4Ws not always up to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Good platforms for sharing of best practices and lessons learned in CTP and MBP – participants are often practitioners/technical experts</td>
<td>✓ Often the WG has a limited Information Management and communication capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Good platforms to share available related tools and guidelines</td>
<td>✓ TORs and clear roles and responsibilities of the WGs are sometimes missing, which might pose a question of credibility and challenging to follow-up on activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Good platforms to plan joint analysis and assessments</td>
<td>✓ The participants of WGs in some situations lack technical expertise (i.e., analytical capacity), which makes it challenging to plan concrete work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Good platforms for discussing and agreeing on common values and harmonizing tools</td>
<td>✓ Diverse variety of actors can sometimes pose a problem for data harmonization and can be difficult to get qualitative geographically disaggregated data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Stakeholders participating are quite diverse (NGO national and international, UN agencies, Government Departments; Donors) and enrich discussions</td>
<td>✓ In some cases Government participates only at national level and not district and provincial levels – this can impact programme effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Usually very well attended and actors are quite active</td>
<td>✓ Often CWGs don't have a dedicated coordinator/chair due to time and funding constraints of organizations – this can have a negative impact on the WG performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Sub-national WGs focused around operational issues and effective solutions to programmatic</td>
<td>✓ In some countries sub-national WGs are not being established –</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
challenges (e.g., crowd controls, harmonising cash transfer values, etc.)

| ✓ Can be useful for conceptualization of the multi-purpose cash strategy and its standing in the response | ✓ In some cases discussions are too focused on FS without covering sufficiently NFIs or vice versa – it is still difficult to have WGs completely focused on multi-purpose CTP |
| ✓ Can be a good opportunity to coordinate with other clusters (i.e. NFIs, Shelter) | ✓ Sometimes it is difficult to actively engage all clusters in the WG |
| ✓ Trainings are often organized for participants (CaLP trainings; PCMMA, EMMA) | ✓ In some situation, WGs act as sector/clusters – this can create quite some confusion among humanitarian actors |

**Good Practice – oPt:**
The Cash Programs WG in oPt among its objectives has the aim to develop tools to improve cash-for-work programmes. In particular, it developed a unified rate of daily wages for skilled and unskilled labours amongst local and international organizations in full cooperation with the ministries and UNRWA, which helped avoid any confusion or misunderstanding while implementing the programme.

**Food Security Clusters’ Capacity in Cash Transfer Programming**
- The majority of respondents stated that there is enough capacity and knowledge of CTP within the FSC
- Some countries however claim that the knowledge remains quite general and there should be more specific technical expertise to adequately address CTP
- CashCap is being currently explored by some FSCs to strengthen the CTP capacity – Nigeria has had two experts seconded to the FSC and the feedback has been very positive
- Some specific capacity building might be useful in some countries such as on EMMA, PCMMA
- Ad-hoc expertise on specific areas could be also strengthened in some cases including linking humanitarian to longer-term sustainable livelihoods programmes through CTP, protection issues around CTP, etc.
- A question mark is also being posed on the multi-purpose cash transfers and the related training and capacity required – technical assistance might be needed to set up these kind of interventions
Main Tools Used by FSC Partners CTP and MBP

- In terms of tools used by FSCs partners in CTP and MBP, they range from more general ones used across humanitarian actors to more context specific ones developed by partners working in the area.
- Some of the main tools used include:
  - EMMA
  - PCMMA
  - Rapid Market Assessment
  - IPC
  - Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB)
  - Post Distribution Monitoring assessments (at HH level)
  - Market based PDM (traders surveys)
  - Multi-sectoral market assessments
  - FNSMS - Food and Nutrition Security Monitoring System
  - FSNAU/FEWS NET Minimum Expenditure (MEB)
  - Household Economy Approach (HEA)
  - Community based targeting through HEA
  - Cash Atlas (on the web)
  - 4W Matrix
  - Market monitoring tools
  - Other WFP VAM tools
  - ICRC cash in emergencies toolkit
  - Food basket calculation tool developed by CRS in Nigeria
  - Organization own tools (OXFAM, Save the Children, Red Cross, etc.)

FS Cluster Coordinators’ Major Challenges in Cash Transfer Programming

- Inter-cluster coordination of CTP can be a challenge for FS Cluster Coordinators – sometimes conditional vs unconditional transfers ongoing in the same areas can create confusion
- Accessing information on CTP for NFIs from other clusters can be difficult sometimes
- Having a Cash WG led by OCHA can create confusion for cluster partners on reporting lines
- In some countries, awareness might be needed to ensure that cash is understood and treated as a modality of implementation and not as a sector or a programme per se
- Harmonising approaches when the responses have already been designed and are ongoing can be challenging as projects are being already implemented with donor specific commitments and objectives
- Getting information and having partners to report on their CTP can be very challenging in some countries, in particular from local and implementing partners
- The debate of short term cash transfer for food security objective vs long-term social protection can pose an issue in some cases
- Gathering information on multi-purpose cash grants can also be difficult, in particular on what is spent for food security and livelihoods
- Needs and gap analysis can be challenging sometimes, especially with the use of multi-purpose cash in emergency settings
• Defining the role of sectorial cash responses (e.g., cash for food only) and its benefits as opposed to multi-sectorial unconditional cash grant is difficult
• There is a need to better clarify the lines of communication between the CWG and the Food Security Cluster concerning the validation of interventions - CWG actors conducting multi-sectoral cash interventions should also be shared and reported to the FSC
• In some cases, the FSC partners’ knowledge, skills and practice related to CTP are not at the required level

**Areas for gFSC CMWG Support**

- Regular information sharing on cash and markets including partners’ projects/research/tools to FSCs from their region of interest or global level
- Provide and/or promote case studies/best practices on CTP in conflict situations through proper dissemination/sharing
- Support in documentation and/or advocacy of studies on impact of CTP in FS/livelihoods/nutrition
- Support in evidence sharing/advocacy on protection issues related to CTP in FS (e.g., complaints mechanisms)
- Support in evidence sharing/advocacy in gender analysis and women participation in cash-based programmes design and assessments
- Provide surge technical support to assist in CTP planning and coordination
- Support in capacity building based on country needs
- Develop ad hoc training tools in partnership with CaLP – coordination should also be included in the training
- Develop an harmonised tool to calculate the food basket that can be used across FSCs (e.g., building upon the CRS one)
- Advocate at global level to ensure that WGs are operational and comprehensive
- Advocate at global level to ensure that cash is treated as a modality and not a sector per se
- Support with Multi-Purpose Cash Grants (MPCGs) including:
  - Share related documentation/tools/guidance produced at global level
  - Develop standards and tools for reporting as well as guidance on how to coordinate with other clusters/sectors to avoid double reporting
  - Share case studies and best practices/lessons learned in implementation
  - Develop guidance on joint market assessments and targeting for MPCGs
  - Develop guidance on MPCGs implications on gender, protection, nutrition, conflict
  - Support research on sectorial CTP vs MPCG (benefits/LLs)
**Recommendations for the gFSC – Cash & Markets Working Group**  
Based on the findings and the requests for support by the Cash & Markets WG of the gFSC, here are few suggestions as way forward.

| Information & Evidence Sharing/Lessons Learned | ✓ Some best practices of cash WGs and the FSC participation within have been highlighted throughout the report. It can be useful to better capture the outcomes/details and share them across FSCs and/or Cash WGs directly (e.g., guidelines developed by some FSCs; Nigeria Cash Symposium report; other);  
✓ Support in documentation/evidence sharing and/or develop specific guidance related to the FS sector on:  
  ➢ CTP in conflict scenario  
  ➢ Impact of CTP – several areas  
  ➢ Gender analysis in CTP  
  ➢ Protection issues in CTP  
  ➢ Regional CTP best practices  
✓ Develop a list or a map of active Cash WG/TFs to share with all FSCs - might be useful for best practices sharing and discuss common challenges;  
✓ Sub-national level cash WGs have more operational roles and aim at specific practical results, while national level ones have also the purpose of information-sharing. Capturing lessons learned and best practices of sub-national bodies in Cash Transfer Programming and Market Based Programming could be a good exercise which results could be shared with all FSCs to inform better local cash programming and setting up of ad-hoc coordination structures. |
| Tools & Capacity Building | ✓ The gFSC CMWG webpage could be a repository for tools and guidelines related to CTP in the FS sector developed by or used across FSCs. Main tools of CLAs should be available and easily accessible to all FSCs - links to toolkits, CaLP and other websites can also be provided;  
✓ Discuss possible development of harmonized tools and standards at global level that can be used across FSCs;  
✓ Discuss with CaLP and CashCap the possibility to develop training modules to be specifically for FS CCs;  
✓ Think of a surge technical capacity to be based in the CMWG and deployed on a need basis to FSCs. |
Advocacy & Coordination

- Global advocacy with relevant actors is needed on specific issues including:
  - Making sure that cash is understood as a modality across sectors
  - Ensure participation of FSCs in national Cash WGs and adequate regular communication among each other
  - Clear reporting lines when dealing with MPCGs
  - Increasing inter-cluster collaboration in CTP/MBP – using the global platform to support collaboration in country

- More engagement in the MPCGs discussions/tools development at global level is important to advocate for country needs and make sure messages and knowledge is transferred to country level;

- CaLP and other organizations conducting research and studies on cash and markets across geographical regions should be regularly linked to FSCs in those regions. The CMWG is already speaking to CaLP to make sure this will happen;

- Ensure a more regular link between CashCap and FSCs to facilitate requests for support and share regular info/updates on the programme;

- A guidance note on CTP/MBP for FS Cluster Coordinators including some key messages that could be useful to support advocacy efforts
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