



**East and Southern Africa Regional Cash  
Working Group Leads and Co-leads  
Workshop Report**

**29<sup>th</sup>- 30<sup>th</sup> March 2022**

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SESSION 1: CASH WORKING GROUPS' ACHIEVEMENTS &amp; CHALLENGES IN 2021/22 .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>SESSION 2: LINKING HUMANITARIAN CVA TO SOCIAL PROTECTION –WHAT PROGRESS HAVE WE MADE? .....</b>	<b>5</b>
1) Madagascar COVID_19 Intervention through social protection.....	5
2) When is it appropriate to link humanitarian CVA to Social Protection? .....	6
<b>SESSION 3: CVA COORDINATION – APPROACHES TO COLLABORATION AND HARMONIZATION OF CASH TRANSFERS .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Common Cash Approach in Uganda Refugee Response by Uganda Cash Working Group .....	8
<b>SESSION 4: GOOD PRACTICE REVIEW (GPR) ON CASH ASSISTANCE IN CONTEXTS OF HIGH INFLATION AND DEPRECIATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Learning from South Sudan and Zimbabwe.....	10
The case of South Sudan .....	10
The case of Zimbabwe .....	11
<b>SESSION 5: DEMYSTIFYING THE MEB.....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>SESSION 6: OVERVIEW AND REFLECTIONS ON GRAND BARGAIN CAUCUS ON CASH COORDINATION OUTCOME DOCUMENT.....</b>	<b>15</b>
Plenary Session: Opportunities and Challenges for the new Cash Coordination Model.....	16
Wrap Up .....	17
<b>ANNEX 1: CWGS ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PLANS.....</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>ANNEX 2: CWGS SUCCESS, CHALLENGES AND PLANS ON LINKING HUMANITARIAN CVA TO SOCIAL PROTECTION.....</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>ANNEX 3: CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED WITH MEB AND TVS AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS .....</b>	<b>22</b>

## INTRODUCTION

CALP Network (CALP) convened the Cash Working Group (CWG) Leads and Co-leads meeting on the 29<sup>th</sup>-30<sup>th</sup> of March 2022. This was a 2-day virtual workshop. Each day had three sessions held between 9 am and 1 pm EAT. The main purpose of the workshop was to encourage peer-to-peer learning among the CWG Leads and Co-leads in the region.

Workshop attendance was by invitation only to facilitate peer discussions amongst the CWG Leads/Co-leads. Furthermore, the topics covered during the meeting were developed based on suggestions made by CWG Leads and Co-leads.

The workshop was facilitated by Sapenzie Ojiambo - CALP Regional Representative, East and Southern Africa and supported by Dennis Owano – CALP Deputy Regional Representative. Technical thematic presentations were given by Julie Lawson-McDowall – CALP Technical Advisor, Isabelle Pelly – EU Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) Global Cash Expert, Nathalie Klein – WFP Cash Coordinator and Co-chair of the Sudan CWG, Kate Hart - CALP Head of Policy, Evidence and Learning and Eunice Mwendu – Uganda CWG Coordinator.

It was highlighted that there was a high turnover of CWG Leads and Co-leads evidenced by the fact that almost all the CWG Leads and Co-leads who attended the 2022 workshop were new to their positions and did not attend the 2021 workshop. The Regional Representative emphasized the relevance of the workshop given the high turnover and reiterated the need to keep the information flowing between country CWGs for them to learn and borrow from each other.

15 CWG Leads and Co-leads from the following countries participated in 2 half-day workshops: Zimbabwe, South Sudan, Madagascar, Burundi, Ethiopia, Sudan, Uganda, Kenya, Malawi and the Southern Regional CWG.

The expectations from the participants circled on learning from others, strengthening linkages between CWGs in the region, network building, learning how other CWGs are harmonizing CVA and finding solutions to challenges CWGs are facing in the region.

## SESSION 1: CASH WORKING GROUPS' ACHIEVEMENTS & CHALLENGES IN 2021/22

This first session focused on CWGs achievements and challenges during the previous year, and plans for the coming year. During this session, the participants discussed in breakout groups and later presented some of the key discussion points in the plenary session. Below is the summary of some of the issues that cut across different CWGs. Please refer to *Annex 1* for a detailed analysis by country on achievements, challenges and plans.

### Challenges

- Lack of adherence to recommended transfer values (TVs) by CVA practitioners and lack of transfer values recommendations in some contexts
- Limited capacity and understanding of CVA programming among CWG members
- Concerning the leadership setup, juggling between a full-time work role and the CWG leadership role was highlighted as a challenge. Also, frequent transitions in the leadership of the CWGs limited the institutional memory of the group.

### Plans

- Review/finalization of Minimum Expenditure Baskets (MEB)
- Harmonization of TVs within different contexts
- Capacity-building for CWG members on CVA programming
- Financial Service Providers (FSP) mapping and engagement of FSPs in CWG meetings.
- Development of minimum standards; especially those promoting quality CVA
- MPCA harmonization.

Suggested resource: The [Cash Coordination Tip Sheet](#) developed by CALP sets out established best practices, key guidance and resources for all aspects of cash coordination. It is intended as a clear, accessible and action-oriented guide for those engaged in the coordination of cash and voucher assistance (CVA) at the field level.

## SESSION 2: LINKING HUMANITARIAN CVA TO SOCIAL PROTECTION –WHAT PROGRESS HAVE WE MADE?

### 1) Madagascar COVID\_19 Intervention through social protection

This session began with a presentation from Madagascar CWG representative sharing the Madagascar COVID-19 response which was carried out through the social protection mechanisms in the country. The programme supported 368,000HHs who had lost their livelihoods because of COVID-19 from March 2020 to February 2021. The objective of the intervention was to:

- Support the implementation of containment measures to reduce the spread of the disease
- Provide economic support for household consumption and support economic recovery thereafter

The intervention was led by the Ministry in charge of Social Protection and the National Bureau of Disaster Risk Management (BNGRC) and Co-led by UNICEF. Funding was from Fonds D’Intervention Pour Le Development (FID), UNICEF and WORLD BANK. Other stakeholders who were part of this joint intervention included World Food Programme (WFP), United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), CARE International), Action Against Hunger (ACF) and Societas Socialis (SOS). The intervention used a joint harmonized approach through the development of a set of operational tools shared by all members:

- A common registration tool and a joint registration process of several partners
- A harmonized targeting strategy
- A common communication strategy
- A common Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) tool.

Questions/Comments	Answers
The collaboration among partners in Madagascar as well as the use of a harmonized approach was commended.	
In Burundi, the CWG is working on a national social registry with the Government of Burundi in the Merankabandi project also supporting the Government in determining cash transfer delivery mechanisms working with FSPs.	
Are you finding that social protection donors are pushing for one model or another? What we have seen in some contexts is competition	In Burundi, there is an integrated approach which includes supporting women towards financial inclusion and IGA to build resilience to

<p>between what I would call a World Bank model with poverty targeting and with maybe conditions (Education, Health, CFW) and UNICEF/ILO Model which is child grants, old pensions or mother-child health. I wonder if this is the same in other contexts and especially in the Burundi experience</p>	<p>shocks. There are also conditional activities which are labour intensive. The Government is also proposing some grants to the vulnerable (elderly and those with chronic diseases)</p>
--	---

Following the presentation, participants discussed the situation in different contexts regarding linking CVA to Social Protection further in breakout groups. This included success, challenges and plans on linking humanitarian CVA to social protection. The use of social registries/universal beneficiary databases was cited as a success in some contexts. In regards to challenges the different transfer values between humanitarian CVA and social protection, and political interference in social protection programs especially during targeting were highlighted. Please see *Annex 2* for in-depth information on the discussions.

## **2) When is it appropriate to link humanitarian CVA to Social Protection?**

The facilitator, Julie Lawson-McDowall – CALP Technical Advisor, gave a presentation on how linking humanitarian CVA to Social Protection has progressed globally over the years and shared some useful resources in linking CVA to Social Protection. The resources included the [Toolbox - Linking Humanitarian CVA and Social Protection](#) – the toolbox makes work easier by bringing together a key set of 150+ practical resources, guidance and templates in one place.

### **Key highlights of the presentation**

- Humanitarian practitioners have designated social protection as not being part of their job description. However, humanitarian Multi-purpose Cash Assistance (MPCA) closely resembles large-scale safety nets/social assistance programming which is a natural entry point for linking humanitarian CVA and social protection. Protracted responses were highlighted to be at the centre of this evolution
- Linking humanitarian CVA to social protection is evolving into a job-share between donors, humanitarians and development actors among whom there is growing interest. The following elements have given impetus to the adaptation/expansion of existing social protection systems: Formal agreements (World Humanitarian Summit, Grand Bargain and so on), a growing body of evidence on social protection, and the COVID-19 response.
- Context is critical as some may allow for linking CVA to social protection while some may not depending on funding and political will among other factors. Entry points need to be identified, nonetheless is not imperative to link CVA to social protection if no entry points are identified or conditions don't allow for it.

- In regards to the way of engaging it was highlighted that one needs to review existing programmes and seek where or how to link, complement, support or align.

Participants were briefly taken through the Social Protection Toolbox and where to find specific resources as per the theme of interest.

Questions/Comments	Answers
Is the Social Protection Toolbox a living document?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes, it is but it will only be updated from time to time and only CALP can input to it. If you want to share your inputs you can do so by sharing the resource on CALP’s website</li> </ul>
There are lots of resources on linking CVA to social protection and sometimes one may get confused about where to find specific information. Nevertheless, the toolbox is an effective tool to solve this	

### SESSION 3: CVA COORDINATION – APPROACHES TO COLLABORATION AND HARMONIZATION OF CASH TRANSFERS

This session kicked off with breakout group discussions on the extent to which common approaches have been institutionalized in different contexts to promote harmonized and coordinated CVA programming.

#### Key highlights from the breakout groups

- Madagascar: During the COVID-19 response a set of operational tools were developed and shared by all members including a common registration tool and a joint registration process of several partners; a harmonized targeting strategy; a common communication strategy; a common Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM).
- Ethiopia: The CWG had recommended a transfer value for the drought response and CWG leads the joint cash feasibility and market functionality assessment. However, there was no comprehensive approach thus far.

- Eswatini: There is one coordinating body, the National Disaster Management Authority (NDMA) that helps to avoid programme overlaps and duplications. However, there was no clear strategy for the harmonization of activities.
- Burundi: MEB values are used to determine the TVs. Also, a financial services providers (FSP) mapping tool had been developed and there was a plan to map all FSPs – including locations, fees, and services. Furthermore, plans were underway for the development of the National Social Registry. However, there was no clear strategy to tackle harmonization.
- Malawi: there is a Unique Beneficiary Registry (UBR) Database. However, there was no clear strategy to tackle the harmonization of CVA programming. The focus at the time was on harmonization of TVs

### ***Common Cash Approach in Uganda Refugee Response by Uganda Cash Working Group***

Afterwards, the Uganda CWG Lead Eunice Mwendu presented the common cash approach model in Uganda which is a **collaborative, multi-stakeholder approach to the delivery of cash** that promotes joint cash programming – from needs assessment to monitoring. This includes joint cash feasibility assessment, coordinated targeting of beneficiaries, joint post-distribution monitoring and pursuing accountability to affected populations through agreed complaints and feedback mechanisms

#### **The main objectives of the Common Cash Approach included:**

- To realize the full efficiency and effectiveness gains that cash assistance presents
- To avoid parallel systems amongst operational agencies.
- To make CVA simple, safe and easily accessible for the recipient and maximize the value of the assistance they receive.

#### **Key highlights from the presentation**

- This is not a “one size fits it all” approach but rather contextualized in the refugee setting in Uganda and neither does it promote monopolies for example by using one FSP, but rather ensures a competitive and inclusive process.
- Some of the common approaches presented included joint multi-sectoral assessment of vulnerable households, a common database for recipients, a common delivery mechanism and joint monitoring.
- The value/benefits of the common approach were highlighted as follows: a common database of recipients, time efficiency, cost efficiency, joint and coordinated efforts (in targeting and monitoring), efficiency on the part of FSPs, innovations in CVA programming, real-time monitoring and simplified donor reporting



**Questions/Answers**

Question	Answers
Quite some interesting collaboration on the design of MPCA but is this applicable to all groups or only the refugee caseload?	<i>Answer:</i> The scope is only for the refugee response.

## SESSION 4: GOOD PRACTICE REVIEW (GPR) ON CASH ASSISTANCE IN CONTEXTS OF HIGH INFLATION AND DEPRECIATION

The relevance of the GPR in the current regional context was highlighted. Many countries in the region are experiencing rapid increases in commodity prices and cost of living because of COVID-19 and the ripple effects of the Ukraine war crisis. The GPR provides an overview of the information and analysis needed, and options available to cash working groups and organisations to adjust programming in contexts of high inflation. The main objectives of this session were to:

- Familiarise national CWG Leads and Co-leads with the Good Practice Review (GPR) on inflation & depreciation and its applicability to the region
- Learn from experiences of tackling inflation & depreciation in Zimbabwe and South Sudan
- Practice using the GPR as a basis for country-level planning on how to anticipate the impacts of inflation & depreciation

Afterwards, Isabelle Pelly who is the Global Cash Expert at ECHO delivered the presentation on the GPR.

**Key Highlights from the presentation**

- The key concepts covered in the GPR include inflation, hyperinflation, hard currency and dollarization, exchange rate, depreciation, devaluation, transfer value & MEB.
- The review focuses principally on maintaining the purchasing power of those already targeted, through policy and programming options.
- The core of the GPR document is structured around the programme cycle – using the key headings of Situation Analysis, Response Analysis and Response Options
- The Situation Analysis section summarizes what you need to know about the context concerning inflation and depreciation. The Response Analysis section summarizes the key information points which can guide decision-making and help identify the type of scenario

under consideration. Finally, the Response Options section provides possible solutions for those different scenarios.

## ***Learning from South Sudan and Zimbabwe***

### **The case of South Sudan**

David Thomas – South Sudan CWG Co-chair gave an overview of the inflation situation in the country and response options that were taken.

- South Sudan had a parallel foreign exchange market system – including a black market exchange rate and an official exchange rate. The difference between the two rates widened rapidly in 2020. That led to major challenges in cash programming.
- CWG members reacted by trying to ensure that the purchasing power of CVA recipients remained the same which led to an increase in the cost of CVA programming. For example, WFP has been using the official exchange rate or close to the official exchange rate to utilize donor funding but increased the transfer values (TVs) provided to recipients, to increase the purchasing power during this period. While the official exchange rate remained static the cost of the CVA programming increased which led to serious discussions if organizations should shift to in-kind.
- Also, WFP tried to narrow the gap between when they were calculating the TV and when the recipients were receiving the funding. WFP had to negotiate/renegotiate with Financial Service Providers (FSPs) on the exchange rates to a more preferential rate (through the legal structure) since they were based on official exchange rates - negotiating up to a 75% increase of the TV. The challenge is that WFP had better negotiating power with FSPs while other members of the CWG did not which resulted in large disparities in exchange rates. This led to a lot of stagnation in the general entry into cash for the broader CWG and not much growth
- Sharing market price data and the JMMI came in handy by providing all members of the CWGs with accurate information to adjust TVs for beneficiaries. JMMI was funded by WFP
- In mid-2021 the IMF entered the conversation with the specific aim of narrowing the disparity between the black-market exchange rate and the official exchange rate. This led to aligning the black market and official exchange rate and the depreciation scenario from the US dollar perspective. The black market rate dropped from 690 to 430 SSD and the official went from 170 to 430.
- The price alignment meant cost-effectiveness of CVA for organizations hence arguments around switching to in-kind reduced and CVA was once again considered an appropriate and cost-effective option. During this period of alignment, the CWGs meeting discussions were centred around sharing market price information and data among partners, and FSPs sharing their views about exchange rate data.
- The key takeaway was the need to regularly share information among CWG members.

**Question & Answer**

Question	Answer
<p>Could other agencies use the same exchange rate as WFP?</p>	<p>Yes and No. Other UN agencies could get access to similar preferential rates but for other agencies, it was not possible as there were challenges to do with the confidentiality of contracts in sharing information on this.</p>

**The case of Zimbabwe**

Nomthandazo Musengezi from WFP & CWG Representative gave an overview of the inflation situation in the country and response options that were taken.

- In June 2019, the Government banned the use of the multi-currency system in favour of the Zimbabwe dollar which saw the rate of inflation skyrocket to 838% by July 2020. By December 2020 the rate of inflation had come down to 349% due to forex stability through an auction system that was introduced by the Government. US dollar prices remained stable while Zimbabwe dollar price is on an upward trajectory.
- Cash liquidity problems were experienced in terms of the local currency not being readily available. Small denominations of US dollars were also not readily available as the banks preferred importing the big denominations as the charges for importing small/big denominations were the same. This led to a parallel foreign exchange market with a higher exchange rate than the official rate fueling inflation.
- The government was also imposing restrictions on the use of mobile money which was another factor that affected CVA programming. The mobile money agents were running out of cash. This led to some retailers taking advantage and over-charging recipients during cash withdrawal and hence recipients losing value for their money.
- Also, with the use of E-vouchers, the retailers would run out of commodities and needed to restock but they did not want to be paid through the bank accounts because they would not be able to withdraw in USD
- The CWG had discussions around the adoption of the USD as the most stable currency in CVA programming alongside a harmonized market and price monitoring data with WFP taking the lead.
- Most of the agencies switched back to in-kind during this period, especially in the rural areas limiting cash programming to urban areas. The GPR has assisted in the harmonization of activities including the MEB and Market analysis through the national CWG

- CWG members regularly shared their experiences to determine the most viable modality for intervention. The CWG also developed SOPs to guide members in implementing CVA in this context.

**Question and Answer**

Question	Answer
<p><b>Question for South Sudan:</b> What has been the reaction of the recipients, especially during the period of depreciation and inflation?</p> <p>Despite your capacity to update the TVs regularly did you see a rejection of cash and a preference for in-kind?</p>	<p>In a way, yes - especially because when the beneficiaries became more aware of the market prices and they would request for shifting to in-kind or pushing for double distribution or usage of the previous month's TV because of the fear that the TVs may come down and not necessarily be reflected with the same speed and reduction of the market prices. Also, preference surveys and feedback from CWG members, indicated that recipients especially on commodity vouchers pushed for agencies to negotiate fixed prices with the suppliers throughout the month.</p>

Afterwards, participants went into breakout groups to further discuss and apply the GPR guidance on Situation Analysis, Response Analysis and Response Options to specific country contexts.

**Participants also shared one key take-way/follow-up action for each country**

- South Sudan: Noted that the GPR was a helpful reminder and the availability of information is key to making decisions. However, there was a lack of gap analysis between income and expenditure. The missing information was expenditure and income data, and how that was impacted by inflation and depreciation.
- Burundi: Burundi CWG mentioned that they have learnt a lot as their context was quite similar to South Sudan and Zimbabwe context since there is a black-market exchange rate and official exchange rate. Following the meeting, the CWG intended to conduct a more comprehensive situation analysis and disseminate this to the rest of the CWG members.
- Kenya: The CWG intended to take the CWG members through the process of Situation Analysis, Response Analysis and Response Options as outlined in the GPR.
- Uganda: Uganda CWG highlighted the need to have a joint programming approach with the cluster/inter-cluster group so that the response models could cut across what the sectors are

planning. Also, information from the joint market assessments done monthly could be used to trigger conversation on the GPR.

- Mozambique: CWG had been merged with the Adaptive Social Protection Working Group and the Government took the lead in the new group. NGOs were a lot of market monitoring however the information sharing was still limited. Their action point was to revamp the process and ensure market prices are shared across the partners and ensure common approaches.
- Sudan: WFP conducts lots of market and price monitoring information which is shared with partners, however, the CWG is not used as a platform to have common reflections and strategies such as advocacy efforts and capacity building.
- DRC: WVI was the only organization implementing cash assistance as others opted for in-kind because the government had put restrictions requiring the CVA funds to go through the government. There was no one to work with on transfer values and also to advocate with the government. WVI decided to go on with cash programming but it was a challenge to deliver the cash.

#### **Links to available resources**

Below are links to the GPR and case studies for further reference:

- [Good Practice Review on Cash Assistance in Contexts of High Inflation and Depreciation - The CALP Network](#)
- [Good Practice Review - Zimbabwe Case Study](#)
- [Good Practice Review - South Sudan Case Study](#)

## **SESSION 5: DEMYSTIFYING THE MEB**

This session entailed a refresher of the MEB and its fundamentals. The session was led by Nathalie Klein, WFP Cash Coordinator and Co-chair of the Sudan CWG and entailed a presentation and Q&A session.

#### **Key highlights of the presentation:**

- Definition of MEB and its fundamentals
- The importance of using MEB was stipulated as below:
  - Helping set transfer values
  - Measure vulnerabilities
  - Trace the cost of living over time
  - Better understand our contribution to improving people's lives
  - Serves as a tool for monitoring and acting as a policy influencer when used in advocacy efforts.)
- How to use MEB to calculate MPCA TV.

### Question & Answer Session

Question	Answer
<p>In South Sudan, we have challenges with the MEB conversation: 1) Establishing the right MEB through a cluster approach and then through the CWG ended up to be what felt like an inflated MEB which scared everybody. How did you manage that process? 2) How do you get income or available data that you feel confident in because we have none?</p>	<p>There is now guidance on how to include sector-specific expenditures for almost every sector developed by the global clusters hence you can always refer to the cluster for this guidance. Also, you can agree on the MPCA TV as a CWG and of course, you need to include sector-specific needs. For income data - we don't have data on income but we know that in almost all HHs we will have at least one casual labourer hence we are using this rate according to the official rate.</p>
<p>1) How often should we revise the MEB? In Uganda, we have a static MEB that takes into account the trend analysis for 12 months and we also monitor market prices monthly and provide a monthly MEB. We have the static one as a guideline when partners are developing proposals. 2) Is there a guidance document for developing sector-specific MEB?</p>	<p>For MEB there is no right and wrong answer as it just depends on the consensus of other stakeholders at the country level and the context itself. For Sudan, we review the MEB monthly because of the inflation but there are ongoing conversations with the sub-national CWGs who want to have localized MEBs for their regions. Also, if prices are relatively stable then you don't need to review your MEB and maybe review on an annual basis</p>

Afterwards, participants discussed the MEB challenges and potential solutions in breakout groups. Please see *Annex 3* for more information on this.

### Available Resources

Some of the available on developing MEB and determining transfer values can be retrieved via the following links:

#### Minimum Expenditure Baskets and Transfer Values

- [Minimum Expenditure Basket \(MEB\) Decision-Making Tools](#)
- [WFP interim MEB guidance \(to be updated soon\)](#)
- [Blog: Demystifying the Minimum Expenditure Basket](#)
- [Recordings: Webinar Series on the Minimum Expenditure Basket \(MEB\)](#)
- [Inclusion of Health Expenditures in the MEB](#)
- Q&A MEB WEBINAR 1: [LINK](#)

- Q&A MEB WEBINAR 2: [LINK](#)
- Q&A MEB WEBINAR 3: [LINK](#)
- Q&A MEB WEBINAR 4: [LINK](#)
- [E-learning - MEB, gap analysis and calculating the transfer value \(20mins\)](#)

## SESSION 6: OVERVIEW AND REFLECTIONS ON GRAND BARGAIN CAUCUS ON CASH COORDINATION OUTCOME DOCUMENT

At the time of the meeting, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) had just formally adopted the Cash Coordination Model setting out the structure, function, leadership and resourcing of cash coordination. Kate Hart, CALP Head of Policy Evidence and Learning gave an overview of the process followed by the Grand Bargain caucus and the cash coordination outcome document adopted.

### Key highlights of the presentation

- Cash coordination to be the responsibility of the Intersectoral Working Group (ISWG) or Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) under the existing chair (OCHA in IDP/ mixed setting, UNHCR in refugee settings, RC/HC in settings where no inter-sector)
- CWGs to manage day-to-day coordination of cash assistance, reporting to ICCG/ ISWG (or HCT if the two are not present). Existing capabilities should be identified and built upon.
- CWGs to have non-programmatic (OCHA or UNHCR in refugee settings) and programmatic co-chairs.
- The programmatic co-chair is to be voted in (based on criteria identified) and should be a local actor where possible.
- A global Cash Advisory Group (gCAG) be established to support country-level cash coordination technically and in terms of capacity. The gCAG is to be chaired by OCHA except for refugee settings/ standards/ guidance when chaired by UNHCR.
- Transition Plan to be agreed upon by September 2022 with the expectation of 18 months to implement the plan. Emphasis is to be placed on contextualisation and flexibility.
- Live updates of the cash coordination to be made available at the following link: <https://www.calpnetwork.org/cash-coordination-2022-live-timeline/>

### ***Plenary Session: Opportunities and Challenges for the new Cash Coordination Model***

What opportunities and challenges do you see in the model that has been agreed upon for Cash coordination?

Below is the summary of the comments, questions and answers:

Question	Answer
<p>What happens to coordination mechanisms that have been working in some countries? Also, do we have a regional strategy to see how we can roll this out to other countries?</p>	<p>No answers at the moment in terms of what happens to the contexts where coordination mechanisms are working well; however, this has been flagged by the Technical Working Group. The next step would be for the gCAG to be formed. The gCAG would then reach out to different contexts to see what is appropriate in those contexts.</p>
<p>The bulk of cash operations and expertise sits in different countries with WFP in terms of assessments/technical guidance. It's good to see in the timeline that there is a transition plan and an opportunity to have conversations to ensure proper transitions in September 2022. What role do we want to take immediately e.g. technical capacity building to ensure expertise and guidance are handed over to the new co-chairs when WFP withdraws?</p>	<p>This is still unclear but it will be clearer in September when the transition plan will have been developed.</p>
<p>How can CALP at a regional position work ahead of September 2022 to come up with a proposition/common plan to ensure a smooth transition?</p>	<p>The transition will only begin to take effect after the transition plan has been developed. The current timeline for the development of the transition plan is by September 2022. Feeding into the transition plan is something that could be taken up by the coordination architecture in the region as well e.g. the regional CWGs and we will decide on what we can contribute and how to go about it in the coming weeks</p>



<p>I wonder how feasible the transition is even in IASC settings/refugee contexts. A complete practical view in our context is that any agency that has a coordination role and isn't invested in CVA doesn't have the emphasis and urgency in cash coordination as others do. Without investment in the CVA programming as a co-chair, you don't have participation and the push and urgency in the way these things are done. So this is something that we need to be aware of as we go about implementing the transition plan.</p>	<p>There is no intention of having one size fits all but rather contextualization/flexibility will be key in understanding the country's context and informing how things are carried forward.</p>
---	--

### Available resources

Some of the available resources offering further insights into the cash coordination caucus outcome document were highlighted. These included:

- [A model on cash coordination endorsed - Grand Bargain caucus outcome document | IASC \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#)
- [Latest Updates on Grand Bargain Caucus on Cash Coordination](#)
- [Feedback on the Cash Coordination Caucus Outcomes](#)

### Wrap Up

During the wrap, it was mentioned that all the relevant documents referred to during the workshop would be shared with the participants. Also, a link to an evaluation survey of the workshop was shared and participants were encouraged to complete it.

## ANNEX I: CWGS ACHIEVEMENTS, CHALLENGES AND FUTURE PLANS

Country	Achievements 2021	Current Challenges Experienced by the National CWGs	Plans for 2022
<b>South Sudan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusion of CWG in Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG)</li> <li>• CWG's involvement in the harmonisation of the different exchange rates. Achieved through working together with Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), development actors and other stakeholders.</li> <li>• Inclusion of reporting CVA in cluster SWs</li> <li>• Increased uptake of CVA as a modality option by some clusters.</li> <li>• Capacity Building for the Partners &amp; Clusters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Market functionality and security challenges leading to lower uptake of CVA</li> <li>• Inflation</li> <li>• Lack of infrastructure for an innovative transfer mechanism</li> <li>• Need for capacity building on CVA</li> <li>• Lack of national Social Policy</li> <li>• No harmonization on MPCA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Work on minimum standards especially promoting quality CVA and more on MPC harmonization and uptake CVA reporting</li> </ul>
<b>Sudan</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reactivation of the CWG with regular meetings and increased participation</li> <li>• MEB composition agreed upon and endorsed by Inter Sector Working Groups (ISWG)</li> <li>• Reconnection with OCHA</li> <li>• Regular matrix filled though need more curation on data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With too many voices, and too low capacities among some partners hence hard to reach consensus and make decisions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree on MEB update methodology</li> <li>• Finish the FSP mapping</li> <li>• Map out sub-national CWG and clarify relation with national CWG</li> <li>• As a CWG, understand and enforce the implications of the new model of CWGs as outlined in the Cash Coordination caucus outcome document.</li> <li>• Harmonize TV</li> <li>• To any possible extent, build single platform operational models with integrated programming (sector-specific / MPCA)</li> </ul>

<p><b>Ethiopia</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conducted donor coordination meeting on MPCA</li> <li>• Established MPC technical working group</li> <li>• Initiate the development of national MEB</li> <li>• Develop interim MPC transfer value</li> <li>• Elected both co-chair and steering committee members</li> <li>• The sector CVA reported by the sectoral clusters</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of harmonized transfer value</li> <li>• Lack of linkages between humanitarian CVA and social protection</li> <li>• No national MEB</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finalized the national MEB</li> <li>• Capacity building</li> <li>• Coordinate assessments</li> <li>• Regularly update 5 W MPCA matrix</li> <li>• Hold regular monthly CWG meeting</li> </ul>
<p><b>Malawi</b></p>	<p>Set up of a CWG for WFP as co-lead involving a sufficient number of staff from other agencies, including other UN agencies</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work of the CWG requires constant follow-up with the other participants who do not autonomously update or share information with other members.</li> <li>• Harmonization of transfer values</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mapping Exercise about the ongoing cash activities. This helps develop synergies and avoids duplication of efforts in the same areas where there are cash distributions.</li> <li>• Market Assessments. We propose sharing market reports to consolidate the information, evaluate any possible gaps, or jointly address them.</li> <li>• Transfer Value Calculation. As a group, we can work to come up with a recommendation on a transfer value based on the food basket or multi-purpose cash distribution, which includes food and non-food. For WFP, we will use our Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Mozambique</b></p>		<p>Harmonization of transfer values is a challenge as different organizations continue to use different approaches</p>	<p>Establishing a sub-cash working group for the Northern Region where most of the CVA activities are taking place</p>
<p><b>Zimbabwe/Madagascar/Burundi</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement from the Government (Burundi)</li> <li>• Developed tools for FSP mapping</li> <li>• Successful development of a set of tools shared amongst partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Engagement and participation of members at a regular basis (meetings, but also getting feedback/input)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify with management the time dedicated to NCWG and apply, following visit of ECHO (Zimbabwe)</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communication strategy in place</li> <li>• PDM tools developed Feedback mechanisms were developed/in place, and most complaints were addressed (Madagascar)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty in completing all planned activities as per the annual work plan</li> <li>• Little field level engagement/provincial levels</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better coordination with the co-chairing (Zimbabwe)</li> <li>• Develop a proper strategy for the NCWG (Zimbabwe)</li> <li>• More capacity building on CVA (Zimbabwe)</li> <li>• Finalization of activities that were not completed in 2022 (for example MEB)</li> <li>• Stronger links with the protection sector</li> <li>• Implement the mapping tool for FSPs</li> <li>• Involvement of FSPs in the CVWG</li> </ul>
<p><b>Southern Africa Regional Cash Working Group (SARCWG)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability to continue to coordinate and collaborate despite the multiple transitions at the regional and national working levels. There is interest from some agencies to learn from each other.</li> <li>• CALP now supporting Southern Africa has been welcome and is helping to give more structure and guidance to how the regional CWG is being coordinated. The East and Southern Africa Leads workshop was an excellent platform to bring everyone together for learning and sharing, especially on COVID-19 Response and how CVA was used to address emerging needs.</li> <li>• Collaboration with SP working group and having a unified voice speaking on CVA to other stakeholders.</li> <li>• Lot of learning around the social protection transfers, especially the urban programming.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transitions of Co-leads lead to a lack of institutional memory</li> <li>• Co-leads are not always available as they have another full-time role and are unable to fully support the CWG when deployed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consolidate our mailing list for Southern Africa and bring in more regional-focused people who may be longer-term in their roles.</li> <li>• Continue to learn from other regions and lean on CALP to improve coordination, build networks and ensure continuity when transitions occur.</li> <li>• Diversity agenda items so that they are not leaning toward what the Co-leads are doing but bring different voices.</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 2: CWGS SUCCESS, CHALLENGES AND PLANS ON LINKING HUMANITARIAN CVA TO SOCIAL PROTECTION

Success in linking humanitarian CVA to Social Protection	Challenges in Linking Humanitarian CVA to Social Protection	Plans of Linking Humanitarian CVA to Social Protection
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kenya: Ability to use existing social registries and Government is the custodian of the data therefore humanitarian actors can easily plough through the data. Nevertheless, there’s a need to ensure the data collection process used is well understood to ensure data credibility.</li> <li>• Mozambique: Alignment of targeting mechanisms, transfer values, delivery platforms</li> <li>• Eswatini: Use of mobile money transfers for response to COVID 19 - also targeting other groups – disabled in the SP program etc. Furthermore, the finalization of the beneficiary management system can be used by all partners.</li> <li>• In Malawi, the use of the Universal Beneficiary database (UBR) has worked well. WFP and the Government of Malawi have done a joint distribution using UBR in one district for two years.</li> <li>• In Burundi, the Government programmes/initiatives in SP and linkages with humanitarian actors.</li> <li>• In Madagascar, the Development of SP manual/availability of manual/tools for implementations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Ethiopia, the challenge is that the SP is under a different Government ministry and mainly SP is targeting chronically food insecure and has different transfer values meaning that other target groups are left out.</li> <li>• Eswatini cited political interference, especially during targeting</li> <li>• Mozambique: Transfer values for humanitarian CVA vs transfer values of SP programmes differ.</li> <li>• Zimbabwe: National Social Protection working group created – difficulties in the beginning/Structuring/Coordination</li> <li>• Madagascar: The transition toward regular SP programmes from Humanitarian/Emergency programmes is a challenge</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In Kenya keeping the registry up to date: Agencies have had to lobby the Government to ensure that there is a clear verifiable process for targeting and selection. Kenya now has a sub-working group to work on targeting, which is intended to discuss the registry and verification; Discussions are ongoing to see the best approach to update the data, e.g. Government to have yearly, or every 2 years registration and verification - work in progress.</li> </ul>

## ANNEX 3: CHALLENGES EXPERIENCED WITH MEB AND TVS AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS

What challenges have you experienced with MEB and harmonizing transfer values?	What are some of the solutions to solve these challenges?
<p><b>Mozambique</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Challenge of market data</li> <li>• Need to have others validate the analysis done so far but this is not happening</li> </ul> <p><b>Zimbabwe</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The challenge of harmonisation, when to do it, who has the leadership, unclear SOPs hence responsibility pushed to WFP.</li> <li>• Rural MEB has not been done for the last 2 years</li> </ul> <p><b>Burundi:</b> Update of the data is not happening consistently as market prices are increasing rapidly leading to outdated data on prices/ MEB values eroded by the high inflation.</p> <p><b>Sudan:</b> Process was the main issue, with diverging views and different levels of understanding, sticking to very specific technical points and losing sight of the operational purpose. Again debates continued on how to update the MEB</p>	<p><b>Mozambique:</b> Work together as different sectors and stakeholders right from the beginning.</p> <p><b>Zimbabwe:</b> Have SOPs with a clear lead so that this is not pushed to WFP</p> <p><b>Burundi:</b> Have a platform for updating the data more rigorously so that MEB and transfer values are updated regularly.</p> <p><b>Sudan:</b> Finally most pragmatic approaches were chosen: apply the CPI to the overall basket rather than doing localized joint market assessments in a dispersed way</p>