2nd Grand Bargain Cash Work Stream Workshop – Co-Conveners' Report

Rome, 4th – 5th June 2018

Contents page

1. The Role of the Grand Bargain Cash Work stream

The Grand Bargain (GB) consists of 51 commitments that are grouped under ten work streams. Each of these work streams is led by two co-conveners, usually a donor and an implementer. The aim of the work streams is to maintain momentum for change in the humanitarian system following the Grand Bargain agreement, and to take forward collective action and closer coordination on commitments[1].

The role of the cash work stream was agreed by Sherpas at the Bonn meeting in September 2016. Work on technical aspects of cash and voucher programming and delivery mechanisms is taking place in parallel in a number of pre-existing *fora*. The role of the cash work stream is to incentivise and influence progress further. This will be done through:

- Sharing good positive examples (benefits and impact for recipients);
- Communicating high level political and public messages (Questions and Answers);
- Identifying barriers and concerns, and addressing them openly;
- Platform for sharing information and following latest developments;
- Individual commitments to voluntary targets.

As co-conveners[2], the United Kingdom (UK) and World Food Programme (WFP) do not duplicate what technical *fora* and actors already do on the areas listed above; the co-conveners aim at filling key gaps and amplifying their work by expanding the outreach of what is produced, focusing on the major obstacles to the uptake of cash and voucher programming.

The GB cash commitments[3] provide the overarching frame of the GB cash work stream. Under the GB cash commitments, **six priority action points** were agreed at the first GB Cash work stream Workshop (30th May - 1st June 2017 at the WFP Headquarters in Rome). These are:

1. Measuring Cash (co–leads: ECHO and CaLP)
2. Donor Coordination (co–leads: Norway and Germany)
3. Cash Coordination (co–leads: USAID and UN-OCHA)
4. Measuring Value for Money (VfM), Efficiency, Effectiveness (co–leads: USAID and IRC)
5. Risk (lead: WFP and CaLP)
6. Mapping of cash work

2. The second GB Cash Work Stream Workshop

The second GB cash work stream workshop took place at WFP Headquarters in Rome on the 4th and 5th of June.

Agenda[4] items were identified by the work stream co-conveners based on the six priority action points agreed in June 2017. The agenda was defined with the dual aim of highlighting progress to date and enabling discussion on issues to be further progressed. Related background reading documentation was circulated to all participants in advance of the meeting.

Over 74 participants representing **41 organizations attended the meeting**[5]. These belonged to a wide cross-section of donor organisations, multi-lateral agencies, Global Clusters, the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs), and specialist agencies and platforms.

In preparation for the meeting, a survey[6] was circulated to 407 email addresses representing 72 organizations. Analysis of the 16 completed surveys received were presented in Day 2

[1] Source: https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc

[2] Final Summary Note Grand Bargain Meeting, Bonn, September 2016: 'Former (or newly interested) co-champions of work streams will continue to play a role in supporting the implementation of commitments within 'their' work streams without having a formalized and standardized function, allowing for diversity in how co-champions fulfil this role; other fora, such as the IASC *[Inter-agency Standing Committee]* and GHD *[Global Humanitarian Donorship]* might have a role in taking some commitments forward; 'cochampions' should be renamed 'co-conveners'.

[3] https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/increase-use-and-coordination-cash-based-programming

[4] See Annex 1 for the agenda of the second GB cash work stream workshop.

[5] See Annex 2 for the list of organizations in attendance.

[6] See Annex 3 for the survey circulated in advance of the workshop.

sessions (please see *Social protection and humanitarian cash linkage*s, *Cash and risks* and *Workplan review* below).

A link to download all PowerPoint presentations used during the workshop was made available by the co-conveners following the event.

3. The State of the World's Cash / Panel discussion

The session set the scene, aligning participants' knowledge on the current cash discourse, as well as allowing for an exchange of reflections and perspectives on main areas of progress and key challenges of scale-up.

The State of the World's Cash report celebrates progress that has been made to date, providing a common basis for analysis, reiterating that cash is an emerging opportunity at a time of amplified needs. Panellists reflected that all members are making progress in increasing the use of cash, with growing donor consensus. Broad agreement exists that we have turned a corner. **We are no longer talking about *whether* to do cash or even the need to scale-up cash; focus has rather shifted to how to do more cash, better.** At the same time, critical challenges remain, requiring discussions on identifying ways forward. Progress does not solely imply technical solutions, but requires political issues to be addressed as well. The following driving questions should be asked: "*How can we improve cash programming? Are we willing to be transformative? Are we willing to question and challenge our mandates?*".

Four key issues were highlighted by panellists – DFID; WFP; Ground Truth Solutions; CaLP - and discussed with the plenary through Q&A:

- *Coordination*: Cash is a tool, but challenges us to work differently. Predictable coordination arrangements and new operational collaboration models can no longer be postponed. Whilst we discuss systems ("*who needs to do what?*"), we should simultaneously think about future strategic directions. An open debate around the changing roles of humanitarian actors going forward should be tabled.
- *Capacity*: the use of cash is growing faster than our capacity to do it well. We need to focus on the quality (outcome) conversation rather than outputs – good programming should be at the very centre of what we do.
- *Evidence gaps*: we need to continue asking if the system has changed, and if it is working. Learning about efficiency and effectiveness means looking into how we understand the basic needs of a household and how we use what we have available in the humanitarian architecture. Testing new delivery models (such as in Lebanon) points to the need to continue to build the evidence of what works, where; how we deliver in different contexts and how we respond to protracted crises, ensure preparedness measures, strengthen national systems, build capacity, mainstream innovation, and bring the private sector in.
- *Recipient perspectives*: We should ensure at any stage that the process does not overtake the relevance of cash to address recipient/beneficiary needs. Accountability to affected populations around cash based programming needs a step change towards a more user-centred and tailored approach. Surveys indicate that though recipients appreciate cash, many don't understand why they receive cash, why others don't, as well as how best to make use of the transfer and what to do when the transfer stops.

4. Update on the GB Cash Work Stream progress

The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) presented its key findings of the 2018 Independent Report on the Grand Bargain, as commissioned by the GB Facilitation Group, to which 56 signatories responded (self-reports).

As key messages shared in plenary, **ODI reported that cash was the best performing GB work stream in 2017.** An average of over 70% of signatories reported some action against their individual commitments. 89% of signatories reported increased routine use of cash – the highest rate of reporting against any individual commitment. Strong leadership from co-conveners and participation from all groups of signatories as well as good efforts to capitalise on pre-existing systems were also noted. In terms of challenges, it was highlighted that many

signatories do not have access to the level of institutional data being proposed as baselines for some commitments. Lack of capacity was also cited as a challenge: a CaLP survey found that only 40% of respondents believed they have enough capacity to implement cash transfers. It was also noted that the cash work stream has not had a strong focus on gender and that progress by others work streams (notably 5 – joint and impartial needs assessments) is necessary before progress can be made on the cash programming work stream commitments.

5. Measuring Cash

The session provided an update on progress made throughout the previous year, with specific reference to the CaLP "*Measuring Cash Transfer programming (CTP) Scoping Study*". Based upon an analysis of both individual agency and inter-agency reporting systems, a summary of the study's key findings, options and recommendations were presented. Working groups discussed in detail two of the questions which emerged from the study: a. "*Should cash and vouchers be separated/disaggregated as modalities in measurement and reporting of CTP?*" and b. "*What are participants' views on whether reporting systems should enable the separation of multipurpose and sector specific cash transfers*"? The working group deliberations were consequently presented and debated in plenary.

A traffic light ranking exercise conducted during the session indicated that **most participants were in favour of separating reporting on cash and vouchers.** Current practices vary. A full appreciation of why this is needed and the associated costs of disaggregation need to be considered. Separate measurement is preferred given the different implications of the modalities and the necessity to improve linkages to needs and outcomes (where, when, how and why cash is being delivered to programme for better outcomes). As cash and vouchers will work differently in different contexts, the plenary discussion highlighted that neither are considered 'better' than each other, nor that segregation should lead to the dismissal of vouchers.

The discussion on the separation of sector specific cash and multi-purpose cash highlighted that **cash itself is not sector specific but unrestricted cash can be well used to achieve humanitarian outcomes in specific sectors.** Instead, **a focus on the programme design of restricted/unrestricted cash transfers** may provide us with more emphasis on outcomes of humanitarian cash. Given the non-sectoral nature of unrestricted cash, there was general agreement on better reflecting a basic needs approach in our systems.

Next steps[7] – Measuring Cash

A broad agreement was reached that greater disaggregation of quantitative measures (i.e. cash disaggregated from voucher, sectoral specific objectives from multi-purpose objectives) **is good in principle**.

The CaLP workshop on the 6th of June 2018 in Rome was to further reflect/clarify the objective of collecting this data, what the information is going to be used for, and how it can help improve programming. The level of investment required, the additional level of complexity it would add to reporting systems, and requirements and guidance on the right terminology to be used were also to be discussed. Subsequently, **the sub-work stream is to develop further technical guidance on how to disaggregate cash and vouchers**.

Some degree of confusion still exists regarding terminology: restricted cash vs. vouchers; multi-sector/purpose cash – various actors and agencies utilise them differently and/or interchangeably, leading to confusion on whether multi-purpose aims are based on their use (e.g. unconditional cash transfers - UCT), design (basic needs approach - BNA) and/or delivery. **The sub-work stream is to develop further technical guidance on whether multi-purpose cash as a category is to be maintained or abandoned in favour of cash being restricted or unrestricted**.

[7] It is assumed that progress under each priority area should be achieved before the next GB cash work stream workshop to take place in spring 2019.

6. Cost Efficiency and Effectiveness

Recommendations reached at the Cost-Efficiency and Cost-Effectiveness in Humanitarian Assistance (CE2HA) workshop held in April 2018 in Washington, co-led by USAID/IRC and logistically supported by CaLP, were shared in plenary. The results of the Multipurpose Cash Outcome Indicator Collection exercise carried out by USAID were also shared. Common practice points to the use of the coping strategy index and a large number of sector-specific indicators, as well as some expenditure-based tracking indicators.

Following Q&A, participants divided in four working groups to debate how to move ahead on the recommendations identified, finding ways forward for practical implementation. Specifically, a. "*How to improve financial reporting systems to better capture data";* b. *"Invest in M&E capacity to collect data we need and tools to capture it*"; c. "*Fill evidence gaps by investing in research priorities identified by affected populations and practitioners*". Additionally, with regards to outcomes that we can achieve with MPC, participants' views were gathered around d. "*For MPC, should we have a benchmark or measure improvements from baseline?*".

As a result of the group work, next steps were defined which would be further reflected upon in the CE2HA Phase 2 activities in the remainder of 2018/early 2019. With regards to the MPC common indicator, USAID is to propose a way forward following the establishment of a donor technical review committee later in 2018.

Next steps – Cost Effectiveness and Efficiency

Work to further progress the definition of the following dimensions should be advanced by the sub-work stream as part of the CE2HA Phase 2. Specifically:

1. *Prioritise improvement of financial reporting*

– Consider risks and trade-offs
– Alignment with *measuring cash sub work stream (CALP/ECHO)* to approaching existing systems: FTS/IATI/OECD-DAC
– Donor harmonization
– Consider "add on" tools (e.g. IRC SCAN)

2. *Investing in M&E*

- Clarity on how this will be used – by whom/for what/create a set of questions we want to answer
- Common set of metrics
- Identify actors who need to be involved – e.g. economists

3. *Filling Evidence Gaps*

- Focus research on modality choice and beneficiary preference

Potential of cash to cover basic needs and establish outcome indicators for MPC - USAID to propose a way forward by involving a small group of donors in a **technical review committee to create a list of MPC outcome indicators**. Driving questions should be considered, including:

- MPC design (by who?)
- Role of other sectors
- Built-in flexibility

7. Donor Coordination

During this session, progress achieved by the sub-work stream on various initiatives was shared with participants, followed by Q&A.

Following a joint donor mission to Jordan and Lebanon in early 2018, the participating donors agreed on ten key findings from the mission. Further discussion led to a proposed common donor approach on humanitarian cash programming:

- All cash programmes are to be provided in a way that maximises accountability to people affected by crises, mainstreams protection and upholds the safety, dignity and preferences of beneficiaries, and differentiates to meet the specific needs of girls, boys, women and men, people with disabilities and other vulnerable groups.
- Donors want to see both effectiveness and efficiency maximized. This means meeting people's most pressing needs with the best possible outcomes, while considering value for money and encouraging innovation.

- Modality selection and cash programmes are to be based on evidence/joint and impartial needs assessments and robust response analysis.
- Donors recognize the value of the engagement of different actors in cash programming, but want to see a coherent system and common programming approaches.
- Delivering cash should, where possible and appropriate, use, link to or align with local and national mechanisms such as social protection systems.

The Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD) cash work stream met in Geneva on the 4th of May, during which an **additional GHD principle on cash was proposed** (with no objections) to be taken to the high level meeting (22 June) for endorsement. The proposed principle - "*Systematically consider the use of cash transfers alongside other modalities according to context, in order to meet the humanitarian needs of people in the most effective and efficient manner*" - recognises the value of cash as a modality and its recent growth. Adding it as a 24th principle avoids a re-ordering of existing principles.

Next steps – Donor Coordination

- **Donors to operationalize the consensus reached to date in on-going crises, to ensure coherence and coordination in the aftermath of the next large scale natural disaster or protracted crisis, and to continue their discussion on areas where different positions exist, to ensure they do not create fragmentation, unnecessary parallel systems and incoherence at the response level.**

8. Cash speed dating

Participants were given a choice to attend one of the below options:

- *OPTION A:* IRC - scaling cash relief + IFRC - cash preparedness.
- *OPTION B:* CaLP - operational models for cash delivery + UN Women gender - responsive cash programming.

Seven Steps to Scaling Cash Relief:

The session outlined the reforms the International Rescue Committee has made in pursuit of its goal to increase the proportion of humanitarian aid delivered through unconditional cash transfers. It included a discussion on lessons learned that are of relevance to other actors across the humanitarian sector. The aim of this session was to share learning and generate transparent discussion on the progress and pitfalls encountered in the expansion of cash-based programming in line with Grand Bargain commitments.

Cash Preparedness:

The session outlined the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement cash preparedness approach, highlighting the breadth of implementation, looking at the key objectives and describing some specific examples. Although developed for International Red Cross and Red Crescent National Societies, the approach is publicly available and can be adapted to the needs of any organisation wishing to strengthen its cash approaches.

Operational Models for Cash Delivery:

CaLP and the Collaborative Cash Delivery (CCD) network explored how to best bridge policy, evidence and operational decision-making to inform the design and funding of models. The following was debated: "*How should agencies collaborate on cash and vouchers to drive the best outcomes for people? Which models of collaboration drive the greatest gains in efficiency, effectiveness and accountability? Which models and platforms should donors invest in?*"

Improving Effectiveness Through Gender-responsive Cash Programming:
The session intended to put the spotlight on gender equality and the empowerment of women to ensure more effective cash programming. Evidence suggests that well-designed, gender-responsive programmes delivered through cash and vouchers can improve outcomes for women and girls while also improving sector outcomes related to food security, health, and education and by generating local economic activity. The result brings greater benefits to women and girls and their host communities and leads to more sustainable outcomes. Yet, it remains unclear what combination of cash and vouchers design features (e.g. targeting, payment size, frequency, and duration, modality, complementary programming, etc.) in what contexts will yield the greatest impacts across the humanitarian-development-peace continuum.

9. Cash Coordination

Panellists presented several initiatives that occurred in recent months. The contents of the nine GHD donors' letter to the Chair of the IASC Working Group in March 2018 requesting to issue clear, actionable guidance on strategic cash coordination leadership were shared. The letter was issued to address the significant barriers preventing scale-up as perceived by the signatories, including: lack of predictability in coordination structures; lack of harmonization in terms of appropriate tools being in place for systematic response analysis to then ensure proper decision-making; lack of clear resourcing; no entity to which cash coordination was accountable, and; lack of systematic approach in engaging clusters. The letter indicated that the authority should only apply to coordination and not to operations or delivery. A non-signatory donor explained that they did not sign the letter because they are not convinced of what model would lead to the best coordination. No response from the IASC Working Group that received the letter, nor from IASC Principals, had been received at the time of the meeting.

The NGO position paper on cash coordination in humanitarian response, which was presented to the IASC in late May 2018 following development by 45 NGOs and broad endorsement from the memberships of ICVA, InterAction, SCHR and VOICE, was also discussed. NGO actors support the Global Cluster Coordinators Group (GCCG) position that cash coordination should be the responsibility of the Inter-cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) and that cash coordination is led by a Cash Working Group (CWG) reporting directly to the ICCG. Several other recommendations were made in terms of structure and linkage to the humanitarian architecture regarding the following: mandate and responsibilities of cash coordination mechanisms; leadership for strategic and technical coordination; local response capacity and national actors, and; dedicated resources and guidance for cash coordination.

Prior to Q&A concluding the session, UN-OCHA presented updates from the GCCG. In terms of highlights, through the revision of the ICCG ToRs, CWGs are now formalized as sub-groups of the inter-cluster. Progress (with CashCap and CaLP) has been made on the development of a document for cash coordination amongst different clusters, and standardized draft ToRs for CWGs based on a mapping exercise conducted by UN-OCHA were proposed.

Next steps – Cash Coordination:

A broad agreement was reached that there should be a differentiation between strategic and technical coordination.

Continued work to standardize ToRs for CWGs needs to be opened up for inputs from field practitioners, especially NGOs, and the advisory role provided by CWGs to the ICCG should be formalised.

UN-OCHA will follow-up on the response by IASC to the nine GHD donors letter as well as the NGO position paper on cash coordination, after which work on cash coordination guidance and ToRs for the CWGs will be finalised.

10. Basic Needs Approach (BNA) vs. Sectoral Cash

This information session provided an opportunity to share learning drawn from implementation of the BNA and multi-purpose cash.

The session highlighted that whilst an agreed definition of multi-purpose cash exists, different understanding and practice are emerging. A review of the definition would help to agree what multi-purpose cash is and where it fits in the architecture.

UNHCR's study on Global Cash Operations was presented in plenary. Evidencing positive outcomes of MPC beyond food security, the study reinforces that sector-specific programming remains essential as value, predictability, frequency, duration and seasonality may affect MPC outcomes. The fear that, because of MPC, donors will cease to fund sectoral expertise should be overcome as the purpose of the basic needs approach is rather to bring sectors together. Next steps were identified in defining which combination of modalities (MPC, cash, in-kind and services/sectoral activities) should be looked into, increasing sector engagement throughout the MPC programme cycle, and seeking synergies between MPC, protection and sector programming.

Save the Children presented two tools which were piloted in Borno State (Nigeria) and in the Somali region of Ethiopia – the Basic Needs Assessment Guidance and Toolbox; and the Facilitator's guide for response options analysis and planning (ROAP). Both were funded by ECHO through its Enhanced Response Capacity. Key findings were that several needs assessment methodologies do not put people at the centre, whereas BNA takes into account factors such as the severity of deprivation, main issues behind unmet needs and coping strategies. However, BNA alone is not sufficient. There is a need to also conduct situational analysis, market analysis, risks analysis et al. - BNA needs to be done in coordination with other assessments.

Habitat for Humanity International on behalf of the Global Shelter Cluster presented the positions and recommendations of Global WASH and Shelter Cluster Joint Advocacy Paper "*Increasing Sectoral Cash Transfer & Market Based Programming Capacity*". Linking MPC/BNA to sector efforts has highlighted both strengths and limitations; it should critically factor in broader objectives.

World Vision International on behalf of the Global Health Cluster (GHC) discussed findings of the round table on cash which led to the establishment of the GHC cash task-team. Key sectoral concerns with cash programming and MPC were conveyed as how to ensure quality of services, and the fact that the unpredictability of health needs makes planning to include health in the Minimum Expenditure Basket problematic as health expenditures are large, sudden and unpredictable. The general lack of evidence base for health outcomes and need for research was recalled.

Next steps – Basic Needs Approach (BNA) vs. Sectoral Cash

Given the different interpretations of multi-purpose cash that emerged, time should be invested to agree what multi-purpose cash is and where it fits. The discussion should continue during the next year, throughout all sub-work streams and notably under cost efficiency and effectiveness, **with a view to arrive at the next cash work stream meeting with an agreed further detailed definition.**

11. Cash and Risks

Cash is delivered within a complex ecosystem and some risks exist regardless of modality. Perceived risks related to misappropriation or leakage of cash, and a greater familiarity with in-kind, remain the largest barriers to scaling up cash. To advance the conversation on risks, panellists recalled work carried out throughout the year and presented findings from the pre-meeting survey. Risks highlighted by those who responded to the survey pointed to the power imbalance between beneficiaries and financial service providers (FSPs), financial literacy, data protection and privacy, as well as concerns on robustness of financial ecosystems. An

introduction to CaLP's on-going work on risk, building on existing work such as the UN reflections on fiduciary risk and NRC's work on counter-terrorism, was also provided.

Following Q&A, participants split into four working groups to discuss in more detail risks and mitigating measures, and identify key gaps related to: a. response analysis; b. programme design / delivery; c. protection / feedback mechanism and d. financial inclusion. The working groups noted that significant progress has been achieved on certain risks (fiduciary ones), whilst others (staff capacity, risk appetite) require additional attention. Likewise, many **important risks** haven't been discussed albeit having emerged – **particularly those that directly centre on beneficiaries**, **such as protection and accountability concerns, improving financial literacy and inclusion.** There is also a greater need to unfold and address risks in a more standardized manner, understanding the implications of transferring risks to partners, and ensuring that risks are analysed across all modalities to avoid applying double standards to in-kind responses. CaLP will be undergoing work around risk, de-risking, mitigation measures and safeguards on cash over the next year, also establishing a toolbox on effective safeguards for programmes relying on cash and vouchers and contributing to initiatives on data protection.

Next steps – Cash and Risks

Progress has been achieved on certain risks (including fiduciary ones) but others require ongoing work. Upcoming work to be co-led by WFP and CaLP will **involve further research and evidence building, looking into setting up mechanisms to share learning and the possible development of a toolbox on effective safeguards.**

12. Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash Linkages

The results of the survey of participants' views on this topic point to the need for a careful assessment of the existing social protection system in each specific context. Humanitarian actors need to first coordinate themselves if they are to align with national systems. Linking humanitarian assistance to social protection systems requires the involvement of a range of actors with different mandates, concerns and priorities - development donors, the World Bank and governments should be part of this conversation as early as possible. Innovative and shared funding mechanisms would be key for future success. Though learning and training is being conducted, more research is needed, including on how to ensure that national systems are taken into account during preparedness measures.

Following a panel discussion providing updates from different contexts (DFID: Iraq; UNICEF: Yemen; World Bank: global), participants identified six questions that need addressing. Due to lack of time, only the first one was briefly debated "*Working with / through national systems often implies working more slowly and less efficiently*".

Given the importance of the discussion to be continued, it was agreed to add Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash Linkages to the cash work stream's priority action points. DFID will convene a conversation with those that registered interest in moving this work forward (UNICEF; IFRC; Oxfam; WVI; Action Aid – non-exclusive list).

Next steps – Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash Linkages

Social protection and humanitarian cash linkages will be added as a new priority action point. DFID to convene a conversation with those that registered interest in moving this work forward **to finalise sub-work stream arrangements. The co-leads will subsequently convene a meeting with interested parties to determine responsibilities and details.**

13. Work Plan Review/Wrap Up/Concluding Remarks/Next Steps

DFID presented the results of the survey of participants' views on the work plan. Respondents were overwhelmingly satisfied with the six work stream priorities identified in 2017 (see page 1). They suggested that none of them should be removed, highlighting interest to add priority action points on linking humanitarian cash and social protection, and cash and gender.

Looking into how to address political issues, moving beyond scaling-up to quality, and a demand for increased capacity building efforts were also identified as areas for follow-up.

Participants subsequently divided in three working groups to discuss actions for the next twelve months. Q&A in plenary, followed by closing remarks by the co-conveners, concluded the proceedings.

Feedback from the final sessions clearly demonstrated that all Grand Bargain participants feel it is necessary and important for the work stream to continue. Significant progress has been made overall, with the ODI noting that the cash work stream has made most progress of all Grand Bargain work streams. The *Measuring Cash* and *Cost Effectiveness/Cost Efficiency* and *Donor Coordination* sub work streams in particular have seen good progress, and these will continue to be a priority. Two new priority action points emerged: linking humanitarian cash and social protection, and cash and gender. There was recognition that there needs to be more effort to coordinate with other relevant work streams, in particular the localisation (work stream 2 – 'More support and funding tools to local and national responders') and the joint and impartial needs assessment work stream (work stream 5). Participants underlined the need to see how we engage external (non-GB signatory) stakeholders, by either inviting them or including them in ongoing priority action discussion processes.

Next steps – Closing Sessions

Cash & Gender will be added as a new priority action point. Those that registered interest in moving this work forward (CARE; UN Women) should convene a discussion **to finalise sub-work stream arrangements, inclusive of identification of co-leads. The sub-work stream co-leads will subsequently convene a meeting with interested parties to determine responsibilities and details.**

Co-conveners will suggest ways forward to ensure better synergy, development and cross-fertilization of the cash work stream with the localisation and joint and impartial needs work streams.

Sub-work streams are to each look into how to engage with actors not part of the GB. For next year's meeting, co-conveners might consider inviting relevant stakeholders to share views if releveant to the agenda.

Annex 1: Workshop Agenda

GRAND BARGAIN CASH WORK STREAM
WORKSHOP WFP Headquarters, Rome 4th – 5th June
2018 Event Objectives:

- Identify further routes forward and consider how the Grand Bargain(GB) cash work stream can support
  the delivery of GB cash commitments
- Update signatories on progress made on the work stream work plan
- Identify issues and formulate solutions

Monday 4th June 2018

09.00 – 09.30 **Registration and coffee**

09.30 – 10.00 **Welcome and opening remarks (Kenn Crossley, World Food Programme [Global Cash Coordinator])**

10.00 – 11.00 **State of the World's Cash**
Patrick Saez, Department for International Development (DFID)
Kenn Crossley, WFP
Elias Sagmeister, Ground Truth Solutions
Karen Peachey, CaLP (Moderator)

11.00 -11.15 **Update on GB cash work stream progress (Overseas Development Institute [ODI])**
Wendy Fenton, ODI

11.15 – 11.45 **Coffee/Refreshments**

11.45 – 12.45 **Measuring cash (CaLP and European Civil protection Humanitarian aid Operation [ECHO])**
Sophie Tholstrup, CaLP
Chloe de Soy, ECHO
Patrick Saez, DFID (Moderator)

12.45 – 14.00 **Lunch**

14.00 – 14.30 **Measuring cash (contd.) (CaLP and ECHO)**

14.30 - 15.45 **Cost efficiency and effectiveness (United States Agency for International Development [USAID] and International Rescue Committee [IRC])**
Daphne Jaysinghe, IRC
Ruco van der Merwe, USAID
Susanna Sandstrom, WFP (Moderator)

15.45 – 16.15 **Coffee/refreshments**

16.15 – 17.00 **Donor coordination (Germany and Norway)**
Angela Schwarz, Germany
Morwenna Sullivan, DFID
Antoine Renard, WFP (Moderator)

17.00 – 17.45 **Cash speed dating**

- ***OPTION A***: **IRC**- Seven steps to scaling up cash relief *and* **IFRC**- Cash preparedness

- ***OPTION B***: **CaLP/CCD**- Operational models for cash delivery *and* **UN Women**- Improving effectiveness through gender-responsive cash programming

17.45 **Reception at WFP**

Tuesday 5th June 2018

08.30 – 09.00 Welcome coffee

9.00 – 10.00 **Cash coordination (USAID/UN office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs [OCHA])**
Juliet Lang, OCHA
Ruco van der Merwe, USAID
Davide Zappa, DFID (Moderator)

10.00 – 11.00 **Basic needs approach / Sectoral cash (UN High Commissioner for Refugees [UNHCR] and sector leads Shelter/Health)**
Annika Sjoberg, UNHCR
Francesca Battistin, Save the Children
Jake Zarins, Habitat for Humanity International
Kevin Savage, World Vision International
Yvonne Forsen, WFP (Moderator)

11.00 – 11.30 Coffee/refreshments

11.30 – 12.30 **Cash and risks (WFP)**
Isabelle Pelly, CaLP
Antoine Renard, WFP

12.30 – 13.30 Lunch

13.30 – 14.30 **Social protection and humanitarian cash linkages**
Ugo Gentilini, World Bank
Claire Mariani, UNICEF
Patrick Saez, DFID
Vibeke Gram Mortensen, Denmark (Moderator)
Morwenna Sullivan, DFID (Moderator)

14.30 – 15.30 **Workplan review (WFP/DFID)**
Davide Zappa, DFID
Antoine Renard, WFP

15.30 – 16.00 Coffee/refreshments

16.00 – 16.30 **Wrap up/ Next steps (DFID/WFP)**
Patrick Saez, DFID
Kenn Crossley, WFP

16.30 **Formal closing: Terri Sarch (UK ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN Food and Agricultural Agencies in Rome)**

Annex 2: List of agencies participating in the 2nd GB Cash Work Stream Workshop

Agencies
Action Against Hunger (ACF) Spain
Action Aid
British Red Cross
Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)
CARE International – UK
CARE USA
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
Development Initiatives (DI)
Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)
Embassy of Belgium in Rome
Embassy of Denmark in Rome
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO)
Ground Truth Solutions
Habitat for Humanity International
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
International Organization for Migration (IOM)
International Rescue Committee - United Kingdom (IRC-UK)
Mercy Corps
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) - CashCap
Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
Oxfam
Plan International
Relief International
Save the Children – UK
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
US State Department (BPRM)
World Bank (WB)
World Food Programme (WFP)
World Vision International

Annex 3: Pre-meeting survey

Organisation

_____

Linking Social Protection and Humanitarian Cash

We would like to conduct a landscape mapping of activities implemented by GB signatories that are linking social protection (SP) and humanitarian cash transfers.

Please provide us with a short summary of what your organisation is doing in relation to SP and humanitarian cash transfers based on the following categories. For each activity (programmes/pilot; research; capacity building; sharing learning), please specify the country and type of context (Recurrent shocks (natural disasters/economic), Displacement, Protracted conflict). Please complete the following table:

	Country	Recurrent shocks	Displacement	Protracted conflict
Programme/pilots (if possible, indicate broad figures for reach; duration; scale /budget)				
Research				
Capacity Building				
Sharing learning (internal/external)				

1. What are the main lessons learned so far for your organisation

1. 2. 3.

Grand Bargain cash work stream priorities

To help identify what the priorities of the work stream should be for the coming 12 months, please answer the following questions:

1. Are you satisfied with the Grand Bargain cash work stream priorities as emerged from the 2017 workshop (attached in survey request email)?

Yes / No

2. Do you believe that any priorities should be removed from the list? Please specify which ones and why?

3. Do you believe that any priorities should be added to the list? Please specify which ones and why?

Cash & Risks

To support the mapping of key risks associated with cash that require further attention from cash stakeholders in the coming year, please could reflect succinctly on the topics in the boxes below with a risk perspective:

Please do fill in any information relevant for your particular organisation/institution; you do not have to fill in anything that is not relevant. If there are any topics your organisation works with in relation to risk that are not addressed, please do use the final untitled box to flag this.

Financial needs and capabilities of vulnerable households relying on formal financial services, and new payment instruments Risks: -

Potential Mitigation measures in place:
-

Protection of beneficiaries both in terms of data protection & privacy

Risks:
-

Potential Mitigation measures in place:
-

Consumer's / Client's rights with Financial Service Providers / FSP Code of Conduct in place / Balance of power between vulnerable households & FSP's agents, retailers

Risks:
-

Potential mitigation measures:
-

Access to financial services beyond the cash-out (merchant payments, credit/loans, insurance)

Risks:
-

Potential Mitigation measures in place:
-

Risks:
-

Potential Mitigation measures in place:
-

END