

Cash Preparedness Measurement Meeting Ankara 20 -21 February,2019

Participants:

CPWG members: Orhan Hacimehmet (TRC), Bulent Ozturk (TRC), Lisbet Elvakjaer (Danish Red Cross), Klug Wolfgang (Austrian Red Cross), Adriana Estrada (Spanish Red Cross), , Emma Delo (British Red Cross), Moore Anne Katherine (Swiss Red Cross), Jo Burton (ICRC), , Mareike Tobiassen (German Red Cross), Caroline Holt (IFRC), Wendy Brightman (American Red Cross), Shirin Narymbaeva (IFRC).

Excused: Carla Marie Taylor (Canadian Red Cross)

Cash Preparedness Group (CPG): Ines Dalmau (British Red Cross), Jenifer Coneff (American Red Cross)

Introduction

The CPWG meeting began by the CPG presenting the meeting objectives and recapping the global evaluation of cash preparedness recommendations. One of the main recommendations was on how to measure cash preparedness. As a result the CPG was tasked to develop these measurements.

More specifically, the CPG needs to:

1. Define being cash ready and cash preparedness
2. Define how to measure the impact of programmes at the outcome and output levels
3. Define the levels of preparedness

At the end of the meeting the CPG aimed to be clear on the next steps as well as on the validation process of the work done.

The WB Capacity Building Indicators and other supporting documents with references and summaries of strength and weaknesses of various indicators were shared to facilitate group work.

During the previous meeting on cash preparedness, it was mentioned that the definition of cash ready should be very clear and refer to all technical sectors and phases (not only disaster response). Concepts such as speed, scale and quality were mentioned as important for the definition as well.

The meeting participants discussed that the definition of cash ready should also not be used as an excuse not to do cash because the organization is not cash ready. The CPWG voted on the definition being inclusive and reflective of the fact that many organizations who may not meet the definition of ready still do cash with external support or in specific sectors. Therefore, it was agreed that the definition of cash ready should reflect the idea that all agencies are always ready with help.

The proposed definition of Cash Ready was introduced with each of the anchor words defined separately.

The definition of cash ready is visionary and describes the result. Supporting definition of cash preparedness was introduced as an expression of the process – a roadmap to the end result.

Members of the CPWG broke into group discussion on the definitions presented.

Review of Outcome Indicators

The CPG presented indicators that are common for cash programming from CALP Programme Quality Guidance, CALP's operational support analysis, IFRC NSD framework and other relevant documentation. The proposed outcome level indicators tied to each of the anchor words in the

definition of cash ready were presented, and the participants were asked to discuss the indicators in groups. The groups reported in plenary, and the edits were captured by the CPG.

CPWG has developed indicators for the Counting Cash initiative and Strategic Framework. However, those are movement wide whereas Cash Preparedness indicators will be at the agency level.

Cash Ready Level Models

After agreeing on 10 outcome level indicators, the next step was to validate how those indicators could be levelled, and to determine which models to use. The CPG presented various levelling approaches along with their weaknesses and advantages. Out of the reviewed models, a model built upon the Cash Preparedness Self-Assessment was proposed as the most appropriate. The CPG already applied the model to 16 NSs to test the tool. As a result, the model was found to be appropriate. The presentation can be found [here](#).

The next step would be to calibrate each indicator according to the level of cash preparedness.

Membership Pack:

Prior to the meeting, documents were shared on:

- Cash Peer Working Group
- Cash Technical Working Groups membership
- Cash Regional Working Group
- Cash Advisory Group Overview

All documents except the one on Cash Peer Working Group were already discussed during a call. The session focused on reviewing the Cash Peer WG document: definition and transitional process around membership.

The document was edited as per comments.

Discussion points:

- Reapplying every two years is a process burden. The previous discussion on membership was that adding new members would mean that existing member agencies would have to rotate out, to ensure that CPWG remains an effective decision-making body.
- On membership to the WG, first see whether there is anyone who would be interested in joining, and how much appetite is there.
- The cap might be established later depending on the number of people who would like to join.
- On Coordination of the CPWG: the dedicated capacity for coordination should come from IFRC if possible, to maintain the linkages to the IFRC structures.
- Having a regional representation in CPWG adds to the depth of the discussions. They can join via Skype or join face-to-face if the meeting is conducted in their region, or if budget is available for guests. The regions can join on a rotating basis depending on availability and interest. Looking forward the positions that are held at the Geneva level now might not there in the future, and the regional roles will play a primary role in the CPWG. The minutes of the CPWG meetings are regularly shared with the regional representatives.
- There has been natural change in the membership when the positions/people transition to new roles or leave.
- The two-year workplan to be developed in January line was removed, but the process will remain.

Action points/Decisions:

1. The WG chairs are to send out an introductory paragraph about the CPWG and to find out how much interest there is in participating in the WG. The British Red Cross will prepare an infographic including all the 1 pagers on membership types. The chairs are to send it out with an introductory paragraph.
2. If the interest is more than 20, the CPWG chairs and standing members are to recommend a process.
3. The cap can be put later if/when the size of the group becomes unmanageable.
4. Chairs need to be selected from the existing members of the CPWG, newly joined members may not assume chairmanship role immediately.

Day 2.

The definitions of cash ready and preparedness, anchor words and indicators were revisited for final validation. The comments and edits were immediately captured by CPG.

All members of the CPWG except 1 voted for the definition of cash ready.

CPWG members separated into groups to look at the definitions of cash preparedness levels.

Action Points:

- The indicator around data responsibility is formulated to measure only time taken for reconciliation. An indicator capturing data responsibility and the degree of transparency in financial systems is needed. CPWG members to talk to data, finance and audits colleagues to formulate an appropriate indicator. The CPG should consult Norwegian Red Cross on data responsibility.
- CPWG members to look for, and consult on, indicators and standards around accountability and beneficiary engagement.
- The CPG will complete the work on output level indicators and link with Cash Capacity Assessment by the end of March.

AOBs.

New CALP glossary:

Last year there was a discussion at the CPWG on whether the movement should use CTP, CBI or CBA. CALP recently announced a new glossary where they are defining the modality as Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA). This term has been agreed on within the Grand Bargain Cash Work Stream participants.

The CPWG voted unanimously to use CVA in all Movement documents/materials from now on. Individual agencies can still decide to use other terms in their own documents/publications. For example, the American Red Cross prefers to use "Financial Assistance", as it has done a lot to move away from vouchers. British Red Cross uses CBA, and their leadership uses the term. IFRC will not spend resources to change the documentation already produced but going forward it will start using CVA.

Counting cash:

How does CPWG would like to handle accounting for cash expended (with fees, no fees or indirect costs)?

Answer: Count only the cash in people's hands and separate the fees. If certain agencies are unable to separate it is fine, but the guiding notes should state the above.

CALP's guidance on restriction has changed, acknowledging that only vouchers are de facto restricting and cash may not be restricted. Do we change the terminology accordingly? We have a column on modality and restriction, and another on the delivery mechanism (options, direct cash, e-cash and voucher).

Answer: The delivery mechanism column should be relabelled as Delivery mechanism/ Modality and options should change to: E-cash, physical currency, voucher and e-voucher. The restriction column should be gone. There is no need to have a column on restriction because e-cash and hard currency are by definition unrestricted, and vouchers are restricted. In cases when vouchers (restricted) and cash (unrestricted) are used together, these can be split into 2 rows or the majority only can be reported. The narrative can include cases when cash is distributed with conditionalities and for sectors.

Other comments:

- Exchange rate: establishing a fixed rate for the year (except in a context like Zimbabwe) was discussed.

Action points:

- CPWG members to comment on the infographic produced by the Cash IM sub Working Group by the end of next week.
- CPWG Coordinator to send a response on the questions posed by Lisa on Wednesday.
- CPWG members are to report first and foremost their domestic cash operations.

Cash Hub:

The feedback on the toolkit navigation has been negative. The British RC is working with their IT department to make improvements. They will provide a mock up and CPWG members should comment on it.

On the internal CPWG communication – there is no way to store documents, to work on the same document nor to organize threads coherently on the Cash Hub. It is meant to be a chat room. Would a Go platform be an option? A more sustainable option should be found.

Action Points:

- The CPWG members should comment on the Cash hub mock up by the 6th of March.
- CPWG members to look for another platform that might meet its needs. Teams and Slack were mentioned.
- Wendy to explore opportunities with the Go platform and other platforms being developed.
- As an interim solution continue using Cash Hub. Approved documents should be uploaded to the Hub (Shirin). The communication should be duplicated via e-mail because not everyone receives notifications via the Cash Hub.

Netherlands Red Cross 121 initiatives

The Netherland Red Cross researcher would like to speak to the CPWG members on how Cash is moved to the hands of beneficiaries. They would like to map how it is done now.

Action Points:

- The Netherland Red Cross should speak to the IM sub WG, because they are officially part of the WG. Points to discuss: objectives, challenges of the platform as well as the results of the pilot in Ukraine.
- CPWG could be invited into this IM Sub WG meeting subject to member availability.
- There are other comparable platforms and initiatives taking place, and CPWG should have a consistent approach to them.

Next Meeting dates

The next face-to-face meeting should be in June. Next call should be in early April.

The April call agenda will include the resourcing of regional structures and an overall discussion on cash preparedness. Activation or reactivation of technical groups on emerging topics is required.

Action points:

- Brainstorm the agenda via cash hub (Shirin organize).
- Shirin send out Doodle polls for both call (23rd to 30th April) and the 2-3 day face-to-face meeting (the weeks of 3rd and 17th June).
- The CPWG sub groups and technical WG to join the face-to-face meeting and update on their progress.

Cash Preparedness

After the PER meeting, the CPWG committed to provide the relevant levels to the benchmarks of PER by mid-March.

British Red Cross has funding to conduct a study on entry points for the Cash Preparedness approach, what will it mean for NSs and the shift from the current approach?

American Red Cross is looking at SOP development, at the moment SOPs are not user-friendly. The American Red Cross is planning to create a format. The IFRC already carried out work on SOPs in a consultative way and they are now on the final working draft. These can be contextualized to NSs.

Action Points:

- Wendy to send parts of the final management response that she has to the evaluation to Cash Preparedness WG. CPWG members to look at the bits that are missing and share feedback with the Cash Preparedness WG.
- Shirin to consolidate the final management response.
- Wendy to share the PER mapping.
- The CPG to finish work on the TOR for the study suggested by the British Red Cross by June. The CPWG will validate and share widely to find the right profile.
- Suggestion to have annual learning events e.g. CPWG defines a learning question, and conducts or commissions research (that leads to an event, if appropriate).
- Shirin to consolidate all various to do lists and workplans in one simple format showing action, responsible, deadline, and a space for comments.