CashHub

Learning from the Ukraine Crisis Webinar Series

Community, Engagement and Accountability in remote CVA programming webinar

Responses from panel to questions which were raised in the Cash Hub Webinar on "Learning from the Ukraine Crisis Webinar Series: Community Engagement and Accountability" (CEA) held on the 18th January 2023.

Webinar Panel:

- Amy Crisp, *Community Engagement and Accountability Adviser – British Red Cross*
- Güneş Alpan, *Community Engagement and Accountability Delegate, Ukraine and Impacted Countries Operations – IFRC*
- Jeremy Smith, *Country Cluster Manager: MENA Region – British Red Cross*

Questions and Answers:

How were communities consulted in the design phase of the programme? How was their feedback taken into account in shaping it?

In some responses communities were not formally consulted, with the priority being placed on setting up online registration for cash payments. The gaps in information were later addressed by integrating questions into the PDMs, such as information channel preferences, what information people wanted, language preferences etc.

What specific and concrete opportunities for collaboration between CEA and IM were there based on this response?

CEA and IM collaborated closely during the configuration of the case management system, EspoCRM, in each new country of operation where a CVA activity was planned. This included training the staff how to navigate the system, introduction to CEA and how to register cases using the coding framework to ensure feedback received from the affected community about the cash assistance is recorded and analysed to inform the operation. CEA and IM also work together for the Social Media Monitoring (with the support of 510 of Netherlands Red Cross) to monitor community chat groups and to create visual products such as dashboards to present the feedback in a digestible way.

IM is integral to ensure that community feedback is visualised in a way that encourages programme teams to digest it and use it to improve programming. IM support within this response was what allowed the Red Cross to act on feedback rather than just gather it.

Are there standard databases for recording feedback and learnings?

In terms of recording feedback, National Societies did this at different levels and in different ways based on the awareness of the importance of collecting and analysing feedback, available channels, and platforms to record feedback data. The use of EspoCRM system enabled feedback to be consistently recorded across the response in a standardized way in one main database. The learnings have also been documented as part of various review/stocktake reports and during workshops and trainings as well.

How were the different complain and response mechanisms chosen? Were there many mechanisms already in place, eg websites, call centres, etc?

The complaint and response mechanisms were chosen with the National Societies based on the capacity, the funding, the channels already in place and the scale of the planned activities. Although National Societies had telephone lines available for the community to reach the HQ and the branches, call centres in different scales were established with the launch of CVA programs to provide a large-scale response. The https://ukrainefinancialassistance.ifrc.org website was created for each country that is part of the response to provide details on where to contact regarding questions, suggestions and complaints alongside provide information on the CVA programmes. A big emphasis was put on digital communication channels, which was important considering the nature of the CVA support however more time should have been spent during the assessment phase to better understand what face-to-face channels communities would prefer and trust.

What are the main challenges in implementing Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) in this sort of complex emergency?

CVA was an appropriate response option given that markets were functioning, and there was a financially literate population and well-developed financial infrastructure.

- *The challenge then is both how to access people and make sure people can access the assistance, and how to make sure it gets allocated and delivered to the right people in the right time and securely.*
- *You must consider capacity to deliver by the National Society and partners like IFRC and ICRC as well make sure it is coordinated with other humanitarian agencies providing assistance.*
- *Cash grant values were set by the national Cash Working Groups but these values need to be monitored to check that they are sufficient for the needs people have as well as impact on the host population.*
- *Feedback and information from the people supported is critical to ensure the assistance is delivered in the right amounts, in the right way and at the right time – this allows the programme to adapt as it needs to and also signal needs for other services provided outside of cash.*

With the cash assistance provided, how do the payments interact or impact with the social protection payments provided by the government in these counties?

The Cash Hub has developed a tip sheet on this subject, aiming to assist National Societies in identifying opportunities to strengthen linkages with existing social protection systems in their countries.

Visit the Cash Hub platform to download the resource: ***https://cash-hub.org/resource/tip-sheet-strengthening-linkages-with-social-protection-systems-orientation-guidance-for-red-cross-red-crescent-national-societies/***

How did the team manage to provide support to individuals with non-CVA related concerns?

CEA, PGI and safeguarding teams worked closely together to establish referral pathways which meant each National Society had a list of other programmes, organisations, and government support which they could signpost callers to. In some countries Humanitarian Service Points were also set up and would provide information of other services available to affected communities.

As with every IFRC response there is also a dedicated Integrity Line website, email and telephone line for communities, volunteers and staff to report any concerns.

Were the feedback mechanisms tailored to be able to manage sensitive complains such as sexual exploitation and abuse?

At the time of the evaluation, they were mostly not, and there were significant data management issues uncovered. For example, in one operation all information from the infoline was kept in a google doc with the helpline volunteers, IFRC staff and NS staff having full access to all data. This was raised as a concern, but there may have been follow up work that may have been done since then in response to the review. In another response a CRM was donated by a PNS, which allowed for a secure database to be used, ensuring better data management. In both systems though there wasn't a specific pathway for SEA complaints at the time of the evaluation, though this was something the PGI roving advisor was aware of and was developing a plan to address.

Are there any good practices of when feedback from call centres/chatbots and the feedback from in person were jointly analysed?

Current case management system -EspoCRM- allows us to register feedback received in person collected through the branches and Humanitarian Service Points. This enables us to categorize under the same coding framework used for call centres/chatbots, make a joint analysis to be reflected in the regional feedback dashboard.

This coding framework can be found as part of the IFRCs new Feedback Kit: https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/ifrc-feedback-kit/