Roadmap for response analysis

## INTRODUCTION

This road map will provide you with brief guidance on how to go through the response analysis module. Response analysis is usually carried out after an initial assessment, in which the affected population’s needs[[1]](#footnote-1) are identified. The response analysis process will help you determine the response options that are most appropriate and feasible, given the objectives set to address emergency needs.

For the purposes of the CiE Toolkit, the response analysis process has been divided into steps and sub-steps. Each sub-step has been associated with tools selected for their potential to be adapted and used in different contexts and cash transfer programmes, by different organizations. When adapting tools to your context and needs, you can get detailed guidance on response analysis from the reference documents suggested both at module and step levels.

Steps and sub-steps are indicative and not necessarily sequential. You may need to move back and forth to reach the intended results. Sometimes, you may even need to skip some of the steps or sub-steps proposed, due to time and resource constraints that are common in emergency contexts. In any case, you should at least comply with the minimum standards set for the response analysis module. For each step, you will also find minimum standards that may help you decide what to focus on.

## MINIMUM STANDARDS

* The process of selecting response modalities and mechanisms must involve finance and logistics.
* Multipurpose cash grants should be considered among the potential response options from the beginning.
* The feasibility of each modality and potential mechanisms must be checked.
* Modality and mechanism selection should be based on a comparative analysis that includes at least risks/mitigation and costs.
* Risk analysis should take into account protection-related risks and benefits.
* Beneficiary preferences and capacity (e.g. to use technology), as well as intra-household issues, must be considered.
* The capacity of the agency/partner to deliver assistance through the selected modality/mechanism must be considered.
* Alignment with policies and practices of the local government and other humanitarian actors should be sought.
* When setting the value of the cash transfer, consider the cost of a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and, when appropriate, align it to the national poverty line.
* Targeting criteria must be linked to the objectives of the intervention, relevant for the local population and context, and feasible with the resources available.
* The choice of the targeting mechanism should be a trade-off between the imperative to act, accuracy and affordability.
* CFW should be considered when community works are required, can be accepted and performed by the local population, and do not interfere with traditional livelihoods.

## STEPS AND SUB-STEPS

The CiE Toolkit suggests three steps for the response analysis process. The CiE Toolkit makes available resources that can help you:

**Select response modalities and mechanisms** that best meet the affected population’s needs and the objectives established for the emergency intervention. This selection starts by exploring potential response options.

|  |
| --- |
| In order to include CTP among the potential response options, you should check if cash is feasible, considering market conditions, organizational capacity, and government policies, among other key issues. Make sure that multipurpose cash grants, which allows for meeting multi-sector needs, are considered among the potential response options. |

Your final decision on the response option should be based on a comparative analysis that takes into account at least: suitability to the intervention objectives, capacity of the agency to implement the different modalities/mechanisms, beneficiary preferences, capacity, risks/mitigation and cost.

The process of selecting response modalities and mechanisms should involve different departments, at least finance and logistics, and the rationale behind the final choice should be shared with the key stakeholders.

**Make decisions regarding the transfer**, particularly its value and frequency, and whether or not it should be adjusted to household size and to price changes. Stakeholders, particularly the government, humanitarian actors and local communities, should be involved in the decision-making process. The value of the transfer should be based on a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) and should take into account differences between recurrent and one-off needs. Whenever possible, harmonization with existing national programmes (particularly social safety nets) should be sought. When planning for adjustments to the value of the transfer, establish clear triggers, budget for contingency resources, and inform stakeholders on the rationale behind potential adjustments.

**Make targeting decisions**, starting from whether to go for blanket or targeted distributions. It is good practice to conduct a collaborative targeting process, involving multiple stakeholders, like government, other agencies and affected communities. It is also advisable to ensure clear and regular communication with the affected communities in order to reduce risks of misunderstanding and complaints. Targeting approaches usually include an initial geographical targeting followed by the selection of households/individuals. Targeting decisions should take place at an initial stage of response analysis, as they influence the choice of the response modality and mechanisms. In order to target households/individuals, you will have to first choose appropriate targeting criteria (usually based on indicators of vulnerability). The choice of the targeting mechanism will likely be a trade-off between the imperative to act, accuracy and affordability.

|  |
| --- |
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1. Food security, livelihoods, shelter, health, water and sanitation, etc. or multi-sectorial. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)