

## Grand Bargain Cash Workstream Workshop Report

*31 May – 1st June 2017*

### The Role of the Grand Bargain Cash Workstream

The Grand Bargain (GB) consists of 51 commitments that are grouped under ten workstreams. Each of these workstreams is led by two co-conveners, usually a donor and an implementer. The aim of the workstreams 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<sup>1</sup>.

The role of the Cash workstream group was agreed by Sherpas at the Bonn meeting in September 2016 and captured in the 'Cash 2 pager': 'while the work on technical aspects of cash and voucher Programming and delivery mechanisms is taking place in a number of existing forums, the role of the group will be to **incentivise** and **influence** progress. 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<sup>2</sup>, the United Kingdom (UK) and World Food Programme (WFP) intend not to duplicate what other forums and actors already do on the areas listed above: we aim to **fill key gaps** and **amplify** their work, by expanding the outreach and uptake of what is produced. We intend to focus on the major obstacles to the expansion of cash and voucher programming. Because a number of active technical forums already exist, we plan to target actors who have engaged less with cash and voucher programming or for a shorter time. The **GB cash commitments** will be the overarching frame of the GB cash work stream work.

### The first GB Cash Workstream Workshop

The first GB Cash Workstream Workshop took place from 30<sup>th</sup> May to 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017 at the WFP Headquarters in Rome. The workshop was the first activity as part of the GB Cash Workstream. The aim of the workshop was to consolidate a work plan based on the interests and priorities of work stream members, where the workstream could add value to existing initiatives, and to start addressing some key factors for the increased use of cash and voucher programming. Agenda<sup>3</sup> items were identified by the workstream co-conveners as areas that current discussion on cash and voucher programming is concentrated on, and that require further, accelerated progress.

It brought together over 70 participants from donor organisations, multi-lateral agencies, Global Clusters, the Red Cross Movement, Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and specialist agencies and platforms (Global Public Policy Institute (GPPi), Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP), Overseas Development Institute (ODI), Development Initiatives (DI)). Discussions across the four main themes – the use and scaling up of cash, cash coordination, risks, and measuring cash – at the workshop as well as steps forward for the GB Cash Workstream are outlined in this report. A draft workplan was put together as a result of this workshop (see Annex 3), and will be finalised with the workstream members.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sources: <https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/grand-bargain-hosted-iasc>;

<sup>2</sup> Final Summary Note Grand Bargain Meeting, Bonn, September 2016: 'Former (or newly interested) co-champions of workstreams will continue to play a role in supporting the implementation of commitments within 'their' workstreams 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'.

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 1 for the agenda of the GB Cash Workstream Workshop on 31<sup>st</sup> May to 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017.

## **The Current Use of Cash and Scaling Up**

The session provided an overview of the current use of cash<sup>4</sup>, the independent GB Annual Reporting process, and the CaLP Global Framework for Action<sup>5</sup>. Progress on the use of cash and voucher programming was noted. Another workshop session focused on learning from successes, opportunities, failures, challenges and risks for scaling up cash as well as its implications and takeaways for GB signatories and the GB Cash Workstream. The importance of clear leadership, and roles and responsibilities, and a good relationship with the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) during a response were highlighted. Technical capacity in a response and also across agencies and donors was considered crucial. Market analysis, needs assessment, accountability to affected populations, information management and evidence building were identified as important processes to guide response decisions. The role of partnerships with financial services providers at different levels, governments and NGOs were considered critical to the success of scaling up cash.

Donors noted the importance of driving efficiency and effectiveness in humanitarian response to extend help to more beneficiaries using existing resources, and identified protection of vulnerable groups (e.g. women) and monetary as well as non-monetary risks as challenges to cash scale-up. Developing and keeping policies on cash up to date was also highlighted as a challenge.

NGOs and the Red Cross Movement underscored the importance of bringing localisation and the value of 'soft' functions (e.g. needs assessment, accountability to affected populations, inclusiveness) back into the global cash conversation. They also noted that system changes required to cater for the emerging push for increased cash transfer programming will require time.

Clusters pointed out that multi-purpose cash alone may not meet all of the beneficiaries needs and called for improved joint response analysis, and emphasised the role of good programming to ensure quality outcomes for beneficiaries<sup>6</sup>. Participants agreed that putting beneficiaries at the centre of a response was vital for its success. Stronger links with other relevant GB workstreams were proposed.

### ***Proposed Action Points***

A number of different areas that need further collective action to promote scaling up cash and voucher programming were identified by participants. Below are those topics that are not dealt with separately in this report (i.e. cash coordination, risk, measuring cash):

1. Collective donor efforts: develop and test a common donor approach and programme in a country; consider host Government involvement.
2. Measuring outcomes: develop a paper with options of markers to measure outcomes and share with signatories, working with Global Cluster Coordinators' Group (GCCG).
3. Communication: develop and share messages for public audience and decision makers.
4. Ensure coherence and synergy with other workstreams and key initiatives: the co-conveners, UK and WFP, will work with co-conveners of other relevant workstreams to integrate recommendations from this workshop, and report back to the cash workstream (e.g. needs assessment workstream on joint response analysis; localisation workstream on capacity and preparedness).

---

<sup>4</sup> Development Initiatives, ODI, Alexandra Spencer, Chloe Parrish and Charlotte Lattimer, Counting cash: tracking humanitarian expenditure on cash-based programming, December 2016. <https://www.odi.org/sites/odi.org.uk/files/resource-documents/11296.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.cashlearning.org/news-and-events/news-and-events/post/455-calpas-global-framework-for-action>

<sup>6</sup> Work by Ground Truth Solutions on capturing front line worker and beneficiary perceptions on the use of cash and voucher programming were mentioned as possible ways to measure qualitative aspects of cash and voucher programming.

5. Capacity and preparedness: map gaps in capacity and propose priority actions for the GB cash workstream.
6. Basic Needs Approach: develop a paper on the links between the basic needs approach, multi-purpose cash (MPC), and sectoral cash with input from cash workstream members.
7. Membership of GB cash workstream: global clusters and specialist agencies (e.g. ODI, GPPi, DI, Groundtruth, etc.) should be invited to contribute to the workstream.

### **Cash Coordination**

The session on 'Cash Coordination' took stock of learning, evidence and recommendations on coordination of cash. Five areas of broad consensus across the IASC-endorsed recommendations from the 'World Bank Strategic Note on Cash Transfers in Humanitarian Contexts'<sup>7</sup>, ODI case studies and synthesis report 'Time for Change: harnessing the potential of humanitarian cash transfers'<sup>8</sup>, and the GPPi 'White Paper on Cash Coordination'<sup>9</sup> were identified:

1. Cash coordination involves both technical and strategic functions.
2. Cash coordination requires dedicated and predictable resources.
3. Cash coordination needs to be inter-sectoral.
4. Cash coordination should be linked to the overall coordination architecture.
5. Host governments should have a strong role in cash coordination (where possible).

There was also a strong consensus that there is an urgent need for the IASC to clarify and provide more definite guidance on cash coordination and the inclusion of cash transfers for basic needs in Humanitarian Response Plans (HRPs). The call for Cash Working Groups (CWG) to be formalized into Response Analysis Groups providing technical support to clusters on cash and voucher programming and in-kind transfers put forward in the World Bank Strategic Note was also supported by other panellist. Members further suggested that CWG should be adequately resourced. It was clarified that work on CWG terms of reference (TOR) is currently on-going. It was acknowledged that no one-size fits all approach could be applied and that cash coordination needed to be context appropriate. In terms of next steps, it was noted that there is a need for more advocacy on cash and voucher programming to increase acceptability amongst decision makers, development of capacity for cash at all levels in the humanitarian system, and further tools, training and guidance on cash coordination.

Discussions touched upon the World Bank report's recommendation for 'the IASC to test whether and under what circumstances a separation of responsibility for assessments and implementation could result in a more accountable division of responsibilities and activities'. While some testing in this area was noted, it was suggested that further piloting could be implemented through the GB process. Further, an opportunity for donor coordination prior to humanitarian crises was observed. The importance of enabling national governments to lead coordination efforts was also pointed out.

### **Proposed Action Points**

Working groups proposed further actions to be taken by the GB Cash Workstream. In a voting process, where participants were given two votes each, the workshop proposed to prioritise actions in the following order with votes received in brackets. Participants were able to abstain from voting.

---

<sup>7</sup> The World Bank Group, (2016). [Strategic Note Cash Transfers in Humanitarian Contexts](#). The World Bank Group.

<sup>8</sup> Bailey, S., and Harvey, P., (2017). [Time for change: Harnessing the potential of humanitarian cash transfers](#). Overseas Development Institute.

<sup>9</sup> Steets, J., and Ruppert, L., (2017). [White Paper on Cash Coordination](#). GPPi and CaLP.

1. The GB Cash Workstream<sup>10</sup> to share mapping of ongoing work on cash coordination (*not voted on, but consensually considered a pre-condition for other work*);
2. The GB Cash Workstream co-conveners to ask IASC to include cash coordination in Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) ToR and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) TOR; HCs are to hold accountability for the timely activation of Cash Working Groups (CWGs). The GB Cash Workstream could work on draft ToR (22 votes);
3. The GB Cash Workstream to ask IASC to clarify where cash coordination fits in the formal humanitarian system (including the link to the HCT) and translate recommendations from the WB Strategic Note and GPPi study into actions (19 votes);
4. The GCCG cash task team to produce a mapping of all cash coordination structures (within IASC structures) at the global level; Global Cash Working Group (GCWG) to ensure that all cash coordination structures (outside IASC structures) at the global level are also mapped (16 votes);
5. Donors to fund and incentivise cluster and inter-cluster cash coordination. Emphasis will be placed on ensuring predictable capacity for CWG and on cash preparedness. (11 votes);
6. The GCCG cash task team to ensure training and capacity is provided for clusters, at the inter-cluster level and to HCs (11 votes);
7. The GB Cash Workstream to produce guidance for structuring cash coordination options in the field for HCTs and UN Country Teams (UNCTs) building on existing mechanisms and evidence (8 votes);
8. Global data sharing agreements to be put into place for sudden onset emergencies (including information on assessments, markets, response options analysis). How this is to be done needs to be further defined. (0 votes)

## Risk

Panel presentations highlighted that the GB commitments on cash put due emphasis on the consideration of risks, and development of appropriate guidance and evidence building on these. A perceived bias towards higher acceptance of risks in in-kind rather than cash and voucher programming was noted. However, panellists and other participants agreed that evidence did not show cash to be riskier. It was also pointed out that no delivery modalities are risk free. In this regard, a statement from the WFP Audit Committee (2017) resonated well with participants:

*“No humanitarian organization, or – for comparison purposes – donor-country safety-net programme, can operate with zero appetite for fraud. However, cases of known fraud or clear signs of potential fraud must result in immediate action and WFP must have zero tolerance for the perpetrators of fraud.”<sup>11</sup>*

A lack of acceptable loss ratios, different understanding of fraud and losses, and little information on risk appetite across donors and agencies was also noted. A potential higher reputational risk stemming from diversion of cash and differing public perceptions on risk in in-kind versus cash and voucher programming were reported. Donors thought it crucial to be transparent with political decision makers about the risks involved in cash and voucher programming, and to support this with relevant evidence. An improved evidence base, good internal control systems (e.g. separation of roles), and monitoring were suggested as potential ways to decrease risks. Capacity building and training for staff were put forward as crucial measure to enable staff to become comfortable with risk involved in cash and voucher programming and it was noted that this may take time. Finally, the risk of not

---

<sup>10</sup> Where an action refers to the ‘GB Cash Workstream’ more broadly, specific action leads will be identified as part of the workstream work plan.

<sup>11</sup> Source: Annual Report of the Audit Committee to WFP Executive Board

intervening in a humanitarian situation was highlighted and seen to offset risks of diversion under most circumstances.

Discussions centred on the importance of considering and addressing non-financial risks. This included the protection of vulnerable people (e.g. gender effects of different response modalities; tensions between internally displaced populations and host communities) through high quality programming and, use and availability of relevant evidence. More extensive evidence on risk was seen as useful to obtain buy-in from the public and political decision makers. Transparency and open information sharing were regarded as key mechanisms to build a common evidence base on risks. Different risks involved with cash and voucher programming versus in-kind were also raised. Amongst others, the possibility of cybercrime with both cash and in-kind, the risk of diversion of physical in-kind aid, and the vulnerability of assistance to diversion by gatekeepers were pointed out. Consideration was also given to money laundering and terrorist financing with some donors confirming that counter-measures applied across all modalities. NGOs raised the concern that financial and protection risks in cash and voucher programming are often transferred to partners, and wider conversation affirmed that agreements need to be clear about who in the value chain is responsible for what risks.

### ***Proposed Action Points***

1. WFP volunteered to facilitate a working group on risks involved with cash and voucher programming (e.g. including building a common understanding of acceptable risk thresholds with donors and other stakeholders).

### **Measuring Cash**

The session on 'Measuring Cash' took stock of current practice in this area. Key challenges to the measurement of cash raised in the presentations were the lack of clarity and consistency on (1) terminology, (2) what should be counted (e.g. transfer values, programming costs, core costs), (3) what should be tracked (e.g. modality, conditionality, restriction; non-financial data related to needs, response, implementation), and (4) whether and how such data can be feasibly and sustainably tracked. Further, an overview of different options to report on cash systematically on a global level were provided including the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC), International Aid Transparency Initiative (IATI), Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Financial Tracking Service(FTS) and the 3Ws/4Ws<sup>12</sup>.

All participants agreed that GB signatories should adopt the CaLP Glossary definitions, while agreeing that these require reviews to: 1/ incorporate other sectors, 2/ include a possible new modality on services, and 3/ consult on the terms that cover both cash transfers and voucher transfers, i.e. 'Cash Transfer Programming' (CTP) and 'Cash Based Interventions (CBI)'. Discussions related especially to CTP and CBI terms in the CaLP Glossary. Some members suggested that an aggregate term capturing both cash and vouchers was not required as these modalities are fundamentally different, while others proposed that such an aggregate term is needed as it simplifies reporting and system requirements. If an aggregate term was required, then it was proposed that a single standard term to describe the aggregate measure for cash and vouchers should be agreed upon to avoid confusion. This could be a new term that would more clearly denote that it captures both cash and vouchers (e.g. 'Cash and Voucher Programming'). In all cases it was agreed that – as per CaLP glossary, the term 'cash transfers' should be used to refer to unrestricted cash only and not vouchers.

---

<sup>12</sup> 3Ws refers to who does what where; 4Ws refers to who is doing what, when and where.

Conversations mainly covered the operationalisation of the agreed terminology. The issue of whether cash and vouchers should be jointly or separately measured and reported on was discussed. Many participants called strongly for cash and voucher programming to be disaggregated in reporting, while others considered that tracking them together would be simpler.

What level of detail may be necessary in the reporting of cash and vouchers (e.g. modality, conditionality, restrictiveness, sectors, transfer mechanisms), costs to be counted, the appropriate standards and platforms to track cash and vouchers at different levels (i.e. global, national, project) as well as the need to measure efficiency and effectiveness were also reflected upon.

Further, NGOs raised concerns about the risk of publishing sensitive information and incentives for reporting. It was clarified that exceptions and anonymization in publishing to IATI and FTS can help protect sensitive data. Lowering barriers to joining platforms and standards like IATI and FTS, and the related possibilities for reduced reporting requirements are aimed at providing incentives for reporting.

### ***Proposed Action Points***

The following next steps were proposed:

1. The GB Cash Workstream co-convenors will promote the CaLP Glossary, excluding the terms CTP/CBI that need agreement, to all GB Signatories, the GB Transparency Workstream, IATI, and FTS to ensure consistency in the use of this terminology;
2. CaLP through its Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will take up a review of the CaLP Glossary to address proposals expressed at the workshop on the terms CTP/CBI, a new services modality, and consideration of other sectors' changing programme approaches.
3. The GB Cash Workstream will facilitate agreement on the measurement of cash and voucher programming (i.e. disaggregated tracking of cash and voucher programming versus aggregated). A meeting could be organised in this regard.
4. The GB Cash Workstream will develop common value for money, efficiency and effectiveness metrics of cash and voucher programming on the basis of existing work.

### **Ways of Working and Next Steps**

The closing session looked at how the workstream will work together going forward and overall concrete next steps for the GB Cash Workstream. There was a recognition that the workstream's work needs to take into account participants' different levels of understanding and experience of cash and voucher programming. Appetite from donors was expressed for explicit guidance from the workstream to help move the cash and voucher programming agenda forward. There was also support for the GB Cash Workstream to facilitate further discussions on quality and programmatic issues in cash and voucher programming.

### ***Proposed Action Points***

The following actions were identified as next steps for the GB Cash Workstream:

1. The GB Cash Workstream co-convenors will share the list of participants, presentations and hand-outs with all participants.
2. The GB Cash Workstream co-convenors will share the GB Cash Workshop report and the workplan draft to enable taking work on key thematic areas raised during the workshop forward.

3. The GB Cash Workstream will also convene a shorter meeting towards the end of 2017 to take stock of progress on the work plan and deliver on some action points.

**Annex 1: GB Cash Workstream Workshop Agenda, 31<sup>st</sup> May – 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017**

**DFID-WFP WORKSHOP ON THE GRAND BARGAIN CASH WORKSTREAM  
31 May – 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017**

**Annotated Agenda**

**Venue:** WFP Headquarters, Rome

**Purpose of the workshop:**

- Share good practice, progress and opportunities in the use of humanitarian cash;
- Identify opportunities, barriers and concerns for the increased use of cash, and address them openly;
- Identify ways forward and how the GB cash workstream can support the delivery of GB cash commitments.

Time	Topic	Expected results
<b>WEDNESDAY 31 May</b>		
9h00-9h30	<b>Participants' arrival</b> Welcome coffee	
9h30-10h00	<b>Welcome and introduction</b> (30 min) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WFP (7 min) – Amir Abdulla – WFP Deputy Executive Director</li> <li>• DFID (7 min) - Terri Sarch - UK Ambassador and Permanent Representative in Rome</li> <li>• Introductions (10 min) – WFP</li> <li>• Administrative information (5 min) - WFP</li> </ul>	
10h00-10h30	<b>Unpacking the Grand Bargain commitments</b> (30 min) - DFID <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grand Bargain as a whole</li> <li>• Cash workstream and the 6 commitments</li> <li>• Link with other workstreams</li> <li>• The GB cash workstream: its role and workplan</li> </ul> <b>Questions &amp; Answers</b> (15 min) – WFP- DFID <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarifications on the commitments</li> </ul>	Setting the frame of the Workshop around the GB commitments  Clarifying the commitments
10h30-11h00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11h00-12h00	<b>Learning on scaling up cash, opportunities and challenges</b> – Facilitation Patrick Saez, DFID & Kenn Crossley, WFP.  <b>Panel on latest learning and evidence on delivering cash at scale with increased efficiency and effectiveness</b> (1 hour – 10 min presentations): <i>Leading questions for panellists: what does learning tells us about the main successes,</i>	Sharing latest knowledge, evidence and learning on scaling up cash, and reflecting potential implications / take aways for GB



Time	Topic	Expected results
	<p><i>opportunities, failures, challenges and risks, for scaling up cash? What does this tell us in terms of what GB signatories could do more / less? What does this tell us in terms of what the GB cash workstream could focus on?</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ODI case studies: learning on cash scale up (Wendy Fenton – HPN Coordinator ODI);</li> <li>2. The scale up of cash in the humanitarian response: HC/RC perspective (Paul Walker, UN HC/RC, UNDP Resident Representative Ukraine);</li> <li>3. The role of NGOs in cash scale up (Paula Gil Baizan – Cash Based Programming Director, World Vision International);</li> <li>4. The role of the Red Cross / Red Crescent Movement in cash scale up (Ines Dalmau –Cash &amp; Markets Readiness Specialist, BRC/RCM);</li> <li>5. Donor perspective on scaling up cash – Germany, Norway and Sweden.</li> </ol>	<p>signatories and GB workstream</p>
<p>12h00 – 12h45</p>	<p><b>Discussion</b> (45 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questions from participants to panellists</li> </ul>	<p>Discussing and understanding learning presented</p>
<p>12h45-13h45</p>	<p><i>Lunch</i></p>	
<p>13h45-14h30</p>	<p><b>The use of cash in the world (45 min)-</b> Facilitation DFID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall use of cash and trends, DI study, <i>Counting cash</i> (15 min presentation) – Development Initiatives;</li> <li>• GB independent report (7 min) – Gppi;</li> <li>• CaLP framework (7 min) – CaLP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q&amp;A and discussions</b> (15 min) - DFID</p>	<p>Providing the landscape on the use of cash within the humanitarian system, acknowledge progress from GB signatories</p>
<p>1430 – 15h30</p>	<p><b>Delivering the GB commitments:</b> key opportunities, and barriers, and implications on how we can support the scale up of cash (Facilitation: ODI)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Group work (30 min): Main opportunities, barriers and concerns to meet GB cash commitments</li> <li>• Group work (30 min): Reflecting on the panel arguments and discussions, how can we support the scale up of cash individually and collectively at sector level? What are the implications for the GB workstream and its workplan? (30 min)</li> </ul>	<p>Identifying main opportunities, barriers and concerns for participants; link with GB cash workstream workplan</p>

Time	Topic	Expected results
15h30-16h00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
16h00-16h40	<p><b>Delivering the GB commitments - Cont (40 min)</b> (Facilitation: ODI)</p> <p>Plenary feedback and discussion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Extracting key areas of opportunities and barriers;</li> <li>• Extracting areas of convergent interest and investment from participants;</li> <li>• Conclude what the implications for the GB cash workstream workplan are.</li> </ul>	Where convergence is observed, extract areas of focus for GB cash workstream
16h40-17h30	<p><b>Cash coordination – 50 min</b> Facilitation WFP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WB report, recommendations and IASC endorsement (15 min);</li> <li>• Presentation of CaLP / Gppi study findings (15 min): learning from different models and approaches (including zoom into the case of Ukraine), and where recommendations converge – CaLP &amp; Gppi.</li> </ul> <p><b>Questions &amp; Answers (20 min)</b></p>	Taking stock of WB/IASC recommendations and of learning, evidence and recommendations emerging from current practice
17h30-17h40	<b>Wrapping up the day (DFID-WFP)</b>	
17h45	<b>Reception at WFP</b>	
<b>THURSDAY 1 June</b>		
9h00-9h30	<p><b>Recapitulation (30 min) – WFP - DFID</b> Summary of the discussions of Day 1 (key opportunities and challenges / constraints; common areas of interest for scaling up cash and what GB cash workstream can include to support that)</p>	Summarising the main discussions of day 1
9h30-10h30	<p><b>Cash coordination - 1 hour</b> Facilitation WB.</p>	Identifying appetite for common principles

Time	Topic	Expected results
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Group work</b> (30 min): What core principles can we agree on? How can we individually and collectively promote and support cash coordination to happen in a more predictable and systematic way? How can the GB cash workstream support?</li> <li>• <b>Plenary feedback</b> (30 min): extracting areas of convergence and implications for GB cash workstream.</li> </ul>	Identifying recommended next steps and role that GB cash workstream could play
10h30-11h00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11h00-12h00	<p><b>Defining and addressing risks (1h)</b> Facilitation WFP.</p> <p>Humanitarian assistance, given the contexts in which it takes place, includes an element of risk taking and possibly that losses will be incurred. A common understanding and agreement on what are acceptable thresholds for risk/loss tolerance would facilitate expanded use of cash.</p> <p><b>Panel (30 min):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donor perspective: Jacqueline Birrer, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs FDFA, Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation SDC.</li> <li>• Agency perspective: Robert van der Zee, Deputy Director of Finance &amp; Treasury, WFP.</li> </ul> <p><b>Q&amp;A and plenary discussion</b> (30 min)</p>	Discussing approaches to risks
12h00-13h00	<i>Lunch</i>	
13h00-14h00	<p><b>Defining and addressing risks (1h)</b> Facilitation IRC.</p> <p><b>Group work</b> (30 min)</p> <p><b>Plenary</b> – reporting back from group work (30 min)</p>	
14h00-15h15	<p><b>Measuring cash</b> Facilitation DFID.</p> <p><b>Current practice (30 min)</b> -DI / FTS / CaLP</p> <p>Facilitation ECHO.</p> <p><b>Towards commonly agreed definitions and markers to track cash (30 min - group work)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agreeing key cash definitions (cash, vouchers, multi-purpose cash)</li> <li>• Recommending markers to measure cash volumes at system level</li> </ul>	<p>Taking stock of current practice</p> <p>Exploring possibility to agree on common definitions of cash, markers to measure cash and cost efficiency</p> <p>Identifying next steps</p>

Time	Topic	Expected results
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reflecting on next steps and action points to reach systematic, reliable and comparable tracking of cash at system level and across organisations</li> </ul>	
15h15-15h45	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15h45-16h30	<p><b>Cont – Group work (30 min)</b></p> <p><b>Plenary (30 min) – Extracting areas of convergence and agreement</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>can we agree on common cash definitions?</li> <li>can we agree on markers to measure cash volumes at system level?</li> <li>What shall the next steps be to reach systematic, reliable and comparable tracking of cash at system level and across organisations; and how can the GB cash workstream contribute?</li> </ul>	<p>Assess appetite for common definitions / markers and what steps can be undertaken by the GB cash workstream and key players to facilitate systematic, reliable and comparable tracking of cash at system level and across organisations</p>
16h30-17:00	<p><b>Closure and next steps (30 min) – DFID &amp; WFP</b></p> <p>Ways forward – based on the 2 days discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What can the GB cash workstream focus on to support signatories in delivering commitments and addressing challenges / concerns? Update GB cash workstream priorities / workplan; including link with other workstreams</li> <li>Quick consultation on ways of working for the GB cash workstream</li> <li>Tour de table: What are key take aways?</li> </ul>	<p>Finalise and endorse the workplan, agree on next steps, address outstanding issues</p>

**Annex 2: List of agencies participating in the GB Cash Workstream Workshop, 31<sup>st</sup> May – 1<sup>st</sup> June 2017**

<b>Agencies</b>
Action Against Hunger
Australian Department for Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)
British Red Cross
Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
Christian Aid
Delegation of the European to the Holy See, to the Order of Malta, to the United National Organisations in Rome and to the Republic of San Marino
Development Initiatives (DI)
Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO)
Embassy of Belgium in Rome, Italy
Embassy of Denmark in Rome
Embassy of Japan in Rome, Italy
Embassy of Spain in Rome, Italy
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)
German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO)
Global Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCM) Cluster
Global Food Security Cluster (gFSC)
Global Health Cluster (GHC)
Global Protection Cluster (GPC)
Global Public Policy Institute (GPPi)
Global Shelter Cluster (GSC)
InterAction
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)
Italian Agency for Development Cooperation
Luxembourg Permanent Representation to the UN in Rome
Mercy Corps
Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
Overseas Development Institute (ODI)
Oxfam
Permanent Mission of Norway to the UN in Geneva
Save the Children
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)
United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID)
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
United Nations (UN) Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs) Financial Tracking

Service (OCHA FTS)
United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)
United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)
United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women)
United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)
United States Agency for International Development (USAID)
World Bank (WB)
World Food Programme (WFP)
World Vision International

**Annex 3: GB Cash Workstream Workplan – Draft Action Points**

Theme	Action Point	
<b>1. The Current Use of Cash &amp; Scaling Up</b>	1.1	Collective donor efforts: develop and test a common donor approach and programme in a country; consider host Government involvement.
	1.2	Measuring outcomes: develop a paper with options of markers to measure outcomes and share with signatories, working with Global Cluster Coordinators' Group (GCCG).
	1.3	Communication: develop and share messages for public audience and decision makers.
	1.4	Ensure coherence and synergy with other workstreams and key initiatives: the co-conveners, UK and WFP, will work with co-conveners of other relevant workstreams to integrate recommendations from this workshop, and report back to the cash workstream (e.g. needs assessment workstream on joint response analysis; localisation workstream on capacity and preparedness).
	1.5	Capacity and preparedness: map gaps in capacity and propose priority actions for the GB cash workstream.
	1.6	Basic Needs Approach: develop a paper on the links between the basic needs approach, multi-purpose cash (MPC), and sectoral cash with input from cash workstream members.
	1.7	Membership of GB cash workstream: global clusters and specialist agencies (e.g. ODI, GPPI, DI, Groundtruth, etc.) should be invited to contribute to the workstream.
<b>2. Cash Coordination</b>	2.1	The GB Cash Workstream to share mapping of ongoing work on cash coordination (not voted on, but consensually considered a pre-condition for other work);
	2.2	The GB Cash Workstream co-conveners to ask IASC to include cash coordination in Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) ToR and Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) TOR; HCs are to hold accountability for the timely activation of Cash Working Groups (CWGs). The GB Cash Workstream could work on draft ToR (22 votes);
	2.3	The GB Cash Workstream to ask IASC to clarify where cash coordination fits in the formal humanitarian system (including the link to the HCT) and translate recommendations from the WB Strategic Note and GPPI study into actions (19 votes);
	2.4	The GCCG cash task team to produce a mapping of all cash coordination structures (within IASC structures) at the global level; Global Cash Working Group (GCWG) to ensure that all cash coordination structures (outside IASC structures) at the global level are also mapped (16 votes);
	2.5	Donors to fund and incentivise cluster and inter-cluster cash coordination. Emphasis will be placed on ensuring predictable capacity for CWG and on cash preparedness. (11 votes);
	2.6	The GCCG cash task team to ensure training and capacity is provided for clusters, at the inter-cluster level and to HCs (11 votes);
	2.7	The GB Cash Workstream to produce guidance for structuring cash coordination options in the field for HCTs and UN Country Teams (UNCTs) building on existing mechanisms and evidence (8 votes);

	2.8	Global data sharing agreements to be put into place for sudden onset emergencies (including information on assessments, markets, response options analysis). How this is to be done needs to be further defined. (0 votes)
<b>3. Risk</b>	3.1	WFP will facilitate a working group on risks involved with cash and voucher programming (e.g. including building a common understanding of acceptable risk thresholds with donors and other stakeholders).
<b>4. Measuring Cash</b>	4.1	The GB Cash Workstream co-convenors will promote the CaLP Glossary, excluding the terms CTP/CBI that need agreement, to all GB Signatories, the GB Transparency Workstream, IATI, and FTS to ensure consistency in the use of this terminology;
	4.2	CaLP through its Technical Advisory Group (TAG) will take up a review of the CaLP Glossary to address proposals expressed at the workshop on the terms CTP/CBI, a new services modality, and consideration of other sectors' changing programme approaches.
	4.3	The GB Cash Workstream will facilitate agreement on the measurement of cash and voucher programming (i.e. disaggregated tracking of cash and voucher programming versus aggregated). A meeting could be organised in this regard.
	4.4	The GB Cash Workstream will develop common value for money, efficiency and effectiveness metrics of cash and voucher programming on the basis of existing work.
<b>5. Ways of Working &amp; Next Steps</b>	5.1	The GB Cash Workstream co-convenors will share the list of participants, presentations and hand-outs with all participants.
	5.2	The GB Cash Workstream co-convenors will the GB Cash Workshop report and the workplan draft to enable taking work on key thematic areas raised during the workshop forward.
	5.3	The GB Cash Workstream will also convene a shorter meeting towards the end of 2017 to take stock of progress on the work plan and deliver on some action points.