**Grand Bargain Sub-Group on Linking Humanitarian Cash and Social Protection - Notes from member consultations on the 2020/21 workplan (21 and 22 July)**

This workshop was part of the Grand Bargain Cash workstream webinar week and was conducted back to back in two time zones to facilitate inclusion of participants from all parts of the world. The purpose of the workshop was to collectively review and finalise the GB sub-group workplan for 2020/21. The recordings for both sessions can be accessed [here](https://eur02.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fdrive.google.com%2Fdrive%2Ffolders%2F1lD0XPXbk0byTOTEQ1_5eFesxYWPlQ2S7%3Fusp%3Dsharing&data=02%7C01%7CS-Brett%40dfid.gov.uk%7C17a81362b8ee4c866da308d8352cc508%7Ccdf709af1a184c74bd936d14a64d73b3%7C0%7C0%7C637317813844699048&sdata=Ky1TYEPeeZVAwMHcQl%2Bh%2Fp%2FNAFHqFrlePKA3DOlXy1Y%3D&reserved=0).

1. Workplan development process
	1. Gaby Smith and Emma Jowett introduced the draft workplan, as well as the consultation and review process led over the past months to design this proposed workplan. All sub-group members were invited to contribute to this process. Please refer to the attached Powerpoint slides and ‘notes’ tab of the draft workplan (shared prior to the meeting and attached again) for further details. The draft excel workplan was shared with sub-group members before this workshop and is the outcome of these consultations.
	2. The group was invited to provide feedback and ask questions regarding the workplan revision as well as on the key outputs, whether there was anything missing or anything that should be removed or ‘parked’ and ‘shelved’. Key comments included:
		* The emphasis from co-leads on the group being a place for members to share different experiences and perspectives, with a view to identifying common directions. While full alignment on positions might be challenging given the breadth and diversity of organizations and perspectives involved, finding shared priorities to work towards together (such as the one-pager put out for COVID-19) is the aim of activities proposed in the workplan.
		* Members are of course invited to contribute to conversations on the group’s future direction, and some suggested specifically mapping areas where we think linkages between humanitarian cash and social protection are or are not appropriate.
2. Implementation of the prior (2019/20) workplan
	1. The group was invited to report on progress regarding activities listed in the workplan.
	2. CaLP confirmed that revisions to their training materials (activity 5.2) are funded and going ahead.
3. Some new activities proposed in the revised 2020/21 workplan were presented and discussed.
	1. Activity 0 – sub-group coordination: No members objected to UNICEF taking on the funding of and responsibility for sub-group coordination after the current DFID funding ends in November 2020.
	2. Engagement area 3 – Knowledge Management and Learning (KML):
		* Zehra Rizvi (who previously facilitated the KML activities for the sub-group) (and Emily Henderson at the 2nd session) presented regarding member consultations that Zehra and Isabelle Pelly led and which formed the basis for the KML action plan (see attached Powerpoint slides and discussion note on KML). They also presented the progress made on this until June 2020. The KML action plan developed through these consultations is included in the overall sub-group workplan proposed for 2020/21. Many KML activities were initiated over the past months, and are being taken forward by Lois Austin since July 2020. Some of the originally planned KML activities were adjusted and increased following COVID-19, with an emphasis on key relevant issues: leadership and coordination, joint funding, the need for humanitarian and development actors to understand one another.
		* The group’s questions and comments on this workplan component were invited.
			+ A key question emerged regarding whether learning products are reaching practitioners on the ground as anticipated, including government partners (who could be targeted more directly by this KML work).
			+ Another was raised regarding the group’s emphasis on humanitarian practitioners vs more systemic social protection/government actors as key audiences – with co-leads clarifying that humanitarian practitioners were viewed as a primary ‘entry point’ audience to test products and approaches before potentially expanding to a broader range of actors down the line.
		* Zehra asked the group a few rapid fire questions regarding members’ use of, perspective regarding and dissemination of KML products to date. Concrete, practical evidence, mapping and sharing information in multiple forms was appreciated, with a suggestion to also capture governments’ perspectives/cases more proactively. Turning KML products into bite-sized chunks (short videos), focusing on concrete country-level examples and (where possible) translating all seem effective to disseminate knowledge at field level. There is also a demand for capacity building from members.
	3. Activity 3.5 – case studies:
		* Lois Austin (new KML Consultant for the sub-group) (and Carla Lacerda at the 2nd session) updated on the progress so far and envisaged focus and methodology for the case studies (see slides for details), with a view to capturing tangible studies tangible studies and practical examples on different aspects of those linkages between humanitarian cash and social protection (e.g. targeting, delivery mechanisms. complaints mechanisms etc) to move away from theoretical nature of some of these prior discussions. Volunteers are sought to co-lead each of the five case studies, which involves helping to develop the Key Informant Interview list, to source and undertake the document review, to conduct the interviews and to draft the content (5-8 pages) ideally from multiple countries and regions on each case study – all with support from Lois. A synthesis note with recommendations for future action will then be drawn up building on the case studies. **Members interested in co-leading or contributing to a case study are invited to contact** **Lois** **to express interest by the end of Friday 31 July**. The aim is to complete all case studies and the synthesis note by the end of November 2020.
		* Members’ comments or questions on the proposed process and thematic areas of focus were invited.
			+ There was interest in capturing experiences in different types of contexts where members are trying to make these links, including fragile contexts. Others suggested ensuring that the selection of case studies captured the different stages and capacities of social protection systems in different contexts (nascent, established, etc.). Budgeting (and data sharing/protection?) was identified as a potential gap in the case study topics.
			+ There was a suggestion to try to harmonize case study outlines/structure so future case studies done by sub-group members could also be comparable in terms of coherence and learning, which might benefit uptake by practitioners.
			+ Lois welcomes other comments or suggestions by email in the next week, and the format for proposed case studies will be shared ahead of the next bi-weekly sub-group KML meeting for discussion.
4. Workplan approval
	1. The draft workplan was proposed to members for approval and endorsement.
		* No members felt activities were missing from the current draft workplan.
		* No members felt activities currently in the draft workplan should be removed or delayed to future years.
	2. There were questions around the proposed new influencing (activity 4.2) and coordination (activity 2.2) activities and their specific contents and purpose, which co-leads proposed to discuss and flesh-out in detail with sub-group members in future meetings or webinars.
		* On 2.2, co-leads clarified that this is proposed in response to the fact that technical-level coordination (activity 2.1) is unlikely to be sufficient to address alone coordination issues between humanitarian cash and social protection. There was a discussion regarding proposed strategic-level engagement, which could be focused at country and/or global level. OCHA confirmed that formal guidance to HCTs requires approval by the IASC, which can be a lengthy and complex process. OCHA is happy to contribute to leading both activities 2.1 and 2.2 to see how far the sub-group can realistically go, building on the technical guidance and informal tipsheets developed by members to date, and sub-group members interested in contributing to this activity are welcome to reach out to Juliet Lang at OCHA. Other avenues to influence (outside the IASC) include broader guidance regarding response planning. Members agreed on the need for these activities and to explore various possible tracks and avenues to move this issue forward, including options to sequence engagement between the various levels as well as to develop technical recommendations to HCTs in parallel to work on more formal guidance via the IASC. The workplan will be revised accordingly to reflect this agreement.
	3. The **deadline to submit final comments to** **Gaby** **on the draft workplan was set for close of business on 31 July 2020**.
		* After this, co-leads will finalize the workplan based on comments received and shared in the workshop.
5. Members were invited to co-lead activities in the workplan.
	1. CaLP confirmed having started work at regional level as well as with OCHA and UNICEF outside of the GB-sub group on supporting better coordination between Cash WG and social protection actors. CaLP will confirm with sub-group co-leads whether they are willing to contribute to leading activity 2.1.
	2. Members agreed on the value of activity 3.7 (maintaining a roster), though CashCap have yet to confirm their willingness to lead this activity, which will require bilateral discussions with co-leads. There was a question regarding the value of creating a specific competency framework for linking SP and HCT as part of this activity.
	3. Members agreed on the value of activity 3.8 (sub-group meetings), perhaps shifting from webinars to workshops to ensure interactivity. Members suggested broadening membership to these meetings to invite more country-level colleagues (SPWG and CWG leads) and promote cross-country/peer learning.
	4. Members saw activity 4.2 (advocacy) as a worthwhile activity, though some wanted to ensure that sub-group advocacy captured the diversity of perspectives and views of the membership, to ensure humanitarian principles and other perspectives were weighed appropriately. This will be discussed further and unpacked in future sub-group meetings.
	5. On activity 1.1 (mapping), there were questions regarding the complementarity of the proposed and other existing mappings (for instance by the World Bank). Co-leads and CaLP clarified the complementarity given the focus on conflict and fragile states and capturing of both SP and HCT programmes which the WB has confirmed they are not doing. A discussion is needed to clarify whether CaLP or the GB SG KML consultant will lead on this work.
	6. CaLP is consulting internally and will confirm shortly whether they are able to lead on activity 5.2 (refreshing/developing trainings).