CPWG 17-19 June 2019 Meeting

Participants:

**CPWG members:** Orhan Hacimehmet (TRC), Lisbet Elvakjaer (Danish Red Cross), Klug Wolfgang (Austrian Red Cross), Emma Delo (British Red Cross), Moore Anne Katherine (Swiss Red Cross), Mareike Tobiassen (German Red Cross), Marianna Kuttothara (American Red Cross), Jo Burton (ICRC), Caroline Holt (IFRC), Wilma Heege ter (The Netherlands RC) and Shirin Narymbaeva (IFRC).

**Technical WG members:** Bilal Hussain Shah (IFRC), Joseph Oliveros (IFRC), Jennifer Harper (British Red Cross), Raquel Bernedo Pardal (Spanish Red Cross), Lisa Williams (American Red Cross).

Excused: Adriana Estrada (Spanish Red Cross), Fredrick M. Orimba (Kenyan Red Cross)

**Introduction, review of the agenda**

The CPWG meeting began with the review of the agenda.

**Activation of the Advocacy Technical Working Group**

There was an Advocacy WG before lead by Swiss RC, Canadian RC and ICRC. It was decided that the advocacy work should be paused until the Movement Cash Strategic Framework was finalised. Now that the Strategic Framework has been finalised and endorsed by the CPWG, the Cash AG and the IFRC Governing Board, it is time for this group to be re-activated. As the Strategic Framework is being contextualised through regional workshops, the need to develop common advocacy positions and materials have been highlighted. Some work is underway by the IFRC Regional Asia Pacific Communications team and it was agreed that such work needs to be better steered by the CPWG to ensure consistent messaging on cash across all components of the Movement. The advocacy WG will be chaired by the IFRC and ICRC and has set itself a deadline of the end of July to start to develop an advocacy plan and initial materials for review and endorsement by the CPWG.

**Comments:**

- Key areas to advocate on: tackling common myths around cash. How to engage with governments and NS senior leadership effectively to engage with and integrate the ability to do cash. The messages need to be practical and clear.
- The draft Advocacy messages will be validated by the CPWG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action points:</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IFRC, ICRC and Swiss RC representatives are to meet and brainstorm the scope, stakeholders and areas of messaging and develop a logical framework. An initial plan and the start of simple messages to be finalised by end of July with the final materials by the end of September.</td>
<td>CH, AK and JB</td>
<td>July 2019&lt;br&gt;Septemb er 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Resourcing of the global structures**

The Global Cash Lead presented the IFRC team structures in 2017 and at present emphasizing that there have been positive changes in terms of structure. The Global Cash Lead’s position is covered by the core funding which demonstrates the IFRC’s commitment to supporting cash as a strategic priority. The other positions have been supported by the CPWG members. However, many of the positions that are resourced are coming to an end both in Geneva and regions. A consortium
approach is needed to fund these IFRC positions. It is increasingly difficult for NSs to support 100% positions. This could be facilitated via agreed templates, agreements and standards.

The IFRC Global Cash Lead invited the CPWG to think about what is needed and what were the ambitions of the strategy. At the moment, the coordinators are responsible for strategic developments related to cash, NS Preparedness and IFRC operations. National Society Preparedness is a big piece of work, making the workload challenging.

Each NS then presented an outline of their current and upcoming plans for cash.

**Discussion:** What should be the next steps? Do we look at a consortium approach? Do we look at coordination as part of another role? Cash Preparedness work has a clear target of supporting 50 NSs in cash preparedness. 27 are engaged at the moment.

- IFRC and ICRC are signatories to the Grand Bargain and have made a commitment to scale up the use of cash on behalf of the Movement without specifying a target.
- In cases when coordination and NS preparedness functions were split, it seems to work well. Could this be the model: Coordination under the Federation mandate with technical support functions?
- Regional workshops that took place almost in every region have all highlighted a need for a regional cash WG. Would this be a mechanism via which partners engage?
- There seems to be an agreement on a Consortium model towards NS preparedness, similar to the cluster approach by pooling resources between partners. One way to move this forward would be to identify partnerships. Based on where NSs are targeting these countries could be bundled together. NSs without cash focal points will be able to profit from those that do have them.

**Cash and Logistics**
Claire Durhan presented the logistics RoadMap – 2018 and 2019. Key messages of the session were:

- There is a role for logistics to play beyond just the procurement.
- There is an advocacy role around the benefits of logistics being involved.
- On the ground, being collaborative and involving logistics early.
- Input needed for final versions to use for training.

Cash for support services training was originally created as an ICRC training and was then broadened out to combine with CalP training. This year the training continued to be rolled out, focusing work on trying to understand capacity and looking at quality control around vouchers.

6 regional trainings planned for this year. The training presentations will be available in English, French and Arabic. There was also already a light ToT training.

The procurement manual and cash SoPs were updated with an aim to make templates on cash and vouchers be user friendly. This can also fit into the Cash in Emergencies toolkit.

**Cash Preparedness TWG update to be led by Bilal**
Sessions on cash preparedness within this meeting discussed further this topic and are reflected in this report.

**DAY 2**

**Data Management/IM Technical WG update to be led by Lisa and Joseph**
The WG presented on their workstreams and advancements achieved so far.
Cash Data Management - Red Rose

- Global Framework agreement with the Red Rose is available to any NS, only a supplementary agreement needs to be signed, transferring everything that has been agreed on to a new signatory. The Federation continues to re-negotiate the rates.
- Data is owned by NSs and/or IFRC depending whether it is a DREF or not.
- As a result of the pilot in Pakistan, Red Rose is being institutionalized. This also led to Pakistan RC receiving a Global Fund project because Pakistan RC was able to demonstrate data quality.
- If an NS builds its own platform, follow up support is not there – it can affect delivery.
- The British RC has also recognised that data management is a fundamental pre-requisite to good programming that can use cash with speed and predictability. BRC is supporting the IFRC to implement RedRose.
- Cost benefit analysis is being done by LRC based on their own experience with an aim to adopt Red Rose as a data management system.
- Red Rose should also proactively engage with NSs as potential clients.
- There needs to be a broader discussion on integration with relief especially at the management level.

Counting Cash Calendar 2018

The figures for 2018 are not yet final – ICRC data are missing, and the existing data needs to be cleaned further.

The process has been slightly different thanks to the IFRC Cash Regional Focal Points who facilitated the process, leveraging their relations with NSs with help from Cash IM as well.

Comments:

- Looking into the future, domestic and international data needs to be collected separately. These figures will help position the RC Movement, emphasizing NSs as local actors which deliver a significant share of cash-based interventions. Collecting internal numbers is also important because when the ESSN programme of the Turkish Red Crescent will stop, there will be a significant decrease of the current numbers, in which case domestic numbers can be used to compensate for the drop.
- The data metric on cash planned is being collected not with the intention to compare with cash expended, but due to the financial set up of some of the reporting agencies. For IFRC, the principal problem is that cash expenditure data sums data for multiple years.
- It is being reported that 1 billion was delivered by the Movement, because 23% overhead was included uniformly to all reported data across organizations. This decision should also be aligned with the discussions taking place at the Grand Bargain.
- Would it be possible to look at the value of stocks agencies procure, to be able to compare the financial costs across modalities (in kind, cash)? AK Moore is to explore the feasibility of this study.
- Austrian Red Cross prefers to know the data points in advance so that branches and HQ can start collecting as they implement, instead of collecting it retrospectively.
- Education sector was not listed as a sector in one of the dropdowns.

Challenges and Next Steps:
- The data collection channels are based on personal relationships. What is the mandate of the CPWG IM Working Group to formalize the process? Could methods like movement-wide notifications be used?

Answer: The message on data collection is being shared. 5 of the 6 regional workshops have taken place. Directors’ meeting and the upcoming work on Advocacy are also avenues that can be used.

There is a lot of information at the level of the CPWG, but it does not always get disseminated equally to the NS level. Cash Hub can be used as a repository and it has a newsletter functionality. Federation communication channels can become formal. NSs that have a lot of cash activities such as those in the Gulf States need to be targeted more specifically.

- Regional Cash FPs are in great positions to collect the data but there is more and more work around this. Remote support was made available, but it did not really work. Possibilities of secondment from PNS to support FPs should be explored.

- The timeline for data collection is linked to the Grand Bargain deadlines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action points:</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Movement partners column to be removed.</td>
<td>IM WG</td>
<td>for 2019 data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing National Society column to be renamed to Implementing Organization.</td>
<td>IM WG</td>
<td>for 2019 data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cash Planned column to be removed. Reporting agencies that cannot report the cash expended, which is the preferred data metric, can resort to reporting “the cash planned” in the column of cash expended. This point will need to be explained in the guidance. In cases when planned numbers are being used for analysis and visualization, the margin of error in relation to how much is usually expended needs to be reported as well.</td>
<td>IM WG</td>
<td>for 2019 data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditionality will not be collected; restriction will be tracked via the mechanism (voucher or cash). Visualization needs to compare vouchers to cash. The visualization will allow toggling between 2017 and 2018, showing changes over time.</td>
<td>IM WG</td>
<td>for 2019 data collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WG will be conducting de-briefing sessions with the IFRC focal points to collect feedback on the process and streamline it further. One of the suggestions was putting more emphasis on making sure that cash surge delegates deploy with an understanding of the data collection requirements.</td>
<td>IM WG</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review period of one week is to be allocated before the data is published on the Cash hub in July also to capture any missing data.</td>
<td>IM WG</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A visualization that unites preparedness data and Counting Cash results is needed.

**Cash Preparedness Session**

The aim of the session was to agree on what needs to be done based on the global evaluation learning on preparedness. The recommendations of the evaluation were summarized at the beginning of the session. There was a discussion across the CPWG as to the next steps. It was agreed that the learning from the evaluation and in light of the Movement target on cash readiness (50 NS continually investing in cash readiness by 2020), it would be most useful to update the cash preparedness guidance in 2019. This would mean a simplification of the current guidance incorporating the learning and providing more concrete guidance for NS on what would be required to move between and up the levels of cash readiness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action points:</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Draft ToR to update the Cash Preparedness Guidance and movement approach based on learning gathered to date. BRC to draft ToR and share with the CPWG for input and review. BRC will manage the process with key stages for CPWG engagement. Also if possible to update the cash preparedness tools to follow the updated guidance.</td>
<td>BRC</td>
<td>by the end of mid July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop a full concept note on the collaborative approach to up-scaling cash preparedness efforts in targeted regions.</td>
<td>AKM, CH.</td>
<td>by end of August.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each CPWG is to apply the tool to each of their own and partner agencies, document the process and make note of the assumptions. This will feed the guidance development.</td>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Day 3**

**Training Technical WG update**

**Discussion/comments:**

- Where are the PECT resources located online, how to best centralise them, how to ensure everything is up to date and available to the right people? Currently being worked on, there needs to be a degree of automation.
  It be good to link trainings and learning to levels of preparedness. If an NS wants to achieve Level 2, then these are the trainings you need to take.

- We have a 30 percent completion on the moodle and its expensive. What can we do creatively to make sure it’s better? Charge for registration? Need to evaluate and change learning methodologies.

- How do we make the trainings relevant across sectors? Most of this training is around livelihoods and food security. We need to actively include colleagues from other sectors. For example, WASH have specific messages regarding cash.

- The modules on global issues used for advocacy need to be more explicit and categorized by audience profiles and levels.
- The WG should align with the competency framework that is being developed as part of surge optimization.
- The working group will send out a survey by email based on the feedback received.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action points:</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Updating the modular package and the competency framework is a priority. Does the WG have enough resources to do all this by the end of 2019? Updating the competency framework is the first step that will inform the modules.</td>
<td>Training WG</td>
<td>by end of 2019?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WG will soon reach out with a plan in place and rough ToR for consultancy work. A training consultant should be booked for November/December. The WG to provide estimates on the budget required.</td>
<td>Training WG</td>
<td>November/December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The cash materials and competencies need to proportionally cover across the sectors and support services.</td>
<td>Training WG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Updates from the CPWG chairs**

The CPWG chairs shared updates on the ESSN proposal, a meeting on Social Protection, and the position of the Movement on the Common Cash System. On the Common Cash System, the chairs requested to spread the news and ask partners on the ground to engage in the discussion.

**The CPWF Membership**

Two NSs expressed interest to join the CPWG: Ethiopian RC and Lebanese RC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action points:</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CPWG members to encourage their partners to look at the membership pack and solicit interest.</td>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>continuous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By mid-August the CPWG is to respond to the applications.</td>
<td>CPWG</td>
<td>mid-August 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>