

## **Consolidated Feedback by INGOs on Avenir Analytics Report on ‘Optimal Operational Set-up for Multi-Actor Provision of Unconditional Cash Grants to Syrian Refugees in Lebanon’**

May 2014

The feedback below represents the consolidated position of INGOs in the core group of the Cash Working Group. This feedback is based on the understanding that this report is an external perspective about an existing system, and is therefore an independent exercise. An endorsement of the recommendations (with the reservations expressed below) does not reflect any commitment from agencies to adopt or adhere to these recommendations. The development of SOPs and the action to operationalize these recommendations must be individual and adaptive and were not intended to be included in a report of this scope.

Acknowledging the caveats expressed above, the Cash Working Group operational task team (responsible for commissioning this report) have confirmed that the report corresponds to the scope of work outlined in the ToR and accordingly formally accepted the report.

RECOMMENDATION	CWG Core group consolidated feedback	Responsibility
<b><i>Recommendation one — Targeting</i></b> Agencies agree to use VaSyr findings and recommendation of the Targeting Task Force on targeting criteria <sup>16</sup> . Agencies working with unregistered refugees develop a system that mirrors proGres and one that can be shared. It is recommended that this is done through the use of volunteer technology networks <sup>17</sup> . Those working with registered but excluded refugees should still use proGres number for tracking and RAIS for inputting assistance given. UNHCR becomes service provider for eligibility lists. Data sharing agreements must include data sharing both ways and a clause stipulating any assistance provided must be	<b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> that a common methodology for targeting is required for cash assistance (Critical)</li> <li>- <u>Disagree</u> with the recommendation to use VASyR 2014 as the basis of targeting approach</li> <li>- <u>Agreement</u> to adopt the recommendations of the Targeting Task Force for a common targeting approach.</li> <li>- <u>Agree</u> that a ‘mirror’ methodology should be used for unregistered refugees</li> <li>- Additionally targeting applied to new arrivals should use same methodology as</li> </ul>	

<p>entered into RAIS.</p>	<p>targeting for registered refugees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agreement</u> that the database for unregistered households will need to have compatible architecture for data communication with proGres (in addition to any other relevant information)</li> <li>- <u>Agreement</u> in principle that UNHCR could be service provider for eligibility lists provided</li> </ul> <p><b>RECOMMEND/ACTION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recommend same targeting for cash and food (with proportional packages of both modalities for different tiers)</li> <li>2. Develop system for regular updating of eligibility lists (to allow systematic inclusion of new beneficiaries and exclusion of existing beneficiaries) or fast track inclusion of highly vulnerable households</li> <li>3. TTF provide open rationale of vulnerability tiers (low, mild, moderate and severe) and on the methodology to quantify respective population sections; (this should be independent from funding considerations).</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Targeting Task Force (TTF) steering committee</b></p> <p><b>2. UNHCR &amp; WFP (including household visits for inclusion)</b></p> <p><b>3. Targeting Task Force (TTF)</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation two — Data management</b> Use WFP as a service provider with cost recovery for card management. Include specific data sharing clauses in IP agreements and any OPs who also use the system. Data</p>	<p><b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> that one-card system is optimal and that CSC card costs can be sunk, but need to address issue of coordination between WFP &amp; UNHCR on generation</li> </ul>	

<p>sharing agreements should stipulate that agencies need to share data that can feed into RAIS in order to keep records updated. All agencies engaging in CTP hire data managers and develop internal guidelines for adherence to CaLP data privacy standards.</p>	<p>of service lists on basis of eligibility lists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> that a centralized data base should be used for economic index information in addition to the proGres database</li> </ul> <p><b>ENSURE:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. UNHCR must sign data sharing agreements with all partners (both IP and OP) as part of their role as service provider for eligibility lists.</li> <li>2. Clear understanding of all partners about the coordination between WfP and UNHCR on the generation of service lists on the basis of eligibility lists.</li> </ol> <p><b>RECOMMEND/ACTION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clarity on how other forms of cash assistance could be loaded on WFP cards and whether additional cards could be provided to different caseloads</li> <li>2. Data systems must be reviewed within frame of possible limitations of RAIS/proGres – Activity Info?</li> <li>3. Recommendation to follow M&amp;E task team’s recommendation regarding centralised data management system (e.g. analysis) &amp; recommendation to engage IM staff to provide guidance about systems that would have the capacity to house this data (Operational Task Team with linkages to M&amp;E team) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Suggestion for Executive Team to house the data analysis person/system</li> <li>o Note that system should clarify</li> </ul> </li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Tripartite agreement (UNHCR/WFP/IPs) for IPs to be led on by UNHCR; Senior cash adviser to develop adaptation for Ops</b></p> <p><b>2. Senior cash adviser through SOPs for IPs and Ops</b></p> <p><b>1. Senior cash adviser (operational review)</b></p> <p><b>2. Senior cash adviser &amp; operational task team</b></p> <p><b>3. M&amp;E task team &amp; senior cash adviser</b></p>
---	--	--

	<p>the information flow from agencies to the centralised point – linked to the M&amp;E recommendations of standard tools and processes and the role of agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Recommendation to gain early understanding of implementation and reporting requirements to maximize the functionality of this system.</li> </ul> <p>4. Recommend to keep CSC cards for cash transfers for anything that is not unconditional (i.e. livelihoods activities &amp; cash for rehabilitation) and for unregistered (as funding is likely to significantly reduce by the end of 2014 so not worth investing in a new system)</p> <p>5. Re-evaluation of best choice delivery mechanism for one-off payments (i.e. casual labour) as CSC &amp; BLF too costly</p>	<p><b>4. Cash coordinator to communicate to other sector WGs</b></p> <p><b>5. Individual NGOs</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation three — Monitoring</b></p> <p>Simplify monitoring to three streams: Process18. Programme19. Protection. Each level of monitoring should have a responsible agency: Process monitoring to one IP in a geographical area. Programme and protection can be combined to another IP in each geographical area. Monitoring should have a clear purpose in how the data will be analyzed and used20. Develop survey forms that can be</p>	<p><b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> to apply recommendations from report to the work of the CWG M&amp;E task team</li> <li>- <u>Disagree</u> on the recommendation to split monitoring functions into three separate themes</li> </ul> <p><b>ENSURE:</b></p> <p>1. Ensure a coordinated regional monitoring structure (national</p>	<p><b>1. Operational task team (using existing field level coordination mechanisms)</b></p>

<p>used with ODK or other systems that are RAIS compliant and can be bulk uploaded automatically.</p>	<p>considered too broad)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monitoring systems for UCT are linked closely with broader protection monitoring for inclusion/exclusion purposes</li> </ol> <p><b>RECOMMEND/ACTION</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommendation that process &amp; programme monitoring is conducted by the same agency; with protection monitoring conducted through existing protection IPs</li> <li>Recommend that work is started to develop a proposed structure at regional level about process/programme</li> <li>Develop a better understanding of how UCP protection indicators and broader protection monitoring (undertaken as standard) will link together.</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Senior cash adviser (operational review) in coordination with M&amp;E task team</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation four — Programme design</b> Set standards on what constitutes delivery of quality CTP programming. Decide on clear objectives for an unconditional cash transfer programme such as provision of monthly unconditional cash transfers to registered vulnerable Syrian refugees in Lebanon as a contribution to meeting MEB costs. Based on the objectives, develop a project plan with indicators for progress and quality. Decide on number of refugees to be assisted. Designate an overseeing body that is empowered to assess quality of UCT programme and make decisions on changes. The overseeing body should be comprised of UNHCR, WFP and the IPs involved. The steering group members</p>	<p><b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> that formalization of CWG task teams (into Executive team) is key to a harmonised programme design; project plan; and budget (linked to RRP6)</li> <li>- <u>Agree</u> on proposed planning team and executive team function</li> <li>- <u>Disagree</u> with recommendation to limit this to only IPs. <u>Agree</u> instead to ensure that planning team includes OPs, possibly joined by MoSA representative and welfare ‘expert’</li> </ul> <p><b>ENSURE:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A clear outline system for channeling funding centrally</li> <li>Formalisation of TOR and membership</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. INGOs &amp; senior cash adviser</b></p> <p><b>2. Carla Lacerda (CaLP)</b></p>

must be authorized to make and act on decisions for changes needed. CWG should advocate for standards on quality of delivery of other CTP by peer agencies (inclusive of unregistered refugees).

criteria in coordination with LHIF

**RECOMMEND/DO**

1. Planning team
  - a. LHIF to recommend NGOs / define criteria
  - b. MOSA participation (but with no veto)
  - c. Chaired by senior cash adviser
  - d. Not Chatham house rules / needs to be accountable to broader group
  - e. Establish clear accountability link with a note that using a single person in a time of high turnover (e.g. the WG Chair) might not be optimal
  - f. Need funding mechanism for cash
2. Executive team
  - a. How to get agency engagement & staffing commitment without overview of budget
  - b. Consider consortium with central budget / technical advisors to be seconded to UNHCR
  - c. Provide a clear linkage to sector decision making mechanisms
3. Recommend early discussions with donors to ensure buy in of the above model and possible financial considerations.
4. Review existing consortium models and understanding for this context.

### 1. Carla Lacerda (CaLP)

### 3. NGOs (collectively)

- #### 4. NGOs (collectively)

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Establish value added of planning group (to be confirmed by Carla)</li> <li>6. Clarify planning role for upcoming projects/programmes for Planning Team</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Recommendation five — Communications</b></p> <p>UNHCR to hire a dedicated (CDAC) officer<sup>21</sup> communicating with disaster affected communities. OCHA to provide candidates for this from their pool of experts. Develop a plan for a central hotline with a ‘triage’ system that delegates calls to appropriate agencies. Central hotline should have all up to date information that is being developed by the communications task team.</p>	<p><b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> on proposed staffing injects from UNHCR/OCHA</li> <li>- <u>Agree</u> there should be dedicated communications support for CTP and on plan for central hotline</li> <li>- Note that for accountability purposes, agencies may require their own hotlines until systems have been assured</li> </ul> <p><b>ENSURE:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Rely on recommendations from Mass Communications and Accountability team.</li> <li>2. Clear SOPs for the types of queries that could be addressed centrally and the types of queries to be addressed directly by organisations</li> </ol> <p><b>RECOMMEND/DO</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suggestion to work off a regional centralized hotline approach</li> <li>2. Need to assure or demonstrate the capacity of a centralized hotline to appropriately ‘triage’ requests for agencies to buy in.</li> <li>3. Recommend at minimum a centralized hotline for the functionality issues related to the card.</li> <li>4. Recommendation that Cash Accountability task team should explore</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Inter-agency cash coordinator, Jerome and Ivan to clarify roles &amp; responsibilities on coordination</b></p> <p><b>2. Accountability &amp; Mass Communications task team</b></p>          <p><b>1. Accountability &amp; Mass Communications task team</b></p>

	this further.	
<p><b>Recommendation six — Delivery Mechanism</b></p> <p>Use WFP as a service provider with cost recovery for managing card provision and cash transfer. WFP should collate requirements with CWG inputs of a delivery mechanism in order to re-tender for services. Delivery mechanisms should be explored on the basis of cost but equally weighted by reach.</p>	<p><b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> on recommendation for a single card system</li> </ul> <p><b>ENSURE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clear SOPs and capacity assessment for provider</li> </ul> <p><b>RECOMMENDATION/ACTION:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review how existing cash assistance for new arrivals, unregistered refugees and returnees (who do not have a BLF card) would be integrated into this delivery mechanism</li> <li>2. Request for more information on WFP card management system, and potential variations for the provision of cash assistance</li> <li>3. Advocate to WFP not to re-tender</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Senior cash adviser (operational review)</b></p> <p><b>2. WFP</b></p> <p><b>3. WFP - done</b></p>
<p><b>Recommendation seven — Implementation</b></p> <p>WFP to continue with the same 6 IPs for implementation. Develop joint WFP/UNHCR and IP 'cells' for central and field coordination between agencies and banks on projected cash flows and people management on payment days.</p>	<p><b>AGREE/DISAGREE</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Agree</u> that lead agency for distribution and process monitoring will remain WFP IPs in the immediate future</li> </ul> <p><b>ENSURE</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Clear understanding that this system does not preclude any other agencies from programming in that same geographical area (through the same centralized system)</li> <li>2. Regular review of IPs and a clear capacity assessment</li> <li>3. Ensure no action is taken without a parallel process for mass communications to beneficiaries</li> </ol>	<p><b>1. Senior cash adviser (operational review)</b></p> <p><b>2. WFP &amp; planning team (+ Carla Lacerda, CaLP)</b></p>



	<b>RECOMMEND/ACTION</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Clarity how WfP e-card operates (for non IPs to understand systems)</li><li>2. Clarify offloading questions related to UCT</li><li>3. Clarify what would happen to existing cards.</li><li>4. Recommendation to undertaken cash mapping for all the actors</li></ol>	<b>1. WFP</b> <b>2. WFP</b> <b>3. CWG core group / Planning team</b> <b>4. Inter-agency cash coordinator</b>
--	---	---