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| **Uganda Technical Working Group for Cash-Based Interventions****Meeting in Kampala, UNHCR office, April 24th, 2019.** |
| **Attendance:** **USAID,** **DFID, CESVI, UNCDF, PHB, CARE, CRS, AVSI, DRC, UNICEF, UNHCR, WFP, CashCap, UNDP, UNWOMEN, LWF, Uganda Red Cross Society, World Vision, Save the children, DCA, ECHO** |
| **Agenda:** 1. Introductions
2. 2019-2020 RRP tracking and reporting on CBI: Activity info, financial inclusion, CBI (sectoral cash, Cash for work and multipurpose cash), 5W and Cash dashboard
3. Result of the survey on measuring the performance of the CashCap support to the CWG in the Uganda Refugee Response - Needs and priorities
4. Cash for Work
5. Presentation from UNCDF on the project plan for the development of a financial literacy curriculum
6. Vulnerability and Essential Needs Assessment (VENA) update
7. AOB
 |
| **Agenda** | **Discussion** | **Action Points** |
| Introduction  | The meeting was marked by participation of remarkably a considerable number of participants compared to the previous monthly coordination meetings. There were new attendees from PHB, a private consulting firm working with UNCDF on the development of a financial literacy training curriculum. |  |
| 2019-2020 RRP tracking and reporting on CBI: Activity info | * About two thirds of the expected number of agencies have submitted CBI information through ActivityInfo
* ActivityInfo reporting is helping to track RRP indicator progress
* Sector specific grants (sectorial cash grants) are tracked under sectors
* Multipurpose cash and basic needs are captured under the CBI reporting section

Reactions* Queries were raises as to whether the activity info captures information on frequency and duration of the assistance
* There was a suggestion to introduce challenges and lessons from CBI programmes of agencies. It was agreed that to keep the AI reporting concise, any agency that has considerable lessons learnt from their programmes can request for a session in the subsequent monthly meeting for presentation
* There was a concern about the frequency of reporting form the agencies. It was communicated that reporting remains on a monthly basis while production of information materials be maintained on a quarterly basis
* As for the dashboards, information management at UNHCR will produce three dashboards for cash for work, sectorial and multipurpose cash and financial inclusion
* UNHCR partners concerned whether activity info reporting will replace the routine monthly reporting to UNHCR. The difference is that activity info only captures figures that would ideally be captured through the 4W reporting
 | * Partners to continue submitting information on a monthly basis
 |
| Results of the survey on measuring the performance of the CashCap support to the CWG | * The survey was presented to CWG in the meeting. Analysis was done by the current CashCap cash and markets advisor to the CWG.
* 19 responses were received in total;83% respondents are partners based in kampala ,11% partners from west Nile and 6% from South West. Out of the total respondents majority, 83% are INGO partners followed by donor agencies (11%), and UN agencies and NGOs 5% each.
* Findings indicated that support by CashCap to the cash working group was very helpful with majority(78%) reporting plan to implement CVA based on the MEB analysis ; remaining partners have reported the need for more discussion on the MEB as well as few have responded that they have already entered a partnership agreement with donors/UN agencies and would be difficult to revise the budget and plan accordingly; CashCap Technical advisor has advised this should be something that could be discussed and necessary amendments to existing partnership agreements should be done between implementing agencies and Donors as the MEB is final and agreed upon for implementation. The MEB is finalized, and validations/discussions should be made to the MEB only once the Vulnerability and essential needs assessment (VENA) report is out.
* In regard to partners readiness and technical capacity to implement MPCs; Majority (35%) responded they are ready, have the technical capacity and have implemented MEB before, and 24% responded ready, have technical capacity and currently implementing similar intervention. CashCap responded; this could be followed by MPC mapping, and ensuring harmonization and coordination of MPC interventions as well as provide on request technical support and backstoppings to partners implementing MPCs.
* In regard to partners feedback to the MEB designing process; partners have responded that they are satisfied in all the performance parameters but reported the process lacked coherence and alignment with social protection elements. CashCap responded; efforts will be made to link existing CVAs with social protection/ self-reliance initiatives as one exit strategy
* 5 priority areas were identified; Support in vulnerability and essential need analysis(VENA) is rated highest , followed by Multi-sectorial market analysis(MSMA); 4 support areas (1)discussion on common cash delivery platforms and facilities, 2)localized feasibility assessment, 3)j Joint price monitoring and joint targeting were rated 3rd); all other areas were rated medium level apart from a need for cash for work discussions and joint accountability and feedback reporting system which were both rated lowest interms of priority. CashCap responded that some activities are subset of the others, and a workplan is drafted based on the few one-one discussions held with CashCap support requesting agencies, based on the on-line survey analysis and based on technical judgement calls and already some actions are taken including; facilitate/ support the implementation of Joint price monitoring and support to the VENA technical group. Final workplan will be developed incorporating the cashcap coordinator role and in line with this survey report and will be shared to the CWG.
* As far as CashCap support is concerned, the following recommendations were made based on partners comments;
* In general, there is a need for capacity building, information management and sharing of products and resources, advocacy, coordination and technical supports; but more specifically;
1. There is need to institutionalize cash coordinator and technical advisor roles as part of the agency structures; the two roles(Technical advisor and coordinator) filled by CashCap at the moment are for one year and there is a need to have a plan which one plan could be possibility of institutionalizing these two roles.
2. Ensuring regular participation of the office of the prime minister and other Government offices (Ministry of Gender…); this is very important particularly talking about linking CVAs with social protection elements and National safety net programs and strategies, Endorsing the MEB, establishing standards and in support of any advocacy needs and so on.
3. Strengthen coordination between national and field level cash coordination working groups; one way could be sharing of meeting minutes and action plans between field level and national CWGs, National CWGs focusing on addressing strategic and technical support needs of field level CWGs and making sure standards are shared with field CWGs
4. Conduct Regular price/market monitoring for MEB and benchmarking of standards on cash delivery modalities that offer best value for money
5. Tailor made Capacity building trainings following a capacity gap assessment
6. The need for standards and harmonization of approaches, clarity on roles of the different platforms at national level like CCD and CWG etc…
7. Always end meetings with clear Next steps. Always open meetings by providing updates to agreed next steps in the previous meetings, and follow-ups should be done to what has been agreed/pending issues
8. Produce and share 4Ws products and analysis regularly
 | * A workplan and detailed report of the survey will be shared with CWG partners. The report should also be shared with field CWG partners. The workplan to the CWG should incorporate both technical and coordination CashCap roles.
* Following the report, the cwg ToR will be reviewed and necessary changes will be made accordingly and the revised ToR will be shared with CWG partners.
 |
| UNCDFFinancial literacy curriculum development | * UNCDF in partnership with PHB, a private consulting firm to develop a training curriculum for financial literacy
* PHB are using an approach of human centered design in the development of the final product
* Consultations and focus group discussions are already underway in some settlements
* In term of timelines, the project is ongoing upto end of July 2019 as this time is expected to be enough to do testing, prototyping and conduct ToT.

Reaction* How does the curriculum align with the already existing adult literacy functional programme?
* How does the curriculum link to the UNCHR-WFP joint plan of action where modalities have already been decided?

In response, there is no danger or risk of losing steps if the modalities have already been decided as for the case of the joint plan as the approach will depend on which part of the cycle is the entry point of the programme.As for the link to the already existing materials, the development will not take into consideration new content development. Existing materials will be reviewed to guide the development of this curriculumThe project also fits directly into the UNCHR-WFP joint project on mitigating risks of abuse of power by FSP in the delivery of cash assistance to refugees | Partners advised to contribute to the curriculum development if consulted. |
| Vulnerability and essential needs assessment  | * VENA was not discussed in detail during the meeting however discussions on price monitoring for MEB took shape
* WFP setting up a monitoring system to collect monthly price data from all settlements to aid MEB monitoring
* WFP is open to collaboration with partners in data collection
* VENA discussion deferred to the next meeting
 | * Partners that are already collecting price data in settlement should share information for harmonization
 |
| Cash for work | * There is concern that since the guidelines for labour intensive public works was developed in 2011 by the MGLSD, the rates there in have never changed. Prices of goods and services and significantly changes since then, thus the need for revision of the rates.
* There were suggestions to have the issue first discussed at the Inter-Agency working group and then other groups
* The livelihoods working group is better placed to discuss cash for work and as such a presentation should be made to livelihoods sector working group for initial thoughts and suggestions
 | * Presentation on cash for work to be made at the next livelihoods sector working group meeting; if requested by the livelihoods SWG
 |
| AOB | * Given that UNHCR CBI Officer’s mission to Uganda was coming to the end, this marked her last meeting as the co-chair of the CWG. As recruitment is ongoing, another temporary deployment will be made to cover the gap until a more permanent replacement has been found.
* The inter agency cash coordinator from NORCAP will report on May 6th until the end of the month to provide technical coordination to the cash working group and will be hosted at UNHCR.
 |  |