

Thematic report on cash-based programming in emergencies

Based upon experiences by NGOs in Kenya, gathered October 2018

By Christoph Lodemann and Maria Haahr, advisors at CISU - DERF

1. Background

CISU conducted a monitoring visit to two specific DERF funded interventions in Kenya. Alongside with the monitoring, the monitoring team also gathered learning from practical examples of different experiences with **cash-based programming** as part of emergency interventions.

2. Objective

The learning objective besides the monitoring was to learn from experiences of cash-based programming.

Learning was gathered through an experience sharing workshop with local partners, who have experience with cash-based programming in emergency interventions. A learning workshop about Cash Based programming was held on 15-10-2018 with participants from Care International, Kenya, IAS Kenya and Plan International Kenya. A representative from Danish Refugee Council, Kenya also attended. The workshop was targeting organisations working with humanitarian interventions funded by the DERF.

Content of the workshop – from invitation:

Unconditional cash assistance is said to give beneficiaries the power of choice. It enables them to fulfill their needs in a dignified manner. At the same time, cash based programming (both conditional and unconditional cash assistance) contribute to the local economy. Both topics are highlighted as arguments for an increased use of Cash Based Programming in humanitarian contexts. What are the experiences with Cash Based Programming in Kenya, and where are the opportunities and challenges in it? This will be discussed on this half day learning workshop about this topic.

3. Observations on thematic issues

3.1 Experiences on CBP shared by participants in the workshop and during visits:

Organization and project	Target group	Type of CBP	Key considerations/learning
Plan Kenya, DERF funded project in Nyakach	400 most vulnerable HH	Unconditional mobile cash transfer (M-Pesa) in two transfers of 6.000 KES each + NFI (seeds) to 400 HH and Goats to 200 HH	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Beneficiary selection is key• Cash transfer is versatile, beneficiaries are empowered to make decisions on their need.• M-Pesa cash transfer is fast and efficient• Women seem to be the natural or widely accepted beneficiaries of cash transfer.• It is important to work with established local structures.• (see monitoring report for further details)
DRC, Cash for returning Somali	18.000 Somali people have returned with	Refugees registered for return are entitled	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Disbursement amount• Means of disbursement• Cost of delivery

refugees (from Dadaab to Somalia)	cash	to a one off unconditional cash transfer contingent on mode of transport, household size and particular needs.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety of beneficiaries and staff
DRC, drought response in Turkana, 2017	700 extremely vulnerable households in Turkana West Sub-County	Three month cash transfer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disbursement amount • vulnerability criteria • Existing support • Means of disbursement • Physical access to population • Financial access
DRC, Multi purpose cash grants with protection purpose (Dadaab)	102 HHs, very vulnerable and unable to earn income due to disabilities or protection/other concerns.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disbursement amount • Vulnerability criteria • Access to population • Means of disbursement • Safety of beneficiaries
CARE	Vulnerable HHs in Marsabit and other areas	Through M-pesa	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pastoralist communities are a challenge to work with as it is hard to locate them for follow-up. • Beneficiaries needs to be sensitized on data security (id-number, M-pesa, non-disclosure of transfers) • Some examples of men using the money transferred to woman and then only giving woman a small gift. • Good experience with combining CBP with access to government health service. • Advocating the government to adjust the minimum basket (3000 KES pr. HH pr. Month) to HH size.
Red Cross	Nyakach flood victims	Conditional cash transfer – construction of shelters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • have only experience with using M-pesa (mobile banking system) and overall only positive experiences due to the choice that it gives beneficiaries • for this disaster are they running a conditional cash-transfer program for housing: a)identification of beneficiaries b)Sensitization of the people, providing of list of materials for the houses c) first cash transfer d) survey of the households e) if first part constructed, then the second cash transfer. They will also distribute iron sheets for the roof using photo documentation and a finger-scanner. • For beneficiaries without M-pesa account, they are working to get an agent to the area to make it possible to get sim-cards to have the account on and then the beneficiaries can borrow a phone if needed • Coordination with other donors is key.

3.2 Advice for other NGOs considering CBP from Kenyan NGOs

- 1) **Assessment:** a needs-assessment as well as a market mapping research must be done first to ensure that CBP is appropriate in the context and which type is best.
- 2) **Choosing of beneficiaries:** all stakeholders must be involved in establishing the list/database of beneficiaries; local committees, community leaders, local authorities and other NGOs in the area to ensure that the money reached the most vulnerable groups and avoid nepotism and favoritism. Lists must be vetted by communities, and it is recommended to share selection criteria at community meetings to make it easier to understand why some people are in the program and others not and thus avoid tensions.
Women are the most appropriate recipient of the cash transfers, as they often has the responsibility of providing for the family. Vulnerable men can also be included. It can be useful to combine with activities traditionally targeting men, ie. some cash for work activities or animal husbandry.
- 3) **Coordination with other NGOs** is important to ensure that the most vulnerable are reached and to avoid "professional beneficiaries", who go from NGO to NGO. Depending on the context, it may be relevant to only work with people, who are not in other programs, or to offer complementary services.
- 4) **Choose the type of transfer carefully and take the local context into consideration:**
 - Vouchers:* often people sell them at a lower price to get money for what they really wants. Therefore and to avoid theft all vouchers must have the name of the recipient clearly written. Engage with the community about which items to put on the items. Mix vouchers with direct cash, as other needs may occur.
 - M-Pesa(mobile money transfer service widely used in Kenya):* when working in remote areas consider making an agreement with an M-Pesa agent to ensure availability. Bring the service closer. Some organizations help the beneficiaries to get a sim-card to use the service, others also buy phones, and some just encourage to get the card. Make a plan for disbursement and keep it secret for non-beneficiaries. Encourage illiterate beneficiaries to be very careful about who they ask to assist them, as theft may occur, and be ready to assist them to understand the system. Child-led HHs/girls who are victims of early marriage can't be supported through M-pesa, as only adults can have an account. Therefore an alternate is needed and extra follow-up.
 - For restricted transfers:* the NGO can try to negotiate with vendors for good prices, since many people will buy the same items, but then it must be ensured that the beneficiaries are willing to use the specific vendor. One organization has good experience with "mystery shoppers", who test whether illiterate/innumerate people are being cheated and if yes, then the vendors are blacklisted.
 - Cooperation with banks:* One project had a good experience with cooperation with a bank, who covered some of the transfer fees for bank transfer. For the organization it helped to transfer people into an income-generating project afterwards, where a bank account was needed, and for the bank it brought new, potential customers. Remember to budget for transfer and withdrawal costs.
- 5) **Set clear objectives and communicate them to the community**
- 6) **Systems** must be in place to control the information and manage the transfers regardless of type. Consider encouraging economic development through Village savings and loan system and self help groups.
- 7) **Learn from partners locally, nationally and globally** take part in local and national coordination fora and learn from best practice globally, i.e. through the CaLP website.
- 8) **Keep authorities informed** to aid coordination, making sure to be included in local steering groups and to get access to assessments done by the authorities. It also protects the NGO from backlash in the form of accusations of mal-conduct.
- 9) **Monitoring** must be done throughout the project. Post distribution monitoring of money usage is important to identify potential problems with access to goods et.a. Can

be done by calling random numbers and/or by visits. It can be difficult, if the population is moving around, but then market days can be used to get in touch.

3.3 Recommendation to donors (including DERF)

- CBP is an effective, efficient and durable tool to be used in emergency work and should be promoted more by donors. It is however only a tool among other tools. It works well in connection with other interventions/approaches (not standing alone).
- CBP are low risk interventions when implemented as online or mobile cash transfers.
- Vibrant monitoring and accountability systems are needed, including community feedback and complaint mechanism. Monitoring systems should also monitor the development of markets of where the CBP is implemented.
- Donors need to be flexible to changes in programs that include CBP, for example when the needs assessment after project start suggests mobile cash transfer. Also donors need to accept the cost of CBP in project budgets.

4. Concluding reflections and learning - the DERF team

The monitoring and learning visit clearly showed that cash-based programming to be a highly efficient, secure and relevant way of providing emergency support in the Kenyan context.

Technology (mobile money transfers) contributes to the efficiency and security of CBP, and the organizations we met have a clear focus on ensuring inclusion of people without personal access to mobile phones and on how to assist illiterate people in understanding the system and not getting abused. This focus is very important to keep in mind when implementing CBP, but the Kenyan examples shows that it is possible to do so.

Use of fingerprint scanners to secure identification and smart card (debit cards) are other examples of how technology can improve efficiency and security of CBP.

Meetings with beneficiaries as well as the experiences shared by NGOs highlights dignity and empowerment (being active in choosing what to buy and when, not having to wait in line for distribution of food and goods, bargaining power in the family) as key benefits of CBP. This counters what was referred to by some NGOs as "dependency syndrome", where populations living in disaster-prone areas become passive in anticipation of the next NGO-project.

Gender is clearly a key issue to consider. It was interesting to observe that there was widespread agreement beneficiaries, local committees and NGOs that cash should be given to the women in the HHs, and also that it is often beneficial to combine it with other activities targeted mainly at men (ie. animal husbandry, cash for work programs).

All examples of CBP, that we were introduced to, included other activities as well. This seems to be beneficial in different ways; some activities require a combined effort best done by the NGOs (ie. introduction of a new, higher breed of goat in an area as done by Plan), not all products can be bought locally; not all needs can be met with money, but require training or other types of activities.

Overall the monitoring team agrees with the list of advice presented in section 3.2. Especially point 2, 4, 7 and 9 could be relevant for DERF to focus on in its capacity building and networking activities.

In summary our recommendation is that DERF continues to gather experiences and learning about CBP for the development of the fund and the capacity-building services to applicants and/or grantees. DERF should also consider specific training and network activities to foster mutual learning among the organizations.

It could also be beneficial to include CBP in the communication about the fund as a way of creating awareness of the benefits as well as potential pitfalls of CBP among organizations working in emergencies as well as the general public.

4. Outputs and Dissemination

Outputs:

- The thematic report on CBP will be shared within CISU, with participants who contributed to the content of the report, and with all other who shows interest in the agenda.
- The DERF team will discuss the report and decide on a way forward from here.

Dissemination:

- The report will be shared with participants in the workshop through e-mail.
- The report will also be uploaded for public review on CISUs website.

Annexes:

- ToR for the monitoring visit and monitoring report Plan International Kenya
- List of participants
- Presentations by Danish Refugee Council, Kenya, and Plan International Kenya at the workshop