

A Meeting of Cash Working Group Leads from East and Southern Africa

**Learning, ideas and recommendations from
Burundi, Ethiopia, Kenya, Malawi, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan,
Uganda, Zimbabwe and the Southern Africa Regional Group**

3 and 4 October 2018



Contents

- 1 Overview.....3
- 2 Making it Work: Ideas for managing a cash working groups3
 - 2.1 Do’s and don’ts.....3
 - 2.2 CWG leadership, management and resourcing CWGs.....5
 - 2.3 What tools do CWGs use? What’s missing?5
- 3 Working with Other Actors and Coordination Bodies.....6
 - 3.1 Working with national and local Government6
 - 3.2 Working with clusters.....7
 - 3.3 Working with financial service providers7
 - 3.4 Building the capacity of other cash actors7
- 4 Humanitarian response plans (HRPs)8
- 5 Thematic discussions8
 - 5.1 Cash and social protection8
 - 5.2 Cash and risk.....9
 - 5.3 Cash, accountability and protection.....9
 - 5.4 Gender and cash..... 10
 - 5.5 Digital payments and working with the private sector 10
- 6 Agreed follow-up actions 11
- 7 Key Reflections 12
- Annex 1: What I would like to leave with..... 13
- Annex 2: Questions and challenges for the Geneva-based CWG..... 14
- Annex 3: Cash Working Group Leads Meeting: Agenda..... 16
- Annex 4: Participants..... 17

1 Overview

Cash Working Group (CWG) leads representing 10 CWGs from East and Southern Africa (nine country-based and one regional) met in Nairobi on 3 and 4 October 2018 to discuss key progress made and lessons learned, share challenges and propose solutions. The agenda and content was guided by requests from and contributions by participants. This learning event was intended to provide a space for reflection, peer learning and developing solutions to shared challenges.

2 Making it Work: Ideas for managing a cash working groups

Ways of successfully managing a CWG were discussed along with ways of addressing challenges such as low participation, limited engagement, unclear direction, resourcing for CWG tasks and the pressure on the CWG leads. Drawing from experience, CWG leads shared the following ideas and tips for how to make CWGs work more effectively.

2.1 Do's and don'ts

Ensure you

- Have clear terms of reference for the CWG which include:
 - Mandate of the CWG
 - Membership of the group
 - Governance structure (leads/co-leads/secretariat)
 - Roles of Chairs/Co-chairs and Secretariat functions that are clearly spelt out
 - Clear criteria and procedures for agreeing leadership positions
 - Responsibilities and tasks of the leadership and members
 - Defined decision making processes
 - Agreed tenure for leadership
 - Frequency of meetings
 - Relationship with sub-groups and other relevant structures
- Secure letters of commitment from country directors that staff members who stand for Chair/Secretariat positions will regularly attend meetings and fulfil duties
- Establish a secretariat with clear roles and responsibilities
- Encourage participation of local NGOs, clusters, government and private sector (as appropriate to context).
- Have bilateral meetings with the cluster leads to encourage their participation and involve them in specific themed meetings.
- Engage donors as active participants - this tends to attract participation of other actors.
- Encourage OCHA to be an active member of the secretariat.
- Develop a work plan, with clear outputs and milestones.
- Sub-working groups should be finite and have clear time-bound objectives.
- Have plenary discussions with members to ask what is needed.
- Hold thematic meetings decided by members.
- Consider whether useful to divide meetings into those for technical people vs other meetings which are more general and/or have broader capacity-building aim.
- Get regular feedback from participants on discussion topics.

- Advocate on the importance of the CWG
- Encourage agency leads and country directors to support the active participation of relevant staff.
- Chair/Co-chairs should attend Humanitarian Country Team and Inter Cluster Coordination Group meetings (HCT/ ICCG) to advocate around cash and voucher based assistance and the work of the CWG.
- Develop tip sheets for cash actors including guidance on cash transfer values.
- Identify resources to support the activities of the CWG.
- Decentralise CWG (geographically) as relevant.
- Be practical! Consider time and resources available and ensure work gets done.
- Keep the group relevant and engage with participants in ways that benefit everyone.
- Undertake capacity sharing and capacity building on general and specific topics.
- Ensure group leaders have good facilitation and coordination skills.
- Be neutral – remove your organizational hats!
- Where OCHA is present, engage them to encourage members and increase participation.
- Encourage organisations to be consistent in their use of guidance and terminology. Encourage organisations to use the CaLP glossary (which has been developed and revised under the guidance of the Technical Advisory Committee of CaLP which involves many CaLP members).
- Be prepared for the CWG to change in size, scope and intensity over time as the nature of the crisis changes – CWG leads should be flexible in allowing the CWG to change based on what cash actors need at a given point in the crisis.
- Prepare, prepare, prepare!

Ensure you do not

- Create too many thematic sub-groups at one time.
- Allow a single agency to take-over.
- Become ad hoc – stick to agreed schedules e.g. agreed timing and content of meetings.
- Take on too much, do what you can do well.
- Be theoretical in approach.
- Use the group as a way to jockey for position – be there to work!
- Be there to only push your organisation’s agenda.
- Create unnecessary burdens, guidance and regulations.

2.2 CWG leadership, management and resourcing CWGs

| | Problems | Solutions |
|------------|---|--|
| Leadership | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lack of collective ownership How does the CWG fit in with and relate to clusters/sectors? Inequitable power and influence of some members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establish governance process in the TOR, including process for elections/rotation Agree clear selection criteria for leadership selection and tenure Standardised CWG TOR, with room to adapt for context specificity |
| Management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low level of effort from leads/co-leads Low level of buy-in from the management of different organisations Lack of consensus of CWG scope and mandate Unclear criteria for organizational representation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek resources for dedicated CWG leads (including through inclusion in broader donor proposals). Communicate what is needed and the consequences of not having dedicated resources. Outline tangible outputs for leads Develop a common agenda for the CWG Invite donors to participate in the CWG |
| Resourcing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No dedicated staff No funds for CWG activities No training available for leads | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above plus ... Advocacy with donors for funding based on CWG workplan Encourage lead agencies to commit staff time to CWG leadership and support. |

2.3 What tools do CWGs use? What's missing?

CWG leads reported using a wide range of tools and drawing on many different resources. Different group leads use various of the following (listed in alphabetical order as usefulness was not clearly ranked):

- 4W and quarterly infographics
- CaLP as resource link
- CaLP glossary
- CaLP newsletter
- CaLP Organisational Self Evaluation Tool
- CaLP quality tool box
- CWG TORs
- Data visualization platforms e.g. Somalia HDX
- Elan resources
- EMMA
- IFRC/ICRC as resource link
- Guidance notes on responses to members
- Joint cash feasibility assessment tool (basic needs)
- Mailchimp to manage participant/member lists
- Markets dashboard
- PDMs
- Relevant studies/market surveys/assessments
- Survey templates: RAM, 4Ws, mapping tools
- UNHCR CBI website
- WFP CBT website

CWG leads felt the following guidance/tools are missing or, if they are available they need to be made more accessible:

- Detailed guidance about the role of the CWG leads and secretariat, with clarity on who should do what.
- Standard TORs (as detailed in section 2.1 above)
- Guidance for handover with links to relevant documents such as:
 - CWG TORs, agreements and minutes
 - Previous country assessments and evaluations related to cash.
 - Report from previous CWG leads meeting in Nairobi (available on CaLP resource library see [here](#))
- Data sharing protocols (SOPs)
- 4W tool and mapping tools
- Training on cash coordination
- Tool for tracking cash and vouchers
- Guidance for establishing transfer values
- TIP sheet for cash transfers

Based on the above, CaLP has committed to draft a cash coordination tip-sheet highlighting key tasks, resources and guidance.

3 Working with Other Actors and Coordination Bodies

How to optimise engagement with other parts of the humanitarian system, in terms of planning, decision making, influence and complementarity, was considered in many debates. Reflections on how to strengthen engagement with some key groupings are summarised here:

3.1 Working with national and local Government

- Government involvement in CWGs is positive but engagement is often weak, taking place on paper only. This is often a reflection of how many groups government departments have to engage with, differing priorities and capacity.
- Engagement could be enhanced by:
 - Strengthening the connection of the CWG to existing social protection platforms where relevant. It was noted that, for example, Madagascar the CWG is a sub-group of the social protection platform.
 - Active outreach to government counterparts, including offering trainings on CTP and regular briefings on the state of CTP in a given context.
 - Identifying issues where harmonization or joint policies may be needed e.g. transfer values and beneficiary management. Arrange specific meetings on such issues as relevant.
 - It may not be possible to harmonize transfer values or targeting methodologies with government in every case, but there should - at a minimum - be a shared understanding of approach, logic and objectives.
- Share examples of where greater engagement with Government has been successful, such as in Malawi where there has been discussion regarding vertical v horizontal expansion of cash programmes and in Zimbabwe where there is engagement on issues related to the single registry.
- There is need for continual advocacy with Government on the relevance of cash and how to use cash effectively as part of humanitarian response.

3.2 Working with clusters

- Many CWGs find it difficult to engage consistently across different clusters. There is need to consider how to introduce and guide the acceptance of cash in different sectors/clusters, supporting learning and evidence.
- Participate actively in the ICCG, as the Ethiopia CWG does, to provide briefings on CTP and engage with clusters on relevant issues. ICCG engagement will improve the CWGs understanding of wider issues and how to engage with different clusters on these.
- Actively and consistently invite cluster representatives to CWG meetings and signal ahead of time when there are issues on the agenda where their engagement would be particularly valuable.
- Seek to have consistent engagement of CWG members at relevant cluster meetings, sharing information with them on the key issues and tasks for the CWG.
- Work to ensure that the clusters and the CWG have a shared and logical approach to CTP.

3.3 Working with financial service providers

- Most CWGs engage with financial service providers (FSPs) to some degree but few regularly include them in CWG meetings. In some instances, this is based on the concern that giving some FSPs access to “privileged information” may be against tender/procurement regulations
- Many participants felt we could do more to negotiate jointly with FSPs, leading to more favourable rates and an assurance for FSPs that there is a solid business case for investments in infrastructure
- Several initiatives were highlighted which are intended to bring FSPs and humanitarian actors together to educate FSPs about the products needed and the contexts in which cash actors are working, to ensure they are able to design/adapt suitable products
- In many countries regulatory issues – know your customer requirements, mobile money tax, exchange rate fluctuations and currency restrictions – make digital payments very challenging. Better engagement with FSPs around joint advocacy positions could help to address such issues.

3.4 Building the capacity of other cash actors

- CTP capacity is a critical issue. We see many organisations with very low capacity engaging in CTP programming, often with poor quality results. The CWG has a role to play in building capacity but, given available resources, this role is limited.
- A big challenge is a lack of resources – though some argued that this can be addressed by including costs (in a coordinated manner) in individual agency proposals for capacity building actions that benefit all. There are examples of how this has been done with CaLP providing training, paid for by one agency, but with participants drawn from multiple agencies.
- CWGs could assign a dedicated capacity building focal point where resources permit.
- The CWG should consider developing basic guidance on the country specific cash response.
- Building capacity of government is important and can be a helpful tool in facilitating engagement.
- Organisations often fail to share their own tools, trainings and resources internally and should be encouraged to do so.
- Encourage actors to systematically share lessons learned.

4 Humanitarian response plans (HRPs)

Given the limited inclusion of CTP in current HRPs and the weak engagement of CWGs and cash actors in their development, some participants felt the HRP process was not very relevant for them. There was broad agreement, however, that HRPs provide a real opportunity to promote stronger response analysis, embed more strategic use of cash assistance and ensure cash and vouchers are fully integrated into humanitarian response plans. Suggestions for increasing the inclusion of cash in the HRPs included:

- Include a clear and shared analysis of cash feasibility and where and how cash and vouchers could and will be used in the overall plan. Make cash a more visible and widely understood element of the response.
- Ensure full involvement of technical cash actors from the CWG at an early stage in the HRP process.
- Build on joint assessments and seek to work from a common picture of needs.
- Strengthen market assessments and cash feasibility analysis in needs assessments and the HNO and ensure this guides the balance of response tools.
- Make space – where appropriate – for the inclusion of multipurpose cash. Ensure reporting and monitoring capture outcomes across clusters.
- Work with the clusters to ensure that each sector response plan includes a robust analysis of which tools are most appropriate and how, if at all, cash and vouchers will be used to reach sector outcomes and objectives.
- Ensure cash assistance across the response can be better tracked throughout the response
- A common cash guidance note for the HRP, leaving room for context specificity, would be welcomed.
- In some contexts a “*why not cash?*” approach may help to drive more robust response analysis.

5 Thematic discussions

5.1 Cash and social protection

Guest speakers outlined the need for greater complementarity between humanitarian and development action, in particular in protracted crises. This imperative is not new, and the need for better joint working has been stressed since the 1990s. However, the rising gap between needs and resources, the preponderance of protracted crises and the increasing overlap between people in humanitarian need and the global extreme poor make this ever more urgent. There was some questioning of whether we are doing new things or just using new words.

The need for closer working between humanitarian cash transfers and national social protection systems is part of this, and participants agreed that working better with government-led social protection systems was necessary in a variety of contexts. The need to bridge this nexus was highlighted.

However, the form this joint working should take and the role of the CWGs in supporting and brokering more coherent approaches is unclear. More guidance and sharing of learning is needed, in particular on different models of cooperation, harmonizing/rationalising transfer values and targeting methodology and data sharing.

Opportunities for linking social protection and humanitarian systems were highlighted. But there was some questioning of whether parallel systems are appropriate if they are designed to address different issues and, as one panellist highlighted, aligning systems is complex – the intent sounds easy, the reality is hard.

5.2 Cash and risk

The State of the World's Cash report shows that the perceived risks of CTP are the number one impediment for organisations seeking to scale up CTP. However, the evidence shows that while cash poses different risks to in-kind assistance the risks are no greater, and in some cases less. Participants discussed the key cash-related risks they were concerned about and shared mitigating measures:

- In Ethiopia the Government has banned all cash assistance in one region as a result of their concerns about the quality and planning of cash assistance. Discussion of the example showed that the issues at stake were related to quality programming (e.g. related to targeting) rather than being cash related per se.
- Government acceptance of cash assistance is a significant issue in many contexts. Sometimes this can be addressed by advocacy but sometimes there are security concerns that should be heeded.
- Participants agreed that, in general, poor quality cash assistance which is sometimes driven by pressure for more and more organisations to deliver cash whether or not they have the requisite capacity or experience. This behaviour is resulting in a poor deal for recipients and jeopardising the acceptance of CTP in some areas.
- Some agencies have different mechanisms through which to report loss for in-kind and cash programmes. It was noted that, in general, there is a far lower risk 'tolerance' for loss of cash and that reporting standards are higher.
- A number of risks related to digital payments and working with the private sector were identified. These are combined with other discussions and reported in section 5.5.

Discussions concluded with a range of questions, such as how can we (anonymously if needed) share thinking on risks and mitigation measures? What is the role of the CWGs in helping to share lessons and address these issues? All these reflections and questions will inform CaLP's ongoing work related to [cash and risk](#).

5.3 Cash, accountability and protection

Cash in itself is not enough to promote accountability and inclusion. Efforts to ensure that adequate complaints and response mechanisms are in place, and that – where appropriate – digital payments channels contribute to long term financial inclusion, still need to be pursued. Modality choice should be driven by beneficiary preferences, not just market conditions. Feedback from beneficiaries should drive meaningful changes in programming, as well as leading to prompt resolution of individual cases. Groundtruth Solutions' recent case study on user journeys in Kenya show that the basics of communication and accountability around cash programmes are still missing, and are critically important to recipients.

Protection considerations need to be mainstreamed around the programme cycle to ensure CTP contributes to strong protection outcomes. The CWG has a role in sharing best practice and minimum standards. There are particular knowledge gaps around data protection, and the best ways to safeguard beneficiaries' data.

5.4 Gender and cash

It was recognised that there has been limited attention given to the gender implications of CTP. In many case programmes are gender blind and, for example, the targeting of women is based on gender related assumptions and historical practice rather than sound gender analysis. The lack of gender analysis means that many important questions go unasked, resulting in risks being overlooked and opportunities unexplored.

Much of the thinking which has documented has focused on gender considerations from a risk or do no harm perspective. Documented examples of practice, for the most part, tend to draw on relatively small-scale interventions and do not address questions of how such work could be managed at scale.

Examples of barriers to strengthening programming from a gender perspective included – assumption based planning; technical understanding; lack of joint working (between gender and cash advisors) and resistance having ‘yet another thing to do’ and/or the issue not being a high organisational/response priority.

The new [gender and CTP](#) webpage on the CaLP website, provides easy access to some of the resources that exist. Albeit that evidence in this area is limited, work is progressing and there is momentum.

5.5 Digital payments and working with the private sector

Building on section 3.3 above, a number of challenges and risks related to digital payments and working with the private sector were raised, including:

- Limited banking/mobile money infrastructure leads to the use of expensive and insecure methods of getting cash to people. Examples included secure convoys/flights and cash in-hand in Zimbabwe and South Sudan.
- Monopolies/limited choice of service providers resulting in high fees
- Exchange rate fluctuations and gaps between the official and market exchange rates
- Regulatory issues including mobile money tax, rigid KYC regulations and the management of exchange rates pose significant challenges in many contexts.

Participants agreed that the following could be helpful:

- CWGs to coordinate joint negotiations with FSPs to secure more favourable rates and help FSPs make the business case for engagement.
- Work with FSPs in advance of RFPs to help them understand the products needed and the profile/context of recipients so tools can be build and adapted which meet need.
- Joint lobbying with the support of the HCT and, if feasible, the FSPs themselves to address regulatory issues.

6 Agreed follow-up actions

It was agreed that CaLP would:

| |
|---|
| a. Share a report of the meeting. Once agreed, the report will be posted on the CaLP library. |
| b. Circulate list of participant contacts. |
| c. Share links: <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Ground Truth Solutions' User Journeys Kenya Case Studyo Glossary revision (shared) |
| d. Develop a tip sheet on cash coordination, bringing together examples of coordination tools |
| e. Prepare/agree a summary of HRP discussions and then post on d-group/website |
| f. Summarize asks of Geneva CWG and share for inputs (shared following meeting and discussed at GBCWG meeting on 10 October. Included as an annex to this report) |

Individual participants committed to:

- a) Share the meeting report widely in their organisation
- b) Make more use of CaLP resources on the website
- c) Orient their staff on resources on the CaLP website
- d) Work towards integration of social protection programme with humanitarian/emergency for sustainability
- e) Promote joint negotiation with FSPs for better rate
- f) Make effort to ensure active participation of government in CWG
- g) Better document CWG history, decisions etc
- h) Embark on capacity-building within the CWG
- i) Seek to include other clusters in the CWG
- j) Seek funding for dedication cash coordination
- k) Strengthen the leadership of the group. Hold everyone accountable.
- l) Include CWG funding in donor proposals
- m) Revise CWG ToRs and governance structure
- n) Develop annual plan
- o) Have discussions around gender in the CWG
- p) Push for more commitment from agencies involved in the CWG
- q) Initiate discussions around the CWG ToRs
- r) Take advantage of contacts and contact systems e.g. skype group
- s) Sign up to d-groups and share the resources on the CaLP website with colleagues
- t) Work on revamping the national CWG
- u) Share takeaways with CWG
- v) Ensure discussions are not just cash but about well-designed cash
- w) Suggest alternatives to CWG on coordination
- x) Try different ways of strengthening coordination solutions based on practical experience of the CWGs
- y) Advocate for gender analysis in CTP programmes
- z) Work on improving participation of CWG members and engage governments effectively
- aa) Reflect all the GENIUS in this room into global policy discussions
- bb) Use the CaLP online resources more

7 Key Reflections

Reflecting on key takeaways from the two days, participants said:



Annex 1: What I would like to leave with

At the start of the meeting, participants shared thoughts on what they would like to leave with:

- Ideas of how to secure resourcing for CWGs and CWG activities
- Ideas for how to make global policy more practical
- Ideas for how to secure organisational buy-in for cash coordination
- Guidance on the leadership and secretariat of CWGs
- Ideas for how to increase the capacity of cash actors
- Understanding the changing roles of cash actors, including collaborative approaches
- New ideas on how to keep the momentum, sustain interest and ensure consistency
- Ideas for how to include cash in the HRP
- A solution on reporting/4Ws
- Ideas for how to avoid parallel systems e.g. at State level, at ICCG, in clusters
- Reflections on handover/transition strategies
- Ideas for the CWG role in working with social protection actors and ensuring sustainability
- Understanding of where the CWG sits in the coordination system
- Suggestions for how to set a learning agenda
- Ideas for how to be more concrete and move away from being an information sharing platform
- Shared experiences on common delivery mechanisms
- Ideas for how to have a common approach to negotiations with FSPs
- Suggestions for how to manage the high rate of turnover of CWG participants
- Strengthened linkages between East and Southern African CWGs
- Reflections on the CWGs role in preparedness, triggering and scale-up
- Ideas on government engagement
- Ideas on donor engagement
- Ideas for how to ensure that nominal CWG leadership comes with the requisite capacity and commitment
- Common ToRs for CWGs and a shared understanding of how we work

Annex 2: Questions and challenges for the Geneva-based CWG

Participants posed questions and challenges to the members of the Geneva-based CWG which were then addressed during their meeting of 10 October. Geneva-based CWG members' responses and proposals will be shared with this group when the meeting report is published. The questions were as follows:

1. Resourcing

- In East Africa most CWG leads have only 10-20% of their time dedicated to this work, which isn't nearly enough to ensure effective cash coordination. What are the opportunities to secure resourcing for cash coordination and how can you help us access them?
- Cluster leads receive training and support, while many CWG leads have never done coordination before and don't understand how to engage with the Humanitarian Programme Cycle and the rest of the system most effectively. Are there opportunities for support or training here?
- How can cash actors – at the global and national levels - ensure their staff in country are incentivised to put the necessary time, effort and engagement into cash coordination? And how can they improve the internal flow of guidance, policy and training to ensure field staff have the necessary capacity?

2. Guidance and planning

- While a degree of context specificity is critical, we want a model Cash Working Group ToR that clarifies the mandate and scope of CWGs, how it fits within the system and how leadership is resourced. We'll need to ensure this is based on field experience and practical concerns. How can we work together to get this? Some suggestions for that this should include are:
 - Clarity on mandate and structure
 - The need for and scope of a secretariat role
 - Rotating leadership
 - Guidance on leadership selection criteria
 - Realistic expectations given capacity
 - Participation requirements
 - Advocacy role
 - Clarity on technical and strategic roles
 - Relationship with the clusters clarified
- CWGs face a continued lack of clarity around how cash should be included in HRPs and face pushback in many contexts as they try to include cash in humanitarian plans – both as part of the overall strategy, in sector plans and multipurpose cash. What can the GBCWG do to provide clarity, advocate for inclusion of cash in HRPs and facilitate the engagement of CWGs?

3. Enabling environment

- In many countries in East and Southern Africa rigid KYC regulation (and other legal issues including new taxes on mobile money transactions) is making it hard for vulnerable people, in particular refugees, to access financial services. As the Cash Working Group we don't have the necessary bargaining power. What can be done at the global level to help influence this?

- Private sector and humanitarians are still fairly ignorant and distrustful of the ways each other work. How can we work together to (a) help FSPs understand the context in which our beneficiaries exist and the products we need to build to reach them and (b) leverage FSP experience in addressing country-by-country issues of monopoly, poor/expensive services or lack of financial infrastructure.

Annex 3: Cash Working Group Leads Meeting: Agenda

The planned agenda is outlined below. In practice, sessions were adjusted as the meeting progressed in order to respond to evolving discussions and the interests of participants.

Wednesday 3 October

| Time | Session |
|--------------|--|
| 0830 – 0900 | Arrivals/coffee |
| 0900 – 0930 | Welcome and roundtable introductions |
| 0930 – 1100 | Coordination: Group work: successes, challenges, needs |
| 1100 – 1130 | Coffee break |
| 1130 – 1230 | Reflecting cash in HRP and other collective humanitarian plans: current practice and lessons learned |
| 1230 – 1330 | Lunch |
| 1330 – 1430 | Coordination tools and resources: group work |
| 1430 – 1515 | CWGs and other coordination bodies: how is it working? |
| 1515 – 1530 | Coffee break |
| 1530 – 1700 | <p>Social protection and the humanitarian-development-peace nexus: implications for CTP – panel discussion and plenary.</p> <p>Panellists</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dr. Dirk-Jan Omtzigt, Head, Information Management and Analysis Unit, United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), Regional Office for Southern & Eastern Africa - Isabella Hayward, Digital Development Specialist, Digital Development Unit, World Bank - Sigrid Kuhlke, Thematic Expert Forced Displacement & Migration - Social Protection Advisor, ECHO Africa - Charles Inwani, Regional Programme Policy Adviser – Social Protection & Cash Based Transfers, WFP Bureau of Southern Africa |
| 1730 onwards | Informal networking event |

Thursday 4 October

| Time | Session |
|-------------|--|
| 0900 – 1000 | Review of day one and cash policy updates |
| 1000 – 1100 | Building CWGs that work: engagement, resourcing, sustainability |
| 1100 – 1130 | Coffee break |
| 1130 – 1300 | CTP and risk: roundtable discussion |
| 1300 – 1400 | Lunch |
| 1400 – 1530 | <p>Breakout sessions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Cash and gender 2) Cash and protection 3) Working with the private sector 4) Cash and accountability to affected populations |
| 1530 – 1600 | Coffee break |
| 1600 – 1700 | Summing up and next steps |

Annex 4: Participants

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------|
| Burundi | Co-Lead | Jennifer Price | IRC |
| Ethiopia | Co-Chair | Praemeenah Poobalan | WFP |
| Ethiopia | Co-Chair | Theodros Tefera | Oxfam |
| Kenya | CWG member, representing the Chairs | Luluwa Ali | OCHA |
| Kenya | CWG member, representing the Chairs | Jean-Baptiste Heral | ACTED |
| Malawi | Co-Chair | Kennedy Nyirenda | Concern |
| Somalia | Co-Chair | Deqa Saleh | ADESO |
| Somalia | Co-Chair Somaliland | Sahara Ibrahim | Care |
| South Sudan | Co-Lead | Veronica Moretti | WFP |
| South Sudan | Co-Lead | Sarah Alex | DCA |
| South Sudan | CB Lead | Syeda Rabeea Ahmed | CashCap |
| Sudan | Co-Lead | Yasmine Bannaga | WFP |
| Sudan | Co-Lead | Sarah Torbey | UNHCR |
| Uganda | Co-Chair | Kenneth Anyanzo | UNHCR |
| Uganda | Co-Chair | Stephan Deutscher | WFP |
| Uganda | Co-Chair West Nile Group | Dada Luke | DCA |
| Zimbabwe | Co-Chair | Abel Simbarashe Whande | Care |
| Zimbabwe | Co-Chair | Agnes Mungatia | WFP |
| Regional | Co-Chair | Charles Inwani | WFP |
| Regional | Co-Chair | Maxwell Sibhensana | WVI |
| | | Esther Mbogho | CaLP |
| | | Karen Peachey | CaLP |
| | | Tegan Rogers | CaLP |
| | | Sophie Tholstrup | CaLP |