



NORWEGIAN  
REFUGEE COUNCIL



NORWEGIAN CAPACITY  
OPERATED BY NRC



# CashCap Review 2017

Lois Austin – Independent Consultant

OCTOBER 2017 | REVIEW REPORT

**COVER PHOTO:** Haitian Elonge Etienne receives a SIM-card from CashCap expert Rachel Bannerman during a WFP distribution outside Jeremie, Haiti in February 2017. The SIM-card contains cash that the receiver can spend on what they need the most. Photo: Ingrid Prestetun/NRC

## Table of Contents

1	Executive Summary	4
	Findings	4
	Recommendations	6
2	List of abbreviations and acronyms	9
3	Introduction	10
4	Methodology	12
5	Findings	14
5.1	Relevance: How relevant was the capacity provided by CashCap?	14
5.1.1	Finding – Needs addressed through CashCap deployments	14
5.1.2	Finding – Neutrality	15
5.1.3	Finding – Skills and expertise	15
5.1.4	Finding – Systematisation of CashCap tools	16
5.1.5	Finding – CashCap’s uniqueness	17
5.1.6	Finding – Collaborative working	17
5.1.7	Finding – Preparedness activities	17
5.2	Effectiveness: To what extent did CashCap deployments contribute to increased effectiveness of cash and markets programming in the selected responses or countries?	20
5.2.1	Finding – Realistic deployment objectives	20
5.2.2	Finding – Factors hindering and facilitating effectiveness	22
5.2.3	Finding – Added value and output of deployments	22
5.2.4	Finding – Expert location/host agency	25
5.3	Sustainability: How sustainable has the capacity support been?	28
5.3.1	Finding – Sustainability activities	28
5.3.2	Finding – Global level sustainability	29
5.3.3	Finding – Challenges to sustainability	29
6	Annexes	33
	Annex 1	33
	NRC Evaluation Terms of Reference	33
1.1.	Background on context	33
1.2.	Background on the thematic area	34
6.1	The overarching objective of this review is to document the contributions, good practices, outcome and impact (to the extent possible) of CashCap support to few selected countries.	35
Annex 2	Stakeholders interviewed	39
Annex 3	Key documents reviewed	40
Annex 4	Interview guide	41

---

# 1 Executive Summary

CashCap is an inter-agency project, managed by NORCAP, the Norwegian Refugee Council's Expert Deployment capacity. CashCap has been deploying senior experts to provide multi-agency support with the aim of increasing the use and effectiveness of cash and markets programming in crisis contexts since 2016. CashCap experts build the capacity of their host agencies, national and local stakeholders and aim to contribute to bridging gaps and improving the quality of cash transfer programming (CTP).

This review is looking at the contributions of six selected CashCap deployments undertaken in 2016 and 2017 in order to assess their relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. The contexts considered are as follows:

Case considered	Criteria
Yemen	L3 crisis, national deployment, strategic support, OCHA hosted, IDP response.
Turkey (for Syria)	L3 crisis, national deployment, OCHA hosted technical/operational support, Refugee response.
Tunisia (for Libya)	Technical/operational/coordination, UNHCR-hosted, refugee response.
Global Food Security Cluster	Global deployment/support, hosted by WFP.
Global Protection Cluster	Global deployment/support, hosted by GPC/UNHCR.

The review has been undertaken by an independent consultant and has focused on qualitative data collection and analysis through interviewing key stakeholders and reviewing relevant documentation. A total of 14 semi-structured interviews were undertaken with CashCap experts, host agencies and those involved in Cash and Markets Working Groups (CMWG).

## Findings

The review has made a total of 14 findings in relation to the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the CashCap deployments considered. Whilst it was not possible to look at the impact of the deployments due to lack of available data and because some of the deployments were ongoing at the time of the review, the review has also considered the added value of the deployments.

### Relevance

#### **Needs addressed through CashCap deployments**

CashCap expert deployments have been highly relevant in order to address a variety of identified CTP-related needs at both country and global level. Needs have ranged from gaps in technical knowledge which have stood in the way of CTP implementation; absence of harmonised approaches to CTP and its coordination; limited knowledge of CTP guidance and tools; and an absence of functioning coordination mechanisms.

#### **Neutrality**

The neutrality provided by CashCap experts is a critical element of the success of the deployments and is highly valued by country and global level cash transfer programming stakeholders.

#### **Skills and expertise**

CashCap experts are required to have diverse professional and social skills in order to undertake their responsibilities. Experts have proved to be able to meet requirements and brought high levels

of essential expertise which have ensured their ability to fulfil often wide-ranging ToR objectives. One area where expertise is more limited is direct experience of cash coordination.

### **Systematisation of CashCap tools**

CashCap secondments are focused within a common framework – provision of technical support; capacity building; establishment of effective cash coordination mechanisms. Although NORCAP has introduced a platform for knowledge exchange and information-sharing – Workplace – which includes a dedicated CashCap Group, this is not known and/or used by CashCap experts. In addition, there is no formal system or process through which CashCap experts are obliged to share tools/guidance developed during deployment.

### **CashCap's uniqueness**

CashCap is currently the only credible mechanism that can be relied upon to provide multi-agency support to achieve the goals of facilitating planning, coordination and implementation of CTP across sectors. Other rosters offering cash and markets expertise do exist but none offer the multi-agency support provided by CashCap. The Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) is in a position to offer some levels of technical advice on CTP but has limited capacity in comparison to CashCap.

### **Collaborative working**

CashCap deployments have been guided by approved secondment-specific ToR and activities implemented by CashCap experts have been undertaken in close coordination with relevant agencies. In order to ensure relevance of approach, some deployments have also appropriately involved close collaboration with other key CTP stakeholders such as CaLP.

### **Preparedness activities**

There have been some missed opportunities in terms of preparedness for deployments including lack of pre-deployment briefings from host agencies and an absence of information-sharing between roster members.

### **Effectiveness**

#### **Realistic deployment objectives**

CashCap ToR tend to be ambitious in nature making the meeting of deployment objectives within initial timeframes extremely difficult. As a result, four out of the five secondments considered had to be extended. Apart from qualitative assessments at the end of each expert's deployment, there is no formal system in place for measuring achievement of objectives.

#### **Factors hindering and facilitating effectiveness**

In spite of a number of factors which have made the achievement of objectives challenging, in many cases CashCap deployments have managed to contribute to outcomes which were not foreseen in the ToR.

#### **Added value and output of deployments**

With no outcome measurement system in place it is difficult to highlight the outcomes of CashCap deployments. However, discussions held during this review highlight that the deployments have provided significant added value at both country and global levels in relation to increased coordination of CTP as well as improved knowledge and harmonisation of approach. CashCap capacity building activities have contributed to bridging gaps, increasing the scale of CTP responses in some contexts such as Libya where more actors are now implementing CTP and improving the quality of cash-based interventions.

#### **Expert location/host agency**

Ensuring that CashCap experts are hosted by an agency that has significant current and future involvement with CTP and that for strategic roles and those with a coordination focus, experts are positioned close to those that have influence within the humanitarian system, such as the HCT, is a key contributing factor in terms of ability to meet deployment objectives.

## **Sustainability**

### **Sustainability activities**

A variety of approaches to sustainability have been adopted at global and country level during CashCap deployments. Training and capacity building workshops have formed a central element of sustainability activities, reaching a wide number of individuals and organisations. It is however too early to provide credible evidence on the long term sustainability of the deployments covered in this review.

### **Global level sustainability**

Sustainability of the work undertaken through CashCap deployments is hindered due to the ongoing lack of clarity in relation to cash coordination structures.

### **Challenges to sustainability**

There are a number of challenges to ensuring the sustainability of the work undertaken via CashCap. A key factor is lack of funding for CashCap which has resulted in an inability to respond to requests for support in contexts with high levels of humanitarian need and the inability to extend some approved deployments. This is combined with external factors outside the control of CashCap such as humanitarian agency staff turnover.

## **Recommendations**

Linked to the key findings above, a total of 10 recommendations for future action are proposed in order to increase and enhance the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of CashCap deployments.

### **Relevance:**

#### **Recommendation 1**

In order to ensure that CashCap experts are sufficiently prepared for their deployment, it is recommended that in advance of the start of their secondment, a briefing Skype/phone call is set up between the expert and the requesting organisation. The briefing should allow for the host agency to highlight expectations and objectives of the deployment and share relevant deployment-related materials with the expert in order that the expert has some background information on the context and requirements pre-arrival. This would ensure that experts are able to start working on achieving the ToR objectives immediately upon arrival rather than undertaking weeks of familiarisation work as part of their mission.

In addition, host agencies should be asked to put together a briefing or induction pack prior to or on arrival to help familiarise experts with their host agencies and the context into which they are being deployed.

#### **Recommendation 2**

It is recommended that CashCap establish an information-sharing system as follows:

- A global level repository of materials developed during different deployments. The repository should be accessible to all those on the roster in order that they are familiar with existing tools and materials and to avoid duplication of effort whilst on mission. The repository needs to be

easily navigable and broken down to country level as well as thematically. It will require dedicated management by CashCap.

- Building on the informal Skype group that has recently been established among some deployed experts, CashCap needs to provide a more formal support system where experts are connected with each other to ensure ongoing exchange of information and back-up when required. Alternatively, consideration could be given to better disseminating NORCAP's existing Workplace system and putting in place a more formal process for experts to use this in order to share materials developed on deployment.

### **Recommendation 3**

With an understanding and practical experience of coordination often lacking within CashCap expert's skills base yet with this area being central to their work, providing the opportunity for rostered staff to participate in coordination training e.g. UNHCR's protection and shelter cluster coordinator training, is recommended.

### **Effectiveness:**

### **Recommendation 4**

ToRs for all the secondments studied in this review were broad and all-encompassing. The quality and expert service provided by CashCap is unique and as such, requesting agencies need to be clear and specific about the needs that the deployment is designed to address and the precise skills required to meet those needs.

It is therefore recommended that NRC increases its efforts to better understand the challenges that are being faced which have led to the deployment request and link this more clearly to achievable objectives within secondment timeframes. NRC needs to challenge the ToRs where necessary and ensure that they are well-tailored to context and expectations.

### **Recommendation 5**

In order that the effectiveness of CashCap deployments can be measured it is recommended that a monitoring mechanism is put in place for all future deployments, in order to assess the extent to which deployment objectives are being met. The system should allow for some form of comparison between country level and global level deployments to try and assess which type of deployment adds more value in terms of reach, influence and results achieved by these different types of deployment. At a minimum, the monitoring system should include an analysis of final reports which state what has been accomplished within each deployment. This needs to be compared to the deployment objective to assess the extent to which each objective has been achieved. With the objectives for each mission being different, the monitoring system will have to be sufficiently flexible to allow for this. Indicators could include:

- Number of CMWG members including new members since the deployment.
- Diversity of CMWG members (cross-sector) – proportion of agencies that are present and in the CMWG
- Number of actors implementing CTP
- Number of actors by sector implementing CTP
- Number of actors implementing multi-purpose cash grants
- Continued participation in CMWG

In addition, in collaboration with CashCap, global clusters should be required to establish a system to measure the country-specific outcomes and/or impact of CashCap deployments in order to support CashCap to undertake a comparison between these deployments and country-level deployments. This will allow CashCap to better assess which type of deployments have the most reach.



#### **Recommendation 6**

In order to ensure that experts are able to fulfil objectives, combined with tailored ToR, it is important that realistic timeframes for deployment are put in place. NRC needs to undertake an assessment of each CashCap request, matching objectives with timeframes in order to avoid frequently having to extend expert missions. This will allow experts to better plan their work from the outset of their deployment.

#### **Recommendation 7**

Although it is generally already the case, it is recommended that CashCap experts deployed into coordination roles are placed at least at a P4 professional level. This should ensure that they have appropriate access to senior management during their deployments and give them sufficient flexibility to influence stakeholders and achieve mission objectives.

### **Sustainability**

#### **Recommendation 8**

As seen with the Yemen secondment, mentoring of host agency staff to ensure that at least some of the work pursued by the CashCap expert during their deployment is continued should be replicated in all deployments. As such, before the deployment starts, the host agency should be required to confirm which staff member will be mentored and ensure that dedicated time is allowed for this.

#### **Recommendation 9**

With one of the key barriers to sustainability identified as funding, it is recommended that CashCap develops a strategy to gain donor support at operation and regional level thereby broadening CashCap's current access beyond global level donor support. Key country and regional level contexts where it is known that there is a need for CTP capacity need to be identified in order to ensure that efforts to access funding in these locations are placed most effectively.

#### **Recommendation 10**

In order to increase opportunities for stakeholders to access training, the training materials developed e.g. on protection and CTP, need to be made more easily available and training of trainer courses undertaken at regional or sub-regional level. With regard to accessibility, work has already begun here through the creation of a video by the UNHCR Global Learning Centre but this needs to be built upon.



---

## 2 List of abbreviations and acronyms

CaLP	Cash Learning Partnership
CBI	Cash based intervention
CBR-TWG	Cash-based Responses Technical Working Group (Syria)
CFW	Cash for work
CMWG	Cash and Markets Working Group
CTP	Cash transfer programme/programming
CWG	Cash Working Group
FSCC	Food Security Cluster Coordinators
FSP	Financial service provider
gFSC	Global Food Security Cluster
GPC	Global Protection Cluster
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
ICCG	Inter Cluster Coordination Group
INGO	International non-governmental organisation
MEB	Minimum expenditure basket
MPCG	Multi-purpose cash grants
NGO	Non-governmental organisation
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
SC	Steering committee
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
WFP	World Food Programme

### 3 Introduction

CashCap<sup>1</sup> is an inter-agency project, managed by NORCAP, the Norwegian Refugee Council's (NRC) Expert Deployment capacity. CashCap aims to increase the use and effectiveness of cash and markets programming in emergencies and other crisis contexts. Since 2016, CashCap has deployed senior experts to provide multi-agency support, helping improve competence, coordination and cooperation in humanitarian response.

Despite the growing recognition of its potential role in transforming humanitarian action, cash transfer programming (CTP) still makes up a small percentage of humanitarian aid. CashCap aims to increase the use and effectiveness of cash and markets programming in all stages of crisis response, from preparedness and prevention to emergency and recovery activities.

Since January 2016, CashCap has deployed 17 experts in 16 different countries and at three global clusters. CashCap experts facilitate planning, coordination and implementation of cash programming across sectors, without an agency-specific agenda. They also build capacity within host agencies, national and local stakeholders.

CashCap uses the following approach in its work:

- CashCap works closely with other standby roster partners to enhance the number, quality and effectiveness of qualified cash transfer programming expertise available to the humanitarian system.
- CashCap experts build capacity within their host agencies, national and local stakeholders while on mission, contributing to bridging gaps and improving the quality of cash-based interventions.
- CashCap experts are deployed on short notice to support the whole response, and not just a specific agency, in a humanitarian crisis.
- CashCap experts increase efficiency and effectiveness by coordinating cash and market agencies in the field, integrating cash-based programming in the overall humanitarian response and developing common standards and guidelines for cash-based activities.

This review is tasked to consider the contributions of key selected CashCap deployments undertaken in 2016 and 2017<sup>2</sup> looking at:

- Relevance of the capacity provided by CashCap in the selected deployments.
- The extent to which CashCap deployments have contributed to increased effectiveness of cash and markets programming in the selected countries.
- The sustainability of the capacity support provided in the selected deployments.

The selected deployments are:

Case considered and host agency	Criteria
<b>Yemen</b> Host - OCHA	L3 crisis, national deployment, strategic support, IDP response
<b>Turkey (for Syria)</b> Host - OCHA	L3 crisis, national deployment, technical/operational support, refugee response
<b>Tunisia (for Libya)</b> Host - UNHCR	Technical/operational/coordination, UNHCR-hosted, refugee response

<sup>1</sup> The Cash and Markets Standby Capacity Project. CashCap's work is guided by a Steering Committee consisting of the Global Food Security Cluster, the World Food Programme, UNHCR, the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, WorldVision International, Action Contre la Faim, and donors such as DfID, ECHO, OFDA, the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, The Belgian government are observers and the Cash Learning Partnership act as a technical advisor.

<sup>2</sup> A set of criteria were used to select the cases to be reviewed. These included at least one L3 emergency; national and global deployments; coverage of different types of support; deployments to the two different coordinating bodies (OCHA and UNHCR); contexts that involved both refugee and IDP-responses, male and female deployees.

<b>Global Food Security Cluster</b> <b>Host - WFP</b>	Global deployment/support
<b>Global Protection Cluster</b> <b>Host - UNHCR</b>	Global deployment/support

As detailed in the Terms of Reference (ToR)<sup>3</sup>, the main purpose of the review is to document the contributions of CashCap support to selected countries and clusters. Whilst the ToR had also envisaged an assessment of the impact of CashCap deployments, during initial review discussions it was agreed that it would be more appropriate and practical to focus instead on the added value of the CashCap deployments being considered bearing in mind that three of the deployments were ongoing whilst the review was being undertaken.

The review is desk-based and “light” in nature and will be followed by a more in-depth study in 2018 which will take a more detailed look at CashCap’s relevance, effectiveness and sustainability as well as considering the impact of its work.

---

<sup>3</sup> See Annex 1

## 4 Methodology

The ToR were used as a basis for the lines of enquiry and approach to be adopted. Data collection was undertaken primarily through stakeholder interviews and a desk review of relevant existing data and documents.<sup>4</sup>

In order to document the contributions made by CashCap during the six secondments (into five contexts) studied in this review, the objectives of each deployment were considered to try and ascertain what difference deployments have made to cash and markets programming (through the provision of support to coordination, capacity building and technical support) in the selected responses.

Detailed interviews were undertaken against a checklist of key issues on the basis of an interview guide designed and approved during the inception phase (see Annex 4).

A full list of experts to be interviewed was provided by the CashCap project manager. The experts provided details of host agency representatives and other key stakeholders to be contacted by the reviewer.

The stakeholder discussions and document review focused on the following topics:

- Appropriateness of CashCap deployments in relation to gaps identified by requesting agencies;
- Levels of preparedness of CashCap experts for their deployment;
- Extent of preparedness of host agencies to receive deployees and enable them to fulfil their ToR;
- Extent to which experts were able to fulfil the objectives of their mission ToRs;
- Key contributions made by experts during their deployments, including unforeseen contributions;
- Challenges faced during deployment by host organisations and deployees;
- Sustainability of capacity support.

*Table 1 Methodology overview*

Research method	Target group/stakeholders	Number*	Purpose
Semi-structured interviews	CashCap experts	6 <sup>5</sup>	The one-to-one stakeholder interviews were designed to allow for an open line of questioning and the interview guides were designed to respond to the different stakeholder groups. The guides were semi-structured in nature, allowing for probing in-depth into various issues and a deeper exploration into the complexity of the topics being covered.
	Host agency staff	5	
	CashCap staff	1 <sup>6</sup>	
	CMWG Chairs/Co-Chairs	2	
Document review		N/A	The literature review provided an objective entry point for the reviewer, and served as a broad survey of existing data and

<sup>4</sup> Please see Annex 2 for a list of those interviewed and Annex 3 for an overview of the key documentation reviewed.

<sup>5</sup> Five deployments were considered. The Yemen deployment was undertaken by two different CashCap experts hence the need for two interviews for that deployment.

<sup>6</sup> The CashCap Programme Manager who was interviewed was also one of the CashCap experts for one of the selected contexts (Yemen). Separate interviews were held with different focus topics in order to capture inputs from both perspectives.

			information both directly and tangentially related to the CashCap deployments.
Inception report			At the start of the review an inception report was approved. The report included some preliminary findings, based on the review of key documentation.
Analysis and report writing			Analysis of data and writing of a report focusing on the contributions of CashCap to selected countries and global clusters. A draft report was submitted to the review committee for feedback prior to finalisation.
Presentation of findings		2	Presentation of findings and recommendations via skype to the review committee and the CashCap steering committee.

### **Assumptions and limitations**

#### *Assumptions:*

- That relevant stakeholders would be available for interview and willing to openly share information and views on CashCap deployments.
- That relevant documentation would be available.
- That the right questions were identified in order to ensure the provision of findings relating to CashCap's relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.

#### *Limitations:*

- Out of the total number of CashCap deployments since its inception, the review was only able to take into consideration a limited number in order to develop a set of findings and recommendations.
- Some of the deployments considered in the review were still ongoing, so it was too early to properly assess their effectiveness.
- With an absence of existing monitoring mechanisms, reviewing the effectiveness of deployments (with regard to achievement/non-achievement of objectives) was reliant upon feedback from employees and host agency staff.
- Accessing representatives of CMWGs to provide more full feedback on the CashCap deployments was difficult.

## 5 Findings

### 5.1 Relevance: How relevant was the capacity provided by CashCap?

This section considers how relevant CashCap support was in order to address identified gaps, also taking into account the skills and experience that CashCap experts had which allowed them to fulfil their ToR.

#### 5.1.1 Finding – Needs addressed through CashCap deployments

CashCap expert deployments have been highly relevant in order to address a variety of identified CTP-related needs at both country and global level. Needs have ranged from gaps in technical knowledge which have stood in the way of CTP implementation; absence of harmonised approaches to CTP and its coordination; limited knowledge of CTP guidance and tools; and an absence of functioning coordination mechanisms.

The deployments considered were requested in order to fill different CTP-related gaps and address needs at global and at country level as seen below:

Table 2 CTP needs and gaps requiring CashCap support

Case considered	Justification for CashCap expert <sup>7</sup>
<b>Global Food Security Cluster (gFSC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of technical knowledge amongst the Food Security Cluster Coordinators (FSCCs).</li><li>• Need for harmonisation and more systematic approaches to gFSC CTP coordination.</li></ul>
<b>Global Protection Cluster (GPC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of field awareness of existing CTP guidance and tools.</li></ul>
<b>Tunisia (for Libya)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Limited CTP.</li><li>• No CTP coordination.</li><li>• Lack of in-country technical support for CTP.</li></ul>
<b>Turkey (for Syria)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Insufficient OCHA expertise to chair the Cash Based Response Technical Working Group (CBR-TWG).</li><li>• No CBR-TWG chair in place for more than 12 months.</li><li>• Lack of CBR-TWG linkage to the humanitarian coordination system.</li><li>• Low technical capacity of implementing agencies.</li></ul>
<b>Yemen</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Markets functioning and CTP growing but need for strengthened Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) capacity in cash and expertise to support the humanitarian community expand CTP in an evidence-based way.</li><li>• Need for systematic incorporation of CTP into the humanitarian system and its strategic coordination and operational mechanisms.</li><li>• Lack of capacity and technical expertise within the humanitarian coordination structure.</li></ul>

<sup>7</sup> Source: Request for support forms and discussions with host agencies and CashCap experts.

In terms of the relevance of CashCap in addressing these gaps, all those spoken to felt that the secondments were highly relevant as in all deployments the deployed experts were able to address the identified gaps. However, linked to challenges around sustainability (see below), for some of the deployments, particularly those at country level, the short term nature of the secondments is an inhibiting factor. This is combined with the ambitious nature of the ToR (see Finding 5.2.1 below).

*The deployment was highly relevant because my presence ensured that identified gaps were addressed. However, it is short term and the problems identified cannot be solved in six months.*  
(CashCap expert)

#### 5.1.2 Finding - Neutrality

**The neutrality provided by CashCap experts is a critical element of the success of the deployments and is highly valued by country and global level cash transfer programming stakeholders.**

A common finding across all deployments was that having a skilled expert from a neutral, non-operational body was essential in order to ensure that deployment objectives were met.

Support to and development of cash coordination was a central element of a number of the deployments considered in this review. As such, and in a global environment where there is ongoing lack of clarity as to which humanitarian agency is lead for cash coordination and where this sits, the neutrality of CashCap, with no agency-specific agenda was considered by all stakeholders as vital.

CashCap expert's neutrality was seen to be particularly important for the country level deployments which are directly linked to operations. It was however also acknowledged with the global level secondments, where host agencies highlighted that the provision of technical advice and support from an external expert carried significant weight.

The neutrality of experts is reinforced by the fact that even if providing a percentage of support to the host agency they are not paid by them.

#### 5.1.3 Finding – Skills and expertise

**CashCap experts are required to have diverse professional and social skills in order to undertake their responsibilities. Experts have proved to be able to meet requirements and brought high levels of essential expertise which have ensured their ability to fulfil often wide-ranging ToR objectives. One area where expertise is more limited is direct experience of cash coordination.**

In order to accomplish the ambitious range of objectives included in all deployment ToRs considered in this review, CashCap experts were expected to possess an extensive variety of skills and experience. Host agencies, experts and the document review show that in the cases considered in this review, experts were expected to bring the following knowledge and expertise to their mission:

- CTP technical skills
- Understanding of the cluster approach
- Coordination expertise
- Understanding of cash coordination issues
- Market analysis skills
- Understanding of multi-sector CTP
- Knowledge of financial service providers (FSP)
- Protection background (Global Protection Cluster secondment only)



- Emergency response background
- General field experience
- Self-management ability

A review of the three available competency evaluations from the deployments considered, combined with discussions held during this review, show that in terms of the technical skills and attitude, generally employees are considered to be exceptional. Experts have displayed proficiency in all the above areas although some experts lack direct coordination system experience (i.e. they have not previously worked for a coordinating body). This latter lack of direct experience has however not affected their ability to perform the functions required.

The performance evaluations reviewed were extremely positive about all deployments considered in this review and included recommendations that CashCap experts were considered to be competent for deployment for the same tasks and/or more complex tasks in the future. The positive evaluation forms highlighted not only the high level of expertise provided by employees which has allowed them to fulfil tasks as expected but also how highly valued CashCap experts are in terms of the skills that they are able to bring.

#### **5.1.4 Finding – Systematisation of CashCap tools**

**CashCap secondments are focused within a common framework – provision of technical support; capacity building; establishment of effective cash coordination mechanisms. Although NORCAP has introduced a platform for knowledge exchange and information-sharing – Workplace – which includes a dedicated CashCap Group and a more general Cash and Markets Group, this is not known and/or used by CashCap experts. In addition, there is no formal system or process through which CashCap experts are obliged to share tools/guidance developed during deployment.**

CashCap deployments are required in order to accomplish the following:

- Provide technical support
- Build CTP capacity
- Establish effective cash coordination mechanisms

However, with no system in place or defined process for experts to follow in order to share their knowledge in these areas and/or materials developed to support their deployment with other CashCap experts, employees regularly seek support either from CashCap itself or informally from each other. There is no formalised information and/or tool sharing system and no CashCap repository to house the variety of CTP and cash coordination materials developed by experts. NORCAP has introduced a knowledge and information-sharing platform called Workspace which includes a dedicated group for CashCap experts as well as a cash and markets group, which is also open to members of NORCAP's other rosters and NRC staff. However, CashCap experts do not appear to use this platform, preferring to have direct conversations with each other via Skype (both bilaterally as well as group discussions) through which they are able to provide real-time support to one another.

As a result of this absence of clear information-sharing system, one of the experts spoken to during this review established a Skype group of deployed experts in order share exactly this type of information. This has allowed for the sharing of experience between contexts with experts acting as sounding boards for one another whilst on mission. This has been extremely valuable in terms of avoiding duplication of tool development. In addition, deployed experts highlighted that the CashCap Programme Manager/Mentoring Advisor has provided valuable support in terms of providing feedback on tools developed and sharing examples of work from other contexts.

#### **5.1.5 Finding – CashCap’s uniqueness**

**CashCap is currently the only credible mechanism that can be relied upon to provide multi-agency support to achieve the goals of facilitating planning, coordination and implementation of CTP across sectors. Other rosters offering cash and markets expertise do exist but none offer the multi-agency support provided by CashCap. The Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) is in a position to offer some levels of technical advice on CTP but has limited capacity in comparison to CashCap.**

All those spoken to as part of this review, experts, host agencies and other stakeholders alike, stressed that CashCap was the only viable option to deliver on the ToRs. Some mentioned that the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) might be able to provide some technical expertise similar to that of CashCap but with its limited deployment capacity would not have been able to undertake the deployments that have been supported by CashCap to date.

In addition, the range of expertise provided by CashCap, in terms of not only cash transfer programming (CTP) technical knowledge but also understanding of the complexities of cash coordination (and humanitarian coordination more generally) and challenges relating to capacity building were noted as unique by host agencies and the cash working group (CWG) representatives spoken to.

#### **5.1.6 Finding – Collaborative working**

**CashCap deployments have been guided by approved secondment-specific ToR and activities implemented by CashCap experts have been undertaken in close coordination with relevant agencies. In order to ensure relevance of approach, some deployments have also appropriately involved close collaboration with other key CTP stakeholders such as CaLP.**

As noted above, stakeholders are of the opinion that the expertise provided by CashCap is unique. The skills and knowledge brought by experts is fundamental to bringing about change in relation to CTP coordination and capacity, particularly at operational/country level. However, in some specific areas, capacity building for example, CashCap experts have pragmatically developed collaborative partnerships with others who have expertise to offer. This collaboration was seen to be beneficial in different ways. For example, in Yemen, CaLP and CashCap were able to jointly deliver training to a number of stakeholders and in relation to Libya, discussions with the regional CaLP representative (who is also on the CashCap roster) were beneficial to support CashCap’s mission.

#### **5.1.7 Finding – Preparedness activities**

**There have been some missed opportunities in terms of preparedness for deployments including lack of pre-deployment briefings from host agencies and an absence of information-sharing between roster members.**

CashCap experts are expected to “hit the ground running” as soon as they are deployed. However, this review has found that in a number of cases, experts needed to spend the first few weeks, and in some cases months, of their deployment familiarising themselves with the general context, as well as the CTP context.

This was experienced in more than one of the secondments considered in this review. With the GPC secondment for example, the impact of the lack of preparedness prior to the expert’s arrival was highly tangible. The initial plan had been that the expert would support three countries with long missions. However, negotiating and planning for these missions only started once the expert was in place and this took considerable time. Ultimately one of the countries cancelled the scheduled mission. This meant that alternative plans had to be put in place and the focus of the secondment amended. As a result, support was provided to all protection clusters in contexts where CTP was already being implemented and shorter missions provided to an increased number of countries using training on CTP and protection as an entry point.

Pre-deployment briefings with host agencies and/or other agencies supporting the CashCap request were not routine and nor was the provision of documentation for review prior to deployment. This has resulted in the need for experts to undertake preparatory work themselves whilst already on secondment, taking up valuable implementation time. Linked to finding 5.1.4 above, the lack of a CashCap document repository for experts to access in advance of (and during) their deployments has also impacted on expert's ability to prepare for their missions due to a lack of knowledge of what tools already exist which may support their deployment.

## **Relevance - Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 1**

In order to ensure that CashCap experts are sufficiently prepared for their deployment, it is recommended that in advance of the start of their secondment, a briefing Skype/phone call is set up between the expert and the requesting organisation. The briefing should allow for the host agency to highlight expectations and objectives of the deployment and share relevant deployment-related materials with the expert in order that the expert has some background information on the context and requirements pre-arrival. This would ensure that experts are able to start working on achieving the ToR objectives immediately upon arrival rather than undertaking weeks of familiarisation work as part of their mission.

In addition, host agencies should be asked to put together a briefing or induction pack prior to or on arrival to help familiarise experts with their host agencies and the context into which they are being deployed.

### **Recommendation 2**

It is recommended that CashCap establish an information-sharing system as follows:

- A global level repository of materials developed during different deployments. The repository should be accessible to all those on the roster in order that they are familiar with existing tools and materials and to avoid duplication of effort whilst on mission. The repository needs to be easily navigable and broken down to country level as well as thematically. It will require dedicated management by CashCap.
- Building on the informal Skype group that has recently been established among some deployed experts, CashCap needs to provide a more formal support system where experts are connected with each other to ensure ongoing exchange of information and back-up when required. Alternatively, consideration could be given to better disseminating NORCAP's existing Workplace system and putting in place a more formal process for experts to use this in order to share materials developed on deployment.

### **Recommendation 3**

With an understanding and practical experience of coordination often lacking within CashCap expert's skills base yet with this area being central to their work, providing the opportunity for rostered staff to participate in coordination training e.g. UNHCR's protection and shelter cluster coordinator training, is recommended.

## 5.2 Effectiveness: To what extent did CashCap deployments contribute to increased effectiveness of cash and markets programming in the selected responses or countries?

The focus of this section is the extent to which deployment objectives were met and factors that hindered or facilitated that. In addition, consideration is given to achievability of objectives within specified timeframes and whether deployed experts were able to contribute to additional outcomes.

### 5.2.1 Finding – Realistic deployment objectives

CashCap ToR tend to be ambitious in nature making the meeting of deployment objectives within initial timeframes extremely difficult. As a result, four out of the five secondments considered had to be extended. Apart from qualitative assessments at the end of each expert's deployment, there is no formal system in place for measuring achievement of objectives.

*At the start of my mission there was no CWG. Now there is a fully-functioning CMWG, producing material that is being used by CWGs in other countries.*  
(CashCap Expert)

For the majority of deployments reviewed (at least 4 out of the 5), the ToRs were extremely ambitious in terms of what was expected to be achieved within originally envisaged timeframes. In addition, some of the experts spoken to for this review highlighted that the first three months of the deployment necessitated a focus on familiarisation and relationship and trust

building before the more tangible activities as outlined in their ToR could be undertaken.

The table below provides an overview of the key objectives for the cases studied during this review and the CashCap deployment timeframes<sup>8</sup>.

Table 3 CashCap mission objectives

Context	Overview of objectives	Deployment length
gFSC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide technical and advocacy skills on CTP to national FSCCs.</li><li>• Build the capacity of the gFSC Cash and Market focal point(s) in order that they can provide CTP-focused support in the future.</li><li>• Assess tools, guidance and advocacy materials and further develop as required.</li><li>• Develop a tool/guidance repository to support FSCC capacity and knowledge of CTP and their coordination efforts.</li></ul>	3 months
GPC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Roll out existing global guidance, tools, tip sheets and training for GPC members.</li><li>• Develop or adapt tools for programming cash in protection in three field locations.</li><li>• Conduct training and provide hands-on support.</li><li>• Gather best practices on how to embed CTP in the Humanitarian Programme Cycle.</li></ul>	Initial 6 months, extended to 12 months.
Libya	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Form an intersector CWG.</li><li>• Build the capacity of the CWG and the sectors, focusing on feasibility, assessments, response analysis and programme design.</li></ul>	Initial 6 months, extended to 9 months total.

<sup>8</sup> Sources: Deployment ToR and stakeholder interviews

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assess CTP feasibility in Libya.</li> <li>• Provide analysis of implementation methods in the context of the liquidity crisis and currency controls.</li> <li>• Identify key market features and implications for CTP.</li> <li>• Identify FSPs.</li> <li>• Design cash based interventions (CBI) operations strategy.</li> <li>• Support the design of a CTP intervention and develop SOPs.</li> <li>• Integrate CTP into contingency plans.</li> </ul>	
<b>Syria</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Coordinate the Cash Based Responses Technical Working Group (CBR-TWG).</li> <li>• Build capacity and provide technical guidance.</li> <li>• Facilitate and encourage information-sharing among partners, with the Inter Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG), cluster coordinators and OCHA.</li> <li>• Undertake bilateral consultations, workshops and advocacy to contribute to better understanding of CTP across the humanitarian community.</li> </ul>	Initial 3 months, extended to 6 months in total.
<b>Yemen</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advise HCT on appropriate response mechanisms.</li> <li>• Help identify the risk associated with CTP and support humanitarian agencies design mitigation measures.</li> <li>• Provide strategic and technical support to the Cash and Markets Working Group (CMWG) and help humanitarian actors roll out/scale up cash and market based approaches.</li> <li>• Build the CTP capacity of humanitarian actors and guide them on creating standards whilst harmonising the process.</li> <li>• Strengthen and enhance the sustainability of existing cash and market coordination mechanisms.</li> <li>• Identify potential cash and market/safety net or social protection advocates, in particular national talent, and work closely with them to guide and mentor on cash and market policy, advocacy and leadership.</li> <li>• Assess the need for organising/facilitating training and learning events.</li> <li>• Collect and promote good practice and lessons learned to create a collection of replicable good practices for CTP.</li> <li>• Provide technical advice during major planning and funding processes including Consolidated Appeals and Pooled Funds.</li> </ul>	Initial 4 months, extended to 10 months in total (covered via two separate deployments).

There is no formal system in place to measure the achievement of objectives beyond a qualitative assessment in each expert's end of deployment appraisal/final report. However, it is understood from those spoken to during the review that there has been little discussion between NRC and the requesting agency with regard to the ambitious nature of the ToRs in order to try and ensure that they are realistically achievable. Despite this, host agencies and experts both confirmed that for the most part, objectives have been achieved in all missions. This has tended to necessitate dedication and flexibility from CashCap experts who, in addition to working long hours to achieve objectives, have often been asked to undertake activities and provide support not documented in their ToR.

As can be seen in the table above, four out of the five deployments considered by this review required extensions to the originally requested timeframe. Whilst this is understandable given the expected outputs within short timeframes allocated, it has hindered the ability of deployed experts to put in place

robust planning timetables for their period of secondment as the need to extend deployments has resulted in them being implemented in a fragmented manner.

## 5.2.2 Finding – Factors hindering and facilitating effectiveness

In spite of a number of factors which have made the achievement of objectives challenging, in many cases CashCap deployments have managed to contribute to outcomes which were not foreseen in the ToR.

A number of issues were considered to have facilitated as well as hindered the achievement of objectives. Key ones raised during review discussions included:

Facilitating factors	Hindering factors
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In situations when the host organisation was also a key cash actor, this had a positive influence in terms of supporting experts to carry out their specified tasks as it facilitated their positioning and influence.</li> <li>• Being hosted by an organisation which allowed experts to carry out their tasks without trying to influence them or interfere was important in ensuring achievement of objectives as it ensured that experts had sufficient flexibility to carry out activities in an optimal manner.</li> <li>• A cash-responsive environment, including openness of clusters and other stakeholders to considering CTP, has contributed to achieving objectives.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political challenges related to lack of clarity on the positioning of cash coordination, where CWGs should sit and by which organisation they should be led.</li> <li>• In those countries where experts were having to provide their expertise remotely (Libya and Syria) it was more difficult to build strong relationships with key actors such as governments; FSPs; beneficiaries; and implementing organisations.</li> <li>• Short deployment timeframes combined with ambitious mission objectives.</li> <li>• Challenging contexts in which high levels of due diligence are required (linked to the remote access issue above, where triangulation of information to inform effective CTP is hampered).</li> <li>• Territorial clusters with a lack of understanding of the benefits of inter-cluster or cross-cluster coordination for CTP.</li> <li>• Unpredictable operating environment with key stakeholders being asked to leave (Syria/Turkey).</li> <li>• Low interest in CTP among key clusters with a focus on provision of in-kind support (Syria/Turkey).</li> <li>• The novelty of discussions on CTP due to key stakeholders' lack of knowledge (GPC, Libya, Syria).</li> </ul>

**Figure 1** *Achievement of objectives – hindering and facilitating factors*

In spite of the barriers that made achievement of objectives challenging, CashCap experts were able to contribute to additional unplanned outcomes as highlighted in the table below:

## 5.2.3 Finding – Added value and output of deployments

With no outcome measurement system in place it is difficult to highlight the outcomes of CashCap deployments. However, discussions held during this review highlight that the deployments have provided significant added value at both country and global levels in relation to increased coordination of CTP as well as improved knowledge and harmonisation of approach. CashCap capacity building activities have contributed to bridging gaps, increasing the scale of CTP responses in some contexts such as Libya where more actors are now implementing CTP and improving the quality of cash-based interventions.



It has not been possible for this review to consider the impact of deployments, partly because some deployments were ongoing but also because there is no impact monitoring and measurement system in place that could have provided relevant data. Instead, based on discussions with all stakeholders and on the review of available documentation, the review has identified some of the added values and key outputs of the deployments considered. Whilst some of these can be directly linked to requirements as outlined in deployment ToR, others are less tangible (such as stimulating discussions on CTP) but equally important. The key reported outputs include:

*Table 5 Key outputs of CashCap deployments*

Case considered	Reported outputs
<b>Global Food Security Cluster Host – WFP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Creation of a digital repository and FSCC briefing package.</li> <li>• Identification of competencies required for the FSCC.</li> <li>• Webinar on MPCG.</li> <li>• Provision of backstopping support to field cluster coordinators.</li> </ul>
<b>Global Protection Cluster Host – UNHCR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eight field missions undertaken.</li> <li>• CTP training delivered in 4 countries (167 staff from 87 organisations trained on protection in CTP).</li> <li>• Two good practice workshops held in three countries.</li> <li>• One combined training and good practice workshop.</li> <li>• Technical advice (e.g. on planning and coordination) provided on demand to three countries.</li> <li>• The CashCap deployment set the groundwork for operationalising UNHCR's newly developed policy on CTP.</li> <li>• Engagement with global level clusters, the Geneva-based Cash Working Group and CaLP to increase awareness of linkages between cash transfers and protection and to provide inputs on cash coordination.</li> <li>• Field-level focus ensured that activities were given attention by the field and provided the opportunity to directly advocate for increased inclusion of CTP in a number of countries. Although not tangible, according to the host agency, having visits from a technical representative of the GPC was of significant value and much appreciated by Protection Cluster Coordinators in the countries supported.</li> <li>• Stimulation of discussion on CTP and technical inputs at country level that would otherwise not have happened.</li> </ul>
<b>Tunisia (for Libya) Host - UNHCR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Move of cash coordination from the shelter working group to a sub-group of the inter-sector working group.</li> <li>• Transformation from a CWG to a cash and markets WG (CMWG)</li> <li>• Positioning of CTP at a high strategic level thereby ensuring expansion of CTP to an increased range of target populations beyond refugees, displaced and host communities.</li> </ul>
<b>Turkey (for Syria) Host - OCHA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Facilitating learning exchange and moving the CWG beyond information-sharing by incorporating a learning session at each meeting thereby improving the quality and accountability of CTP in Northern Syria.</li> <li>• Expansion of the CWG to include Syrian NGOs and not just INGOs.</li> <li>• Increased cooperation with regard to information-sharing through the 4Ws.</li> <li>• Holding of a learning event on cash for work (CFW) participated in by a cross-section of stakeholders.</li> <li>• Inclusion of cash and vouchers in the 2017 humanitarian dashboard.</li> </ul>
<b>Yemen Host - OCHA</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Cash technical working group initially hosted under the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster redefined to a CMWG and moved to under the ICCG with the responsibility of advising the HCT.</li> <li>• Training for Pool Fund partners.</li> <li>• Support in HRP development.</li> <li>• Liaison with donors.</li> </ul>

- Provision of multiple trainings to clusters/sub-clusters.
- Development of a cash and voucher mapping matrix.
- Cash feasibility study including in-depth mapping across Yemen.
- FSP mapping to identify most appropriate transfer mechanisms.
- Community study on acceptance and risks related to CTP.
- Creation of a CFW sub working group to standardise approaches to CFW.
- Leading a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) review
- Creating MPCG guidance.

In addition to some of the key outputs highlighted above, as mentioned previously, one of the CashCap experts has established an informal CashCap information-sharing Skype group. The group holds regular discussions on key issues being faced which has allowed for important information exchange on topics such as optimal approaches to establishing an MEB. The group regularly shares material that has been developed in order that this can be used in other contexts and with other CWGs and stakeholders.

The timing of the secondments is noted to play an important part in relation to their potential added value. For example, the GPC deployment coincided with the adoption by UNHCR of a policy on CTP as well as increased awareness of the importance of cash in humanitarian response following the World Humanitarian Summit. The timing of the CashCap deployment was considered by the GPC to have the potential to make these policies and approaches operational. In addition, the promotion of protection in CTP by the GPC was a completely new initiative, timed to coincide with the creation of guidance that had been developed in the two years prior to the deployment. Although not easy to measure, the host agency highlighted that the CashCap deployment contributed to collective thinking and awareness on protection in CTP, at a scale that would otherwise not have been possible. The deployment helped encourage Protection Clusters to make progress in integrating protection into CTPs as part of their routine work.

*The CashCap Expert gave us the vision to see how the CWG can work in the future. The expert helped to address questions from different clusters and CWG members at different levels of capacity and was like a mentor for us. (CWG Co-Chair)*

In relation to the added value that CashCap has had at a programme level, deployment reports and discussions highlight the positive added value that deployments have had in terms of scale and sophistication of CTP. Whilst there has not been any specific measurement of this in the contexts considered, interviewees highlighted that without the inputs of CashCap experts there would be

fewer organisations implementing CTP and less understanding of how to go about it. A prime example can be seen in Libya where, since the CashCap deployment, humanitarian agencies have moved from international procurement to local procurement (thereby supporting local markets) and an increase in CTP being implemented. Another example can be seen in Yemen where, as a result of the production of a policy paper on exchange rates (not foreseen in the expert's ToR) prohibitively high exchange rates have been unlocked and there is an expected significant increase in CTP in the coming months. Two of the deployments considered in this review were at the global cluster level. However, it was not possible to establish what the outcomes or impact of these deployments were at country level as there is no system in place to follow up on country-specific results.

Some of the outputs and outcomes achieved through CashCap expert deployments in the contexts considered are outlined in the table below:

Table 4 *Unplanned outputs and outcomes achieved by CashCap*

Thematic Area	Context and activity
<b>Coordination between emergency and longer term CTP</b>	<b>Yemen</b> – ensuring coordination and information-sharing between the humanitarian-focused CMWG and agencies funded by the World Bank for longer term development CTP as part of the Humanitarian Plus Programme.
<b>Harmonisation</b>	<b>Yemen</b> – harmonisation of cash and voucher payment rates by all members of the CMWG.
<b>Humanitarian Pooled Fund support</b>	<b>Tunisia (Libya) and Turkey (Syria)</b> - experts have acted as a backstop for the Humanitarian Pooled Fund in terms of reviewing proposals to the fund and checking technical elements included in proposals. Sitting within OCHA has been important to allow for this.
<b>Information sharing and networking</b>	<b>gFSC</b> – conducting a webinar on multi-purpose cash grants (MPCG) with FSCCs to ensure awareness of and dissemination on this important area of CTP.
	<b>GPC</b> – working with other global level clusters, particularly around the role of sectors in multi-purpose cash grants. Representing UNHCR at external meetings in Geneva.
	<b>Turkey (Syria)</b> – Networking across the clusters to ensure an improved understanding of the inter-sector CWG.
<b>Localisation</b>	<b>Turkey (Syria)</b> – focused effort on ensuring nationalisation of the CWG in order to contribute to its sustainability.
<b>Policy change</b>	<b>Yemen</b> – creation of a policy paper on the macro-economic situation in Yemen, analysing Yemeni law and banking systems leading to an important change in the exchange rates being charged to humanitarian actors by Yemeni FSPs. The original exchange rate had been prohibitive in terms of implementing CTP.
<b>Working group formation and revival</b>	<b>GPC</b> – involvement in the creation of a cash task team on protection.
	<b>Tunisia (Libya)</b> – establishment of an active CMWG which had positive impacts on the existing weak coordination system. Having an active working group attracted key people which assisted in accessing humanitarian information across all sectors which contributed to shared understanding on key issues such as targeting. This information was then shared with the Inter Sector WG to assist in their understanding of such issues.
	<b>Yemen</b> – moving the CWG out of the Food and Agriculture Sector Cluster (FASC) to sit with the ICCG.

The deployments have also resulted in more sophisticated use of transfer modalities by implementing agencies. For example, in Libya, prior to the arrival of the CashCap expert all cash transfers were being provided through money in envelopes but since the deployment there has been a shift in thinking, to consider e-transfers and more adaptable transfer mechanisms.

Whilst all deployments, whether at country or at global level, were considered by those spoken to to have added value in a number of different ways, some stakeholders were keen to emphasise the far-reaching results of global deployments, highlighting that these deployments ensure access to a number of countries (through cluster coordinators) thereby having an amplified influence in more than one country.

#### 5.2.4 Finding – Expert location/host agency

Ensuring that CashCap experts are hosted by an agency that has significant current and future involvement with CTP and that for strategic roles and those with a coordination focus, experts are positioned close to those that have influence within the humanitarian system, such as the HCT, is a key contributing factor in terms of ability to meet deployment objectives.

In the cases considered, the CashCap experts were hosted by the following agencies:

Location	Host Agency
Yemen	OCHA
Turkey	OCHA
Tunisia	UNHCR
GPC	GPC/UNHCR
gFSC	WFP (home based)

The location or agency hosting the expert was understood to be important in terms of experts being able to meet objectives and influence approaches to CTP.

For example, in Turkey and in Yemen, being located in OCHA, as coordinating body, was essential for those experts to be able to carry out tasks as expected. For example, in Yemen, as advisor to the HCT, the CashCap expert(s) was able to coordinate with all cluster coordinators and members. In addition, proximity to the HCT ensured the ability to move the CMWG out of the FSAC to be located under the ICCG and the HCT.

Proximity to senior management (such as the HCT) was also considered by experts as important in terms of their ability to influence coordination of cash and facilitate network. For example, having experts at high professional category levels (i.e. P4) ensures this proximity to senior management thereby allowing experts the flexibility to work independently which is important given the neutrality that being a CashCap expert should provide.

## **Effectiveness - Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 4**

ToRs for all the secondments studied in this review were broad and all-encompassing. The quality and expert service provided by CashCap is unique and as such, requesting agencies need to be clear and specific about the needs that the deployment is designed to address and the precise skills required to meet those needs.

It is therefore recommended that NRC increases its efforts to better understand the challenges that are being faced which have led to the deployment request and link this more clearly to achievable objectives within secondment timeframes. NRC needs to challenge the ToRs where necessary and ensure that they are well-tailored to context and expectations.

### **Recommendation 5**

In order that the effectiveness of CashCap deployments can be measured it is recommended that a monitoring mechanism is put in place for all future deployments, in order to assess the extent to which deployment objectives are being met. The system should allow for some form of comparison between country level and global level deployments to try and assess which type of deployment adds more value in terms of reach, influence and results achieved by these different types of deployment. At a minimum, the monitoring system should include an analysis of final reports which state what has been accomplished within each deployment. This needs to be compared to the deployment objective to assess the extent to which each objective has been achieved. With the objectives for each mission being different, the monitoring system will have to be sufficiently flexible to allow for this. Indicators could include:

- Number of CMWG members including new members since the deployment.
- Diversity of CMWG members (cross-sector) – proportion of agencies that are present and in the CMWG
- Number of actors implementing CTP
- Number of actors by sector implementing CTP
- Number of actors implementing multi-purpose cash grants
- Continued participation in CMWG

In addition, in collaboration with CashCap, global clusters should be required to establish a system to measure the country-specific outcomes and/or impact of CashCap deployments in order to support CashCap to undertake a comparison between these deployments and country-level deployments. This will allow CashCap to better assess which type of deployments have the most reach.

### **Recommendation 6**

In order to ensure that experts are able to fulfil objectives, combined with tailored ToR, it is important that realistic timeframes for deployment are put in place. NRC needs to undertake an assessment of each CashCap request, matching objectives with timeframes in order to avoid frequently having to extend expert missions. This will allow experts to better plan their work from the outset of their deployment.

### **Recommendation 7**

Although it is generally already the case, it is recommended that CashCap experts deployed into coordination roles are placed at least at a P4 professional level. This should ensure that they have appropriate access to senior management during their deployments and give them sufficient flexibility to influence stakeholders and achieve mission objectives.

### 5.3 Sustainability: How sustainable has the capacity support been?

This section considers the extent to which experts were able to build systems and capacity in a sustainable way and what the challenges were in relation this.

CashCap expert secondments include an overall mandate to strengthen global technical capacity and/or coordination in CTP. As such, requests for CashCap expertise include a requirement that sustainability of the expert's work will be clear from the outset, asking requestors to describe the plan for taking the CashCap expert's work forward, including the creation/adaption of dedicated posts.

#### 5.3.1 Finding – Sustainability activities

A variety of approaches to sustainability have been adopted at global and country level during CashCap deployments. Training and capacity building workshops have formed a central element of sustainability activities, reaching a wide number of individuals and organisations. It is however too early to provide credible evidence on the long term sustainability of the deployments covered in this review.

A number of approaches have been adopted in order to try and ensure sustainability in terms of establishing sustainable cash coordination systems combined with capacity building of key CTP stakeholders. In some cases, deployments have had timebound outputs but have still contributed to

*What the deployment did was to stimulate our own thinking on sustainability and we now know what further work needs to be done to ensure this.*

*(Host Agency)*

ensuring that invaluable groundwork has been set which stakeholders will have to continue to build on to ensure sustainability. This foundational type of work can be seen for example with the creation of an MEB or undertaking CTP feasibility studies which may need updating at intervals, but once created, provide a solid base from which CTP

actors can build informed cash-based humanitarian responses.

Some examples from the cases considered in this review include:

- GPC – Establishment of essential links between the GPC, CaLP and the Geneva Cash Working Group. Maintaining these links will be important to ensure two-way information exchange to support the continuation of CTP in protection globally.
- Libya – Establishment of a steering committee (SC) comprising six active CTP agencies to help maintain the newly-established inter-cluster CMWG. The formation of the steering committee will ensure that the CMWG coordinator can focus on coordination whilst the SC focuses on keeping the CMWG active.
- Libya – Development of an active CMWG Skype group and Dropbox to ensure that communications flow doesn't hinge solely on the CMWG Coordinator but is a shared responsibility across CTP stakeholders.
- Syria – linking with an OCHA-designated cash focal point who will take on some of the tasks once the expert leaves.
- Yemen – creation of a vibrant CMWG and hand over of CMWG to permanent coordinator.

At country level, a key part of all the deployments has been the provision of a series of training sessions and workshops for cash actors, sometimes in collaboration with other stakeholders such as CaLP. The aim of these has been to ensure strengthened knowledge and capacity of those involved in CTP thereby contributing to sustainability.

At a global level, the gFSC deployment focused on the creation of a CTP tool and guidance repository. This was developed in close coordination with field cluster coordinators and the package is considered to be helpful for their coordination work. The main output of the gFSC technical support was the development of a briefing package which should be systematically provided to all FSCCs. The extent to which this package is used by FSCCs will be a mark of its sustainability.

As noted above, requests for CashCap expertise include the requirement for the creation/adaptation of dedicated posts to ensure the continuation of the expert's work once the secondment is over. One of the challenges here, particularly in relation to the coordination function, is that host agencies are not able to be neutral in the way that a CashCap expert can be. As many agencies lack the funds and/or the capacity (hence the request for an expert in the first place), once the expert leaves, the risk of the host agency requiring a staff member to carry on their usual duties whilst double-hatting and taking on the additional tasks carried out by the expert remains in place – even if some capacity has been built during the secondment. In some situations, the development of co-chairs for CWGs has been seen as a way of overcoming this (e.g. Yemen).

### 5.3.2 Finding – Global level sustainability

**Sustainability of the work undertaken through CashCap deployments is hindered due to the ongoing lack of clarity in relation to cash coordination structures.**

*Until there is a global structure in place for cash coordination, achieving sustainability and exit is difficult.*  
(CashCap Expert)

CashCap deployments are being undertaken within an unclear global cash coordination framework. There is confusion and an absence of clarity in relation to a UN-agency global lead for cash coordination. This has impacts at country level as different UN agencies take the lead on cash coordination

depending on context but no single UN has the lead role globally. This means that expectations and interaction between CashCap experts and UN agencies often differ from one country to another. This in turn negatively impacts on the sustainability of CashCap's work as there is currently no one agency committed to hiring staff with CTP skills to whom CashCap experts can hand over once their missions are complete.

The two global level secondments considered in this review both had specific sustainability requirements. For example the GPC secondment aimed to establish tools and best practice to apply for all Protection Cluster members to ensure that protection risks and benefits are adequately considered when delivering cash assistance. The gFSC secondment focused on the creation of a briefing package for use by all FACCs. It is too early yet to tell how sustainable these activities have been.

### 5.3.3 Finding – Challenges to sustainability

**There are a number of challenges to ensuring the sustainability of the work undertaken via CashCap. A key factor is lack of funding for CashCap which has resulted in an inability to respond to requests for support in contexts with high levels of humanitarian need and the inability to extend some approved deployments. This is combined with external factors outside the control of CashCap such as humanitarian agency staff turnover.**

A number of challenges have been identified in relation to the sustainability of the work undertaken by CashCap experts during their deployments. The key challenge noted by all stakeholders is in relation to funding, with the success of CashCap hinging on donor support. There is an ongoing lack of funding for CashCap deployments which has resulted in a number of requests from countries with humanitarian



emergencies being rejected. Recently this has included the rejection of requests for support coming from Niger, Somalia and South Sudan – key contexts with significant levels of humanitarian need where support to harmonised and coordinated CTP would undoubtedly benefit those most in need.

However, in some cases, Yemen for example, external factors are limiting sustainability. This is as a result for example of human resource capacity limitations meaning that the opportunity to mentor and then hand over the systems put in place is not there. At the same time, whilst mentoring is considered a positive approach to ensuring potential handover, ensuring requisite levels of knowledge within the short deployment timeframes of the CashCap experts remains a challenge to sustainability.

High turnover of implementing agency staff was also considered by some to be a hindering factor in relation to sustainability (with Yemen cited as a key example). With lack of consistent HR, institutional memory in relation to CTPs is being hampered.

## **Sustainability - Conclusions and Recommendations**

### **Recommendation 8**

As seen with the Yemen secondment, mentoring of host agency staff to ensure that at least some of the work pursued by the CashCap expert during their deployment is continued should be replicated in all deployments. As such, before the deployment starts, the host agency should be required to confirm which staff member will be mentored and ensure that dedicated time is allowed for this.

### **Recommendation 9**

With one of the key barriers to sustainability identified as funding, it is recommended that CashCap develops a strategy to gain donor support at operation and regional level thereby broadening CashCap's current access beyond global level donor support. Key country and regional level contexts where it is known that there is a need for CTP capacity need to be identified in order to ensure that efforts to access funding in these locations are placed most effectively.

### **Recommendation 10**

In order to increase opportunities for stakeholders to access training, the training materials developed e.g. on protection and CTP, need to be made more easily available and training of trainer courses undertaken at regional or sub-regional level. With regard to accessibility, work has already begun here through the creation of a video by the UNHCR Global Learning Centre but this needs to be built upon.

---

## 6 CashCap Case Study: CashCap strategic deployment to Yemen 2016 – 2017

### ***Contextual overview***

After more than 15 months of high level conflict, in the last quarter of 2016 the situation in Yemen continued to deteriorate. The ongoing conflict had a number of inter-connected economic and humanitarian impacts including loss of livelihoods, basic commodity price rises, limited importation of food, fuel and medicines, increased food insecurity, depreciation of the Yemeni Rial and the near exhaustion of central bank reserves. It was estimated that 51% (14 million people) of the Yemeni population were suffering from food insecurity and indications that one out of three children (1.3 million children) were suffering from malnutrition. With an escalation of conflict and high level security risks, access to affected populations has been an ongoing challenge for humanitarian organisations.

In spite of this, markets have remained generally functional in most areas of the country although prices have fluctuated and were above pre-crisis levels. Within this environment humanitarian agencies have been implementing CTP as a way to reach more beneficiaries than has been possible through the provision of in-kind support.

### ***Why was a CashCap expert needed?***

Although some agencies were implementing CTP there was a lack of capacity in this area, particularly within the Humanitarian Coordination Team (HCT). In order to try and strengthen the HCT cash capacity and support the expansion of CTP through an evidence-based approach, UN OCHA requested support from CashCap with the aim of strengthening the effectiveness of the overall humanitarian response.

### ***CashCap tasks***

Within the overarching objective of supporting coordination and promoting the greater use of multi-sector cash, the CashCap deployment was designed to ensure that CTP was systematically incorporated into the humanitarian system and its strategic coordination and operational mechanisms, including joint needs assessments; data/information management; strategic response analysis and planning; and inter-agency emergency response preparedness. This included developing cash components for the 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview and Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan.

### ***What value did the CashCap deployment add to the humanitarian response?***

The tasks required through the ten month deployment to Yemen (undertaken in two consecutive missions by two different experts) were ambitious. However, significant results were achieved including:

- A re-definition and re-location of the original cash technical group hosted under the Food Security and Agriculture Cluster to a Cash and Market Working Group covering strategic and technical coordination under the Inter Cluster Coordination Mechanism with the responsibility of providing advice to the HCT.
- Provision of training for Pool Fund partners and multiple training sessions provided to clusters and sub-clusters.
- Development of a cash and voucher mapping matrix.
- Implementation of a cash feasibility strategy including assessment of community acceptance and related risks.
- Mapping of financial service providers to identify the most appropriate transfer mechanisms.
- Creation of a cash for work sub working group to standardise approaches to CTP.
- Leading a minimum expenditure basket review.

- Creation of multi-purpose cash transfer guidance.

In addition, through engagement with donors and humanitarian organisations, the CashCap expert was able to develop a policy paper on the macro-economic situation in Yemen, including an analysis of Yemeni banking law. This paper was extremely important due to the high exchange rates being charged to agencies implementing CTP which was resulting in the provision of cash transfers to those in need becoming unfeasible. As a result of the paper, the HCT was able to advocate for exchange rates being charged in line with market rates thereby securing significant cost savings for implementing agencies and ensuring that the implementation of CTP remained a viable programming option.

---

## 7 Annexes

### Annex 1

#### **NRC Evaluation Terms of Reference CashCap Review**

**Country:** Various / Desk Study

**Duration:** Maximum 20 days

**Reporting to:** Head of Unit, NORCAP

#### **1. BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

---

##### 1.1. Background on context

CashCap is the Cash and Markets Standby Capacity Project. It is an inter-agency project, managed by NRC's Expert Deployment capacity, NORCAP. CashCap aims to increase the use and effectiveness of cash and markets programming in emergencies and other crises contexts. Since 2016, CashCap has deployed senior experts to provide multi-agency support, helping improve competence, coordination and cooperation in humanitarian response.

##### **Background on NRC and NORCAP:**

NRC's work with standby rosters started in response to the displacement crisis caused by the Gulf war in 1991. With mandate and financial support from the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (NMFA), NRC deployed seven field officers to support the UN High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) relief operations in Iraq and Turkey. NRC's rapid expert deployment was a success, which encouraged the UN, the NMFA and NRC to set up a permanent system which would enable the rapid deployment of experts to other international humanitarian operations. To date over 9000 international experts have been deployed to partner organizations' operations worldwide through the NORCAP mechanism. From their origins in providing specialist humanitarian expertise to support relief operations, the rosters now provide multiple expert profiles, including in resilience, peace building and capacity development to the whole international system.

NORCAP strengthens the capacity of the international community to prevent and respond to humanitarian challenges through provision of expert personnel to national governments and international organizations.

In 2016 NORCAP seconded staff to over 500 assignments, accounting for 194 person-years of work in the field. Most of the secondments took place in sub-Saharan Africa, followed by the Middle East and North Africa, Asia, the Americas and Europe.

## 1.2. Background on the thematic area

**Despite the growing recognition of its potential role in transforming humanitarian action, Cash Transfer Programming (CTP) still makes up a small percentage of humanitarian aid. The Cash & Markets Standby Capacity Project (CashCap) aims to increase the use and effectiveness of cash and markets programming in all stages of a crisis response, from preparedness and prevention to emergency and recovery activities.**

One of the main challenges with cash programming today is a lack of coordination and technical expertise collaboration. Because coordination of cash-based interventions does not fit properly in the regular coordination architecture. The result is a myriad of different cash-responses, challenges in delivery and coordination on the ground. There are relatively few fora in which all relevant stakeholders are able to come together to identify and resolve the barriers to better implementation of CTP across sectors. In addition, there is also a lack of analysis on protection issues related to cash programming. This undermines the promise of cash programming – meeting different needs with one multi-sector response, and giving choices to people in need. Hence cash coordination, harmonization of cash and market based responses are led by the cash experts deployed to the cash working group by CashCap. Likewise, CashCap contributes towards solving these issues and facilitates an efficient and effective delivery of cash and/or voucher.

## 1.3. CashCap Intervention

CashCap is the Cash and Markets Standby Capacity Project. It is an inter-agency project, managed by NORCAP. CashCap's work is guided by a Steering Committee consisting of the Global Food Security Cluster, World Food Programme, OCHA, UNHCR, Food and Agriculture Organization, World Vision International, Action Contre la Faim, DFID, ECHO and The Cash Learning Partnership (technical adviser).

Since January 2016, CashCap has deployed 17 experts in 16 different countries and 3 at global clusters. It covers a range of agencies and provides support to NGOs.

CashCap deploys senior cash experts to provide multi-agency support at all levels and in all stages of a crisis on CTP. The experts facilitate planning, coordination and implementation of cash programming across sectors, without an agency-specific agenda. They also build capacity within host agencies, national and local stakeholders.

The CashCap method:

- CashCap works closely with other standby roster partners to enhance the number, quality and effectiveness of qualified cash transfer programming expertise available to the humanitarian system.
- CashCap experts build capacity within their host agencies, national and local stakeholders while on mission, contributing to bridging gaps and improving the quality of cash-based interventions.
- CashCap experts are deployed on short notice to support the whole response, and not just a specific agency, in a humanitarian crisis.
- CashCap experts increase efficiency and effectiveness by coordinating cash and market agencies in the field, integrating cash-based programming in the overall humanitarian response and developing common standards and guidelines for cash-based activities.

## 2. PURPOSE OF REVIEW AND INTENDED USE

- 7.1** The overarching objective of this review is to document the contributions, good practices, outcome and impact (to the extent possible) of CashCap support to few selected countries.

The primary users of this review will be the Expert Deployment/NORCAP department and the CashCap Steering Committee. The findings of this review will be used by CashCap to improve its planning and programming in future. The findings will also be shared with CashCap partners, relevant stakeholders and donors. This review is also expected to be the cornerstone for the planning of a more extensive CashCap evaluation at a later stage.

## 3. SCOPE OF WORK AND LINES OF INQUIRY

### 3.1 Review Scope

- Contributions of key selected CashCap deployments (4-5) undertaken in 2016-2017.
- The deployments will be selected by the review committee covering technical, operational and strategic support to agencies and humanitarian country teams/clusters in various countries.

### 3.2 Lines of inquiry

#### **3.2.1. Relevance: How relevant was the capacity provided by CashCap?**

- i. How relevant was CashCap support to meet the needs and fill the gap in the different missions?
- ii. How equipped were the deployed personnel to “hit the ground running” in terms of experience, professional and social skills?
- iii. During the deployment, what worked and what did not?

#### **3.2.2. Effectiveness and impact: To what extent did CashCap deployments contribute to increased effectiveness of cash and markets programming in the selected responses or countries?**

- i. How did the deployees deliver or perform against their TORs?
- ii. How did the deployees contribute to other intended or unintended outcomes?
- iii. What were the main challenges faced by the deployees?
- iii. What were the main challenges faced by the hosting organizations while receiving CashCap deployees?
- iv. What was the contribution made by the CashCap deployee on CTP in the given context in that particular country, and what was the good/best practice that can be/was documented and shared with other stakeholders?

#### **3.2.3. Sustainability: How sustainable has the capacity support been?**

- i. To what extent did the deployees leave something behind in the form of systems, developed capacity, culture, etc? What footprint is left by the CashCap deployees through the deployment?
- ii. Are exit strategies in place and how effective are these?
- iii. What are the main challenges related to sustainability of the CashCap deployments?

#### **4. METHODOLOGY**

This is a home based mission. The consultant is expected to utilize qualitative data collection methods including:

Desk review of existing project documents, reports, background information, monitoring data, minutes of meetings. This includes, but not limited to:

- Requests and Terms of Reference for CashCap missions
- CVs of deployed personnel
- Deployees' mid-term and final reports
- Performance evaluation reports from receiving organisations
- Strategies, plans, meeting minutes etc. documenting the activities and results of the deployment

Qualitative key stakeholder interviews as follows:

1. Interviews with CashCap project manager
2. Interviews with CashCap experts deployed to the selected missions
3. Interviews with key staff / representatives from hosting organisations
4. Interviews with other key stakeholders depending on the context of the mission, including, but not limited to, cash working group participants, local organisations etc.
5. Interviews with key Steering Committee members

The consultant should suggest qualitative approaches that can identify the contributions of deployees in contexts that often required flexibility and where many outcomes were not pre-determined. Outcome harvesting and similar methods have been used in previous evaluations in order to identify and assess the contribution of the deployees to outcomes and impact, but alternative qualitative approaches may be suggested by the consultant.

#### **5. REVIEW FOLLOW UP AND LEARNING**

This review will contribute to an annual learning review which feeds into NORCAP annual strategic planning processes. Key findings will be reported to NRC's senior management team in Oslo.

#### **6. EVALUATION PRINCIPALS**

- The views expressed in the report shall be the independent and candid professional opinion of the evaluator. The review will be guided by the following ethical considerations:
  - Openness - of information given, to the highest possible degree to all involved parties
  - Public access - to the results when there are not special considerations against this
  - Broad participation - the interested parties should be involved where relevant and possible
  - Reliability and independence - the review should be conducted so that findings and conclusions are correct and trustworthy
- The review findings should be based on quality evidence, in line with NRC's evidence principles.

## **7. COORDINATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE REVIEW**

A review committee will be established by NRC, with the following members:

Head of NORCAP unit, Ulf Flink

CashCap Program Manager, Mamta Khanal Basnet (review manager)

ED/N Analysis and Reporting Adviser, Hilde Faugli (Focal point)

The review manager is responsible to facilitate access to information, documentation sources and stakeholders, the focal point manages the relations with the consultant. In case of any changes in the positions at Head Office, the review committee will be adjusted accordingly.

The review committee will oversee administration and overall coordination, including monitoring progress. The main functions of the review committee will be:

- to establish the Terms of Reference of the CashCap review;
- select external consultant(s);
- agree on the criteria for selection of deployments to be reviewed and agree on the selection;
- review and comment on the inception report and approve the proposed review strategy;
- review and comment on the draft final report;
- establish a dissemination and utilization strategy.

## **8. DELIVERABLES AND REPORTING DEADLINES**



The main deliverable of the assignment is a final report covering results (see above), key challenges and recommendations.

All NRC reviews should include the following:

- An inception report summarizing the findings from the desk review and outlining the review schedule and proposed structure of the final report
- Draft Report
- 1-2 Skype presentation of key findings and recommendations
- Final Report (no longer than 30 pages)

All material collected in the undertaking of the review process should be lodged with the Chair of the NRC review committee prior to the termination of the contract.

## **9. TIMEFRAME / BUDGET**

Total payable contract will not exceed 20 days or 10 000 USD.

Start date: August 2017

Key deadlines:

1. Inception report: 25.08.2017
2. Draft report: 30.09.2017
3. Final report deadline: 10.10.2017

Deadlines, except the final report deadline will be agreed with the consultant. In event of delays, the review committee should be informed immediately. Any significant changes to review timetables shall be approved by the review committee in advance.

## **10. QUALIFICATIONS**

NRC seeks expressions of interest from people with the following skills/qualifications:

- Experience with leading evaluations of UN organisations and/or large-scale humanitarian crisis
- Proven experience with and solid understanding of cash transfer programming (or reviews/evaluations of such)
- Preferably knowledge of deployments and rosters in emergency response
- Minimum 5 years of experience of working in the humanitarian sector at an advisor level or above.
- Proven social research skills: including qualitative method such as outcome harvesting or most significant change.
- Fluency in written and spoken English
- Excellent report writing skills

## Annex 2 Stakeholders interviewed

The following people were interviewed during the review:

Name	Position
<b>Rajendra Aryal</b>	Senior Programme Advisor, Global Food Security Advisor, FAO
<b>Bediako Buahene</b>	Deputy Head of Office, OCHA, Turkey
<b>Thomas Byrnes</b>	CashCap Expert
<b>Dana Cristescu</b>	CashCap Expert
<b>George Fehda</b>	WFP Programme and Policy Officer
<b>Mustafa Gulam</b>	Oxfam EFSVL Coordinator and CMWG Co-Chair, Yemen
<b>Fe Kaghastian</b>	CashCap Expert
<b>Mamta Khanal Basnet</b>	CashCap Expert and CashCap Programme Manager/Mentoring Advisor
<b>TimothyMcInerny</b>	CashCap Expert
<b>Jimena Peroni</b>	CashCap Expert
<b>Julian Peschmann</b>	UNHCR Shelter/Protection Sector Coordinator, Libya
<b>Simon Russell</b>	Coordinator of the Global Protection Cluster
<b>Hailu Teka</b>	Oxfam EFSVL Coordinator and CMWG Co-Chair, Yemen

## Annex 3 Key documents reviewed

The list below highlights the key documents that were reviewed in order to contribute to the data collection and analysis process.

1. CashCap support requests for missions considered in the review
2. CBI Technical Working Group ToR - Libya
3. CMWG Meeting Minutes – Yemen (various)
4. CVs of deployed personnel
5. Expert's interim and final mission reports (where available)
6. Food Security Cluster Cash and Markets Working Group CashCap Final Report (December 2016)
7. Food Security Cluster Coordinators Cash Transfers Briefing Package (January 2017)
8. Generic ToR for Senior Cash and Market Advisor
9. NORCAP CashCap overview
10. Performance evaluation reports from receiving organisations
11. ToR for CashCap missions

## Annex 4 Interview guide

(This guide was for CashCap experts. Similar guides were used for host agencies and CWG representatives)

### Relevance

1. What were the key challenges that were being faced which led to the deployment of a CashCap expert?
2. How relevant was CashCap support in order to address those challenges and in what way was it relevant?
3. Would another form of support have allowed for addressing the identified challenges?
4. What were the key skills and experience that you had that enabled you to “hit the ground running” upon your arrival (personal and professional)?
5. Did you feel that you lacked any specific skills or professional and social skills which would have allowed you to fulfil your ToR?
6. What more could have been done to ensure that you were better prepared?
7. What recommendations would have to ensure that CashCap deployments are relevant and that those deployed are suitable for the deployment?

### Effectiveness and impact

1. What were your deployment objectives?
2. To what extent were you able to deliver on your ToRs? – to what extent were the objectives of your ToR achieved?
3. How realistic was it for you to achieve your tasks set out in your ToR within the specified timeframe?
4. What facilitated and hindered the achievement of objectives?
5. In what way were you able to contribute to other outcomes?
6. Apart from the hindering factors in question 4 above were there any other challenges that you faced during your deployment?
7. What do you consider the main added values of your deployment were?
8. What difference did the deployment make to cash and market based programming that would not have occurred without the deployment?
9. What recommendations would you have in relation to ensuring future effectiveness (in terms of meeting objectives) and impact of future CashCap deployments in order to ensure increased effectiveness of cash and markets programming?

### Sustainability

1. To what extent were you able to leave something behind in the form of systems, developed capacity and/or culture? Can you give examples?
2. Was there an exit strategy for your mission and if so, what was it? How realistic and effective was it?
3. What do you consider to be the main challenges related to sustainability of CashCap deployments?
4. What recommendations would you have to ensure sustainability in relation to future CashCap deployments?

### Other

1. Do you have any other points in relation to your deployment or CashCap in general that you would like to raise?



NORWEGIAN  
REFUGEE COUNCIL

[www.nrc.no](http://www.nrc.no)

Norwegian Refugee Council  
Postboks 148 Sentrum  
0102 Oslo, Norway