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INTRODUCTION

OBJECTIVE OF THE SCOPING STUDY

Primary
1. To gain insights on how cash transfer programming practitioners target and select their beneficiaries.

Secondary
1. To gain insights on the CTP implementation practices of humanitarian agencies.
2. To explore coordination mechanisms in beneficiary selection.
Ten (10) organizations responded to the survey. The organizations are:

1. Seven (7) international non-government organization (INGO)
2. One (1) local NGO
3. One (1) government agency
4. One (1) private sector

Position of respondents in their organizations are:

1. Program managers and coordinators
2. Program directors
3. CTP focal persons
4. Program advisers
RESPONDENTS OF THE SURVEY

- CTP experience of respondents:
  1. Four INGOs and one local NGO have at least five years of experience.
  2. Two INGOs started CTP in 2013
  3. One INGO started only 2015 in the Philippines

- CTP implemented during:
  1. Four INGOs and the local NGO use CTP in *Emergency Response*, *Early Recovery* and *Development Projects*.
  2. Two INGOs use CTP only in *Emergency Response* and *Early recovery*.
  3. One INGO use CTP only in *Early Recovery*. 
CTP PROGRAMS OF RESPONDENTS

- Program sectors *Food needs, Livelihood, Shelter, WASH, NFI and Health*
  - Five of the ten respondents provide cash assistance to all the abovementioned sectors—three INGOs, one local NGO and private sector respondent.
  - One INGO responds through cash in all the sectors except Shelter.
  - The lone government agency and one INGO provide cash assistance only for Livelihood.

- **Food:**
  - Prioritized *ALWAYS* by five INGOs and the local NGO. [4 respondents]
  - Prioritized *MOST OF THE TIME* by one INGO. [1 respondent]

- **Livelihood**
  - Prioritized *ALWAYS* by three INGOs, local NGO and government agency. [5 respondents]
  - Prioritized *MOST OF THE TIME* by four INGOs and private sector. [5 respondents]
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- **Shelter:**
  - Prioritized **ALWAYS** by only one INGO and the local NGO. [2 respondents]
  - Prioritized **MOST OF THE TIME** by two INGO and one private sector. [2 respondents]
  - **SELDOM** prioritized by two INGOs

- **WASH**
  - Prioritized **ALWAYS** by the local NGO. [1 respondent]
  - Prioritized **MOST OF THE TIME** by three INGOs and private sector. [4 respondents]

- **NON-FOOD ITEMS**
  - Prioritized **ALWAYS** by two INGOs and local NGO. [3 respondents]
  - Prioritized **MOST OF THE TIME** by one INGO and private sector. [2 respondents]

- **HEALTH**
  - Prioritized **ALWAYS** by three INGOs and local NGO. [2 respondents]
  - Prioritized **MOST OF THE TIME** by one INGO and private sector. [2 respondents]
CTP DISBURSEMENT

Respondents were able to disburse cash grant within these timeframes:

• Within two weeks after the disaster -- 2 INGOs and Private sector
• Within a month after the disaster – 3 INGOs
• More than a month after the disaster – 2 INGO respondents.
• Less than a week after the disaster – 1 INGO respondent
TARGETING

- Seven INGOs and the local NGO indicate they target specific groups or sectors.
- Groups targeted:
  - Vulnerable groups, children, marginalized, Elderly, PWD, PLW, malnourished children, child-headed households, chronically ill;
  - Poorest of the poor; worst affected families;
  - MSME, small farmers, small fishers, indigenous groups

BENEFICIARY SELECTION CRITERIA

- Presence of vulnerable member in the family;
  - Child-headed households
  - Single female-headed households
  - PWDs, families with chronically ill member.
- No resources or capacity to recover; high dependency ratio, house is damaged
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TIMEFRAME FOR BENEFICIARY SELECTION

- From the time of disaster, average timeframe to complete selection of CTP beneficiaries:
  - Within a month after the disaster: 4 respondents
  - More than a month after the disaster: 3 respondents
  - Within two weeks after the disaster: 2 respondents

CHALLENGES IN BENEFICIARY SELECTION

- Duplication of selected beneficiaries with other humanitarian agency
- Inaccessibility of community
- Political influence from local officials
- Acceptance of community
COORDINATION IN BENEFICIARY SELECTION

- If there is a centralized coordinating entity, all respondents, except private sector respondent, expressed willingness and readiness to share information about their beneficiaries.
- Last Mile Mobile System (LMMS), both INGO using the LMMS are willing and open to coordinate with other INGOs using the system to identify overlaps among their beneficiaries.
  - Should be covered by agreement
  - Should clearly spell out purpose or use of the data
  - Subject to data protection policies and practice
  - Should require the consent of the beneficiaries
  - Info: name of beneficiary, age and location/address.
1. (i) Livelihoods, followed by (ii) Food then (iii) Shelter, NFI, WASH and Health are the priority sectors addressed through cash.

2. Only one respondent was able to release cash grant in less than two weeks after the disaster. Two within two weeks. Six within a month or more.

3. Respondents target specific groups: (i) Vulnerable groups; (ii) worst affected families and poorest of the poor; and (iii) sectors e.g. small farmers, fishers, etc.

4. Selection criteria: (i) No resources or capacity to recover; and (ii) has vulnerable member.

5. Timeframe to complete beneficiary selection: Most respondents indicate within a month to more than a month after the disaster.

6. Challenges in beneficiary selection: duplication

7. LMMS can be explored as tool for bilateral coordination to prevent duplication.
About 4Ps,

It is possible that 4Ps will be and should be included among the cash grant beneficiaries after a disaster as long as:

- They are in need of assistance; and/or
- They lack the capacity to meet basic needs and to recover despite the PhP1,400 cash grant from the program; and/or
- There are vulnerable individuals in the family.