## Agenda point

**JPMI**
- Introduction of the JPMI to the attendees by Jessa
- Brief presentation on the creation of the JPMI, Approach, Purpose and Methodology
- Presentation of the first output:
  - 12 Participating Partner Agencies
  - 7 Assessed Governorates
  - 13 Assessed Districts
  - 74 Markets Assessed
  - 363 Shops Assessed
- Sharing of lessons learned by Jack

**UNHCR’s ASSIST**
- Introduction of the ASSIST Platform and the technical features
- ASSIST supports the complete aid cycle
  - Assessment
  - Vulnerability scoring
  - Referrals
  - Eligibility
  - Assistance delivery and coordination
  - Appeals
- ASSIST is being used in Lebanon and Jordan
- It allows different assessments as long as the basic bio data form is being used.
- Different assistance types can be defined for each organization or can be shared among many organizations
- Multiple types referrals can be created manually or from file’s (bulk), to refer cases from one organization to another or within the same organization
- Applying an assessment based vulnerability score for multi sectors
- If a vulnerability scoring is being used and Inclusion/Exclusion process is put in place; ASSIST has an appeal module.

**Discussion:**
- OCHA flagged the importance of coordination with both the Information Management WG and the Assessment WG before considering rolling out a move to such a platform.
- ECHO stressed on the importance of taking urgent action, inviting the IM focal points from different platforms, namely WFP’s SCOPE, to discuss how such platforms would talk to each other.

**ODI Iraq Case Study**
- Presentation of Findings
  - Situation & Response:
    - Cash actors are rolling market and vulnerability assessments
    - A rapid multi-sector assessment is now being conducted before RRM is activated, but is not comprehensive.
    - Cash emergency preparedness was undertaken before the Mosul Response
- **Intervention Design:**
  - CWG Strategy is not followed by all active cash partners in Iraq
  - Funding Cycle is not in line with the HRP cycle
  - Different Cash Transfer values is in-line with CWG strategy (flexibility)
  - No Harmonized vulnerability criteria
    - The CWG is launching the Vulnerability and Targeting TaskForce in early 2017
  - Cash strategies in Iraq are driven by needs, but also by HCT leadership and donors

- **Delivery**
  - Cash Feasibility transcending market assessments is not implemented in Iraq yet
  - Transfer Modalities: the majority of actors are resorting to Hawala agents
  - Pilots on mobile cash and banks are underway
  - CWG partners argue that Hawalas are more efficient in a context like Iraq, and that digital money is not necessarily the best transfer modality
  - Does cash pose risks that outweigh efficiency and dignity gains?
    - In newly retaken areas, in-kind assistance and cash have the same risk factors on beneficiaries, and that goes back to the sheer volume of needs.

- **Monitoring & Evaluation:**
  - Monthly vs. Fortnightly reporting in addition to Activity Info are still not capturing the entirety of the cash response in Iraq mainly due to lack of trust from Partners towards these reporting tools
  - PDM findings exist, but are not capitalized on enough in influencing strategy, intervention design and targeting.

- **Exit Strategy:**
  - Referrals: the example of Kirkuk is working locally, but did not expand to the whole of Iraq yet.
  - Referrals to protection actors by the CCI is at a nascent stage, but it’s proving to be possible, and is setting beneficiaries on the right track towards re-accessing the Government’s social protection programmes.

- **Cash Working Group:**
  - Is currently only focused on MPCA because of the MPCA chapter in the HRP
  - Is currently not providing any technical support to other clusters
  - Is lacking resources to undertake any proper advancements in terms of harmonization of tools, approaches