



Oxfam
Great Britain

Cash for Work Programming



A Practical Guide

Written by Sarah Lumsden, Turkana Recovery Project Coordinator (HSP Project Manager)

& Emma Naylor, Kenya Humanitarian Programme Coordinator

Oxfam GB Kenya Programme

BO 40680, Nairobi, Kenya

Tel: +2542 715003

Fax: +2542 715095

Email: hecainfo@oxfam.org.uk

June 2002



Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	2
The story of Habiba Abdi Ahmed of Boji Yare village	2
2. WHY CASH FOR WORK?	2
Box 1: Advantages & disadvantages of cash for work programmes	2
3. PLANNING THE INTERVENTION	2
3.1. Initial assessment	2
3.2. Carrying out assessment	2
4. GETTING STARTED	2
4.1. Finding and selecting community projects.....	2
Key elements to consider.....	2
a) Relevance and community ownership.....	2
b) Technical viability	2
c) Appropriate for resource transfer purposes	2
d) Appropriate for target groups	2
Box 2: Understanding livelihoods to identify the most vulnerable	2
4.2. Deciding on CFW as a project.....	2
Box 3: The case for CFW in Turkana	2
4.3. Designing the activities.....	2
a) How can we design projects that will include the most vulnerable community members?.....	2
Box 4: Designing an activity for vulnerable groups.....	2
b) How much cash does a beneficiary need?	2
c) What is the number of people/households that need to receive cash to make a sufficient impact?	2
d) What possible negative impacts do I need to consider?	2
Box 5: Threat of conflict in families in Wajir.	2
Box 6 - the story of Fatuma Adow Malicha	2
4.4. Examples of cash for work activities.....	2
Table 1: Examples of CFW activities and their scope.....	2
4.5. Lessons we learned the hard way	2
a) Careful how you discuss CFW before finding a project!	2
b) Be careful not to raise expectations!.....	2
c) Be aware of history of work projects in the area – innovation may be necessary!	2
d) Never allocate projects to communities!	2
e) Be aware of authorities influencing projects to meet their own needs!.....	2
5. IMPLEMENTATION.....	2
5.1. Management & staffing	2





- a) Managing and supervising projects 2
- b) Logistical and technical support 2
- c) Site Supervisor 2
- d) Technical Staff 2
- e) Contracting technicians 2
- Box 7: Implementation constraints in Turkana 2

- 5.2. Beneficiary selection 2**
 - a) Deciding who to target 2
 - Box 8: Methods of selection in Turkana. 2
 - Box 9: Beneficiary selection in an urban setting 2
 - b) Issues in beneficiary selection 2
 - c) Targeting households vs. individuals 2
 - d) Number of beneficiaries to select 2

- 5.3. Coordination 2**
 - Box 10: Communicating effectively 2

- 5.4. Organising the work 2**
 - a) Day to day supervision 2
 - b) Division of work/rate of payment..... 2
 - c) Sensitivity to gender and disability 2
 - d) Working hours 2

- 5.5. Transferring the cash 2**
 - a) Making payments 2
 - b) Security of cash disbursements 2
 - c) Other security measures 2

- 5.6. Monitoring & impact assessment 2**

- ANNEX 1: ASSESSMENT 2**
 - a) Structures 2
 - b) Population 2
 - c) General Situation 2
 - d) Needs 2
 - e) Logistics 2
 - f) Economic Data 2
 - g) Labour 2

- ANNEX 2 - COMMUNITY SENSITISATION SHEET: USE OF CASH 2**
 - a) Objective 2
 - b) Background 2
 - c) Why raise awareness?..... 2
 - d) Process of Raising Awareness:..... 2

- ANNEX 3 – EXAMPLE OF CFW INFORMATION SHEET FOR COMMUNICATING WITH STAKEHOLDERS. 2**

- ANNEX 4 - AREAS OF INTEREST FOR MONITORING 2**

- ANNEX 5 - CHECKLIST FOR MONITORING THE CFW PROJECT 2**





1. Introduction

This document was written following the experience of implementing a drought recovery programme based on cash for work (CFW) in Turkana and Wajir, Kenya, from August 2001 to June 2002.

Turkana and Wajir are arid districts in Northern Kenya. The main form of livelihood is pastoralism. Pastoralists are generally nomadic, and herd sheep, goats, donkeys, camels and cattle. The districts are chronically underdeveloped, with poor infrastructure and very limited access to basic services. Drought is a recurrent threat to livelihoods. There are also problems of conflict and insecurity relating to ethnic conflict, cross-border raiding and banditry.

By 1999 Kenya was heading towards the worst drought in living memory. Oxfam began drought mitigation measures, including water supply, food distribution and other livelihood protection programming. By 2000 4.4 million people were receiving free food relief across Kenya through a Government of Kenya / World Food Programme emergency operation.

The programme aimed to help pastoralists recover their livelihoods as the prolonged drought began to wane. This project aimed to provide cash to 70 000 vulnerable people, including at least 6 000 women-headed households, in Wajir & Turkana Districts, largely in exchange for community labour contributions to projects that benefited the wider community (CFW). The project tried to build on experience and learning from previous similar interventions, including the 1998 El Nino Recovery Programme and the 1999-2001 Drought Emergency Mitigation Project (DEMP), both funded by the Department for International Development (DFID). Novib also funded the DEMP.

Oxfam Great Britain, DFID, Oxfam Hong Kong and Klub funded the programme, which was worth about US\$1.2 million. One objective of the programme was to learn as much as possible about the implementation of CFW programmes and to share this learning.

This document is intended to provide practical guidance to programme managers and advisors when planning and implementing CFW programmes. It outlines the processes that the Kenya team worked through, and the problems encountered in managing the programme. We have also tried to incorporate comments from Oxfam Uganda, who have implemented similar programmes in different circumstances.

This document is strictly a short practical guideline; there are a number of documents already written on CFW. Rather than repeat this information, these documents should be considered as essential reading before planning CFW as an activity.

- Oxfam GB Food Policy, (work in progress).
- Cash: An alternative to food aid, Khogali H. & Takhar P., Oxfam GB, 2001
- Evaluation of Oxfam GB Cash for Work Programme, Kitgum / Pader District, Uganda 2000/1, August 2001.
- Review of Oxfam GB Kenya Drought Recovery Programme, Frize J., Oxfam GB, 2002.
- Food-security assessments in emergencies: a livelihoods approach, Young et al, ODI, 2001

In addition, a number of other organisations, including the British Red Cross, have worked in this area.

The team would like to express their appreciation to all those who supported the implementation of the Drought Recovery Programme and the production of this guide.

Asanteni sana.





The story of Habiba Abdi Ahmed of Boji Yare village

Habiba came to this settlement in 2000 from Wajir, where she lived on famine relief food aid and the sale of firewood.

She is a widow. Her husband was killed in clan clashes in 1994. Their livestock was also stolen. She was left with only 5 sheep, forcing her and her dependents to migrate to the outskirts of Wajir town. She has four children; one is a daughter, who is divorced with four children. This family is dependent on her. The four grandchildren are attending Koranic school but none is attending formal school.

She decided to move to Boji Yare because life is very competitive and expensive in Wajir town. In town, too many people are trying to make a living by selling firewood. She settled with her 5 sheep but lost 2 of them during the 2000-2001 drought

Along with three other women she was identified to work on the Oxfam roads project. The community chose them because they were more vulnerable than the other members of the community and were responsible for extended families. Their main tasks were pulling away the tree branches, which are cut down by the men, making tea for the workers and carrying water.

She worked for 60 days on the project and earned about £45, which she used to buy 3 sheep, clothes for all her dependents and a big bag of sugar. She bartered the sugar for milk, which she sells at the milk market in town, making a few shillings profit on each bottle. She uses the profit from the sales of milk to supplement the family's household budget. They have to buy water. She is able to contribute to the community causes such as funerals. She even managed to attend to her brother's burial in Isiolo.

She used her savings to open a tea kiosk. She says the kiosk does well during dry spells, when the nomadic pastoralists move closer to permanent wells near the village.

Today her assets are 6 sheep and savings of about £20, in addition to the on-going trade in sugar and milk

According to Habiba, the cash she received was much more useful than the food aid because it can be directly invested into businesses - unlike food, which cannot be converted into business or exchanged for medicine, clothes or school fees.





2. Why Cash for Work?

Cash for work (CFW) is increasingly being considered as a relief or recovery intervention. In East Africa, where food aid has dominated as a mechanism for supporting communities in emergencies, particularly during drought, there has been a growing desire to develop alternatives ways of delivering this support.

This has largely come about due to the increasing emphasis on livelihood protection and recovery rather than life-saving interventions in slow-onset emergencies. This has meant that food aid has been used more as a resource transfer mechanism than nutritional support, in order to stop community members having to deplete their assets in order to meet household needs. Food may be available in the market, but during a crisis terms of trade decline and communities are not able to access food.¹

Using food as a resource transfer has been seen to be highly inefficient². The costs involved in sourcing and distributing food relief are enormous. This equation is worsened when beneficiaries use food relief as a resource to meet household needs other than general ration consumption – i.e. when they sell their food relief to buy other food stuffs, pay for health and education fees etc. Generally, the price beneficiaries can get when selling relief food does not reflect the costs of the distribution of the food. The value of the food to the beneficiary is not reflected in the amount of money it takes to deliver it. Sales of relief food can also have other negative impacts – possibly undermining local markets by causing a collapse in the price of general ration commodities, for example. Targeting of relief food has also been seen to be problematic.

The traditional alternative to free food relief, food for work, suffers from many of the same constraints, along with additional problems associated with work projects.

These observations have led to Oxfam Great Britain in the Horn, East and Central Africa (HECA) region adopting the objective of developing viable alternatives to food distribution programmes. CFW is one intervention that can be effective in meeting the needs of populations in food insecure situations.

A slow-onset emergency is not the only time where its use may be appropriate. Oxfam Uganda has used CFW in conflict situations.

Our objective in Kenya was to support livelihood recovery, not to meet nutritional needs. As such, we found that CFW may not be most appropriate as an alternative to free food relief, but as a complement. When food needs were being met, beneficiaries were able to use cash for other purposes. Had no food been available, the objectives of the programme may have been different. See Section 4.3.d for further information.

There are a number of reasons for choosing CFW rather than other forms of resource transfer. The following table lists some of the main advantages and disadvantages of implementing a CFW programme. Some of this pros and cons are not unique to CFW, but are common to similar programmes, including food for work.

¹ Implicitly this is based on entitlement theory. See “Cash: an alternative to food aid”, Khogali, Oxfam GB, 2001

² Evaluation of the Wajir Relief Programme 1996 - 1998, Buchanan Smith et al, 1998




Box 1: Advantages & disadvantages of cash for work programmes³

Advantages of CFW	Disadvantages of CFW
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It provides households with a degree of choice with regard to their own spending priorities (flexible, fungible). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only viable in cash economies. (See Annex 1 & 2).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost effective in comparison to alternatives (restocking, seed distribution etc.). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Work is often inappropriate for the most vulnerable (sick, old, children). (See section 4.1.d & 4.3.a).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relatively low distribution costs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The workload of women may be increased. (See Box 4 & as above).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Makes up for lack of variety in food rations. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Women may not retain control of income. (See Sections 3.2 & 4.3.d)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beneficiaries receive greater proportion of donated money. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision of cash may provoke other social problems such as family disputes and domestic violence. (As above)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Boosts the local economy – can indirectly impact positively on petty traders, livestock & food prices etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May be abused e.g. purchase of tobacco and alcohol. (See Section 4.3.d).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CFW projects themselves provide social benefits to the community as a whole. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People may not understand how to use the money wisely. (see Section 4.3.d & Annex 2)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Properly managed, can improve women's and marginalised groups status. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could cause inflation, which may have a broad negative impact if not controlled. (Section 4.3.d, annexes)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Self-targeting because wages will be at a relatively unattractive minimum wage & better-off beneficiaries will not want to participate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CFW may affect community participation in the future community projects – they may expect to be paid in future. (See Sections 4.3.d & 5.3)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces risk of corruption (money is earned and hence more valuable to beneficiaries). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for corruption & diversion (See sections 4.3.d & 5.5)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can be quicker to mobilise than alternatives such as food purchase and transport. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> May divert people from other productive opportunities. (See Sections 4.1.d & 4.3.a)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Can reduce social disruption caused by coping mechanisms like people migrating to look for work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher security risk. (See Sections 4.3.d & 5.5)

³ Adapted from “Cash: an alternative to food aid”, as before.





3. Planning the intervention

3.1. Initial assessment

The decision to start a CFW programme is dependent on gathering good information on the possible project area.

In an emergency situation, a rapid assessment may demonstrate that people can most effectively meet their needs through the provision of cash. This is likely to be true in the following circumstances, among others:

- Highly monetised economy, where cash is used routinely.
- No absolute shortage of basic commodities.
- Supply (trading) systems are relatively efficient and likely to be able to meet the demand of the community.
- Potential for relatively transparent implementation structures.

However, in order to implement a CFW programme, there also has to be potential for suitable work projects. The process of finding suitable projects is unlikely to be met by a rapid assessment alone, as a number of criteria need to be met. These criteria are discussed below.

The kind of information required to establish the feasibility of implementing a CFW is outlined in Annex 1. This information should be incorporated into a baseline survey. This list is not exhaustive and should be read in conjunction with more comprehensive advice.⁴

3.2. Carrying out assessment

Oxfam has guidelines on undertaking assessments as mentioned above.

However, for the purposes of a CFW programme particular attention should be paid to information that will help analyse the potential threats more prevalent in CFW programming. These threats have been mentioned above in section 2.1.

Of particular concern therefore are issues relating to

- Gender, particularly division of labour and control over household income. This will help you decide whether or not risks like conflict within families are real.
- Vulnerable groups and mechanisms for meeting their needs.
- Transparency and trust.
- Economic information. It is wise to gather baseline data at various levels to be able to measure impact and monitor for risks like inflation. Village level information on prices should be coupled with district level information and, if possible, control group information, to be able to monitor trends.

Good baseline data is essential for programme monitoring. However, it is good to try to limit the amount of data collected so that monitoring is straightforward and practical. If there are reliable secondary sources of data, such as early warning systems, it is ideal to incorporate these to reduce workloads.

⁴ See Food-security assessments in emergencies: a livelihoods approach, Young et al, 2001, ODI





4. Getting started

4.1. Finding and selecting community projects

Projects must have a dual purpose:

- To create an opportunity for the targeted beneficiaries to earn money.
- To provide a public good (a lasting service or facility of benefit to the wider community).

Generally, the key objective of CFW programming is resource transfer. Nevertheless, the secondary objective (provision of public good) is what distinguishes CFW from cash distribution.

The detailed assessment may identify needs that could be met through community work projects. Where such potential is identified, further assessment visits would be required to that particular community. Discussions would need to be held with the whole community to discuss possible solutions to their problems. Projects and solutions should come from the community - sustainability is an important factor. If the community do not see a real need, the project is likely to fail.

Key elements to consider

Many of these elements are the same as for other humanitarian and development projects, including:

- Relevance
- Ownership & sustainability
- Technical viability
- Management capacity

Some of the elements are similar to any other work project:

- Appropriate for resource transfer purposes
- Appropriate for target groups

a) Relevance and community ownership

The project should be proposed and agreed by the community as a whole. Ownership of the project is key to the sustainability of the project in the long term.

- Community must see an advantage in completing the project other than a means of earning cash.
- The community needs to be able to maintain the public good.
- Low input costs, minimal materials required from outside project area (helps with sustainability as well as cost-effectiveness).

b) Technical viability

Work projects also need to be reviewed from a technical perspective. A challenge for programme managers is that community priorities may cover a range of technical areas, from water to road building to livestock management to sanitation programming. Such diverse technical knowledge is rarely available within one operational team.

Technical advice may be available from a range of sources:

- Oxfam Humanitarian Department – Food & Nutrition Advisors and Technical Advisors.





- Government departments.
- Other organisations working in the areas.
- Consultants.

e) Appropriate for resource transfer purposes

The projects usually need to be fairly labour-intensive to maximise participation and transfer the appropriate amount of cash.

The project also needs to be cost-effective. If the primary aim of the programme is resource transfer, capital-intensive projects will divert project funds from this objective.

Ideally, the following factors should be considered:

- Community able to target vulnerable groups.
- Project uses local materials.
- Labour intensive. Ideally the project should require a lot of labour.
- Requires low skills base, or at least skills that are widely available locally.

d) Appropriate for target groups

One risk with work projects is an over-emphasis on need for heavy labour, which may prevent vulnerable groups from participating. Special consideration should be given to designing projects for vulnerable groups (e.g. see box 4 below). Where vulnerable groups cannot participate directly, other measures can be taken.

Identification and understanding of vulnerable groups is dependent on a strong livelihood analysis.

One of the problems with CFW is that some members of the community are not able to benefit directly from activities⁵. The most vulnerable members of the community (very young, elderly, sick or disabled people for example) may be unfit to provide the heavy labour required for large infrastructure projects such as desilting pans or clearing bush.

Certain livelihood groups may also have problems committing to lengthy work activities. One such group is pastoralists in the *baadia* (nomads) who cannot abandon their migration patterns for extended periods in order to participate in CFW projects.

The timing of activities may also have an impact on who can participate. For example, agricultural communities have seasonal variations in their workloads.

Thus, any activities need to consider the needs of special groups who may not be able to benefit so easily through CFW, either because of their vulnerability or the demands of their livelihood. Groups who may not be able to benefit so easily from CFW include:

- Livelihood groups with incompatible labour demands or coping strategies, such as nomads or agricultural communities at certain times of the year.
- People who are unable to take part in heavy labour (old people, sick or disabled people, children).
- Women with care responsibilities.

There is a lot of advice available on livelihood and vulnerability analysis.⁶ The Oxfam livelihoods approach is straightforward, practical & logical, but it relies on good understanding of the local context, as in box 2 below.

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Ibid.





Box 2: Understanding livelihoods to identify the most vulnerable

In Wajir, pastoralists with large mixed herds tend to be better off. With a large herd, they can withstand a degree of declining livestock productivity and loss caused by drought, floods, conflict or disease outbreaks. With mixed herds, they are also more resilient, as different kinds of animals are vulnerable in different conditions – camels can get sick and die quickly during flooding, but sheep and goats survive. In drought, cattle are vulnerable to lack of water but camels and donkeys are hardy.

To maintain these herds, pastoralist families need adequate labour and the capacity to be mobile.

This understanding leads us to recognise that during drought, the most vulnerable pastoralists are those with small herds of small animals that cannot trek for water (low mobility). Families with such herds often also lack labour (typically, they are families without a fit adult male).

Such families are likely to drop out of pastoralism if they are unable to maintain their stock or recover their stock quickly after a drought. If they drop out, they are likely to become destitute, relying on family members and petty trade to survive. When drought bites, families become less able to support their destitute relatives, and food insecurity becomes acute.

4.2. Deciding on CFW as a project

Ideally after a detailed assessment and discussions with all stakeholders, including communities in the project area, a list of possible CFW projects will have been drawn up.

The decision whether to go ahead with projects must consider many questions, including the following:

- Is cash transfer an appropriate output in this context?
- Will a work programme meet the needs of the target population?
- Does the activity (public good) meet criteria that would normally be used to judge the same technical intervention delivered in another way?
- Is this activity appropriate as a work project?

Box 3: The case for CFW in Turkana

In Turkana, food relief was being distributed in response to a prolonged drought. Since food was already being received freely, food was not a priority at household level. Some of the food was being sold to meet other household needs. With the drought, communities had lost livestock, which was the only source of livelihood for nearly the whole population. Communities had no means to restock or pay for essential items such as medical care, clothes, household goods or school fees.

Communities used cash and needed it. The local economy is not very well developed, but with free food still available, it seemed like inflation beyond acceptable levels could be avoided.

CFW was a possible method of allowing people to buy livestock and/or other essential items.

There was a range of labour-intensive infrastructure projects that would benefit the wider community. The communities had some experience of organising themselves on work projects.





4.3. Designing the activities

a) How can we design projects that will include the most vulnerable community members?

It is important to include a range of activities in which different kinds of people can take part. Such a mixture will ensure that different kinds of people can participate. Crucially, communities should not be diverted from other productive opportunities or appropriate coping mechanisms, regardless of how vulnerable they are.

In developing a range of activities, it is useful to consider the following factors:

- Time commitment required, both in terms of daily scheduling and overall length of project.
- Locations (rural/urban mix, travel time to work location).
- Type of work (light/heavy, cultural acceptability, especially with regard to any gender, ethnic or other division of labour).
- Impact on existing workload and access to other productive opportunities.

Activities could be spread geographically, between rural areas and settlements. Road clearance, for example, can employ people based both in centres and rural or nomadic groups.

Communities can also develop mechanisms to allow vulnerable people to benefit from a task. In some areas, we have seen communities allowing elderly beneficiaries to nominate younger relatives to do the work in their name. Tasks in infrastructure projects, such as supervision, counting or clerking, can be given to people who cannot manage heavy labour.

Box 4: Designing an activity for vulnerable groups

Primary objective: To support women-headed households to recover their livelihoods threatened as a result of drought.

Secondary objective: To support conflict-affected (displaced & returnee) families to rebuild homes destroyed during ethnic clashes.

We have seen how peri-urban women-headed households have been identified as vulnerable in Wajir (box 2). Designing a work programme for these urban destitute women is not straightforward. They have weighty domestic responsibilities, and the most vulnerable are elderly or physically disabled. They may be physically unable to do heavy work. Even if they are able, their domestic responsibilities may make it difficult for them to work for fixed hours labouring.

In Wajir, homes are called *herios*, which are temporary structures made of sticks and mats known as *dufuls*. These homes can be transported as the pastoralist family moves with its herd. The construction and maintenance of the *herio* is the woman's responsibility. *Dufuls* can be woven from locally available materials.

Oxfam decided to meet the objectives described above by providing housing materials for conflict-affected families through CFW. Oxfam agreed to buy *dufuls* on a piecework basis from urban destitute women, represented by women's groups.

The women were able to participate in the project because they could decide how much work they wanted to do and when. They were able to work at home and fit the labour around their other responsibilities. Elderly and frail people were able to participate because the work is light and can be done sitting down.

The other housing materials required were poles for the *herios*. Oxfam paid women in the conflict-affected areas when they had collected enough poles to build a house.





The targeting of these tasks to women, and particularly women-headed households, did not cause conflict, as men perceive this work as appropriate for women.

b) How much cash does a beneficiary need?

Why do people need cash? What will it be used for? The need identified indicates the amount of money that needs to be earned. For example, a family needing to rebuild a viable herd of animals may need to earn more money than a family needing to replace household possessions. If the quantity of money earned does not meet the requirements of beneficiaries, the project will have little impact on the situation. Therefore, it is important that work within a project is sufficient to enable people to earn an adequate amount of cash.

The amount of cash that people need can be calculated in different ways. You can ask the communities what their objectives are and then calculate how much money would be required to meet those objectives. If the aim is to help people rebuild homes after displacement, you could calculate the cost of reconstructing a basic shelter. If the aim is livelihood recovery, you can calculate the cost of restocking or seeds and tools needed.

It is important to take into account factors like household debt. Where families have been using debt as a coping mechanism, it is very likely that this will have to be paid off before money is used for other activities.

c) What is the number of people/households that need to receive cash to make a sufficient impact?

Will spreading funds thinly over a number of people have more impact than giving a larger sum to a few in order to effect significant change to their situation?

The response to this question is based on careful economic analysis (e.g. needs) coupled with a delicate balancing of risks (inflationary impact, security). Some of the risks are described below.

d) What possible negative impacts do I need to consider?

Inflation

Care has to be taken to assess potential inflationary impact. This is likely to happen where demand will outstrip supply when cash is provided (if food supply is inadequate, for example). If cash injections cause inflation, groups not targeted for CFW may end up being unable to access food themselves, causing major negative impact.

In a situation where the target group and amount is small proportionate to the size of the economy, negative impact is unlikely. For example, cash transfers to a specific section of a community within a large urban setting is unlikely to unbalance the wider economy.

In Kenya, we used CFW to help people recover from the effects of drought. When the programme started, people still had food needs that were being met by free food distribution. We decided that the programmes should run in parallel. This would ensure that people were able to use the cash earned for recovery activities not food needs, and that availability of food in the market would mean inflation was limited. It also meant that people would eat the food distributed to them, thereby ensuring greater nutritional impact.

Impact of CFW on other community participation projects

Other NGOs & development actors should be consulted over the implementation of CFW programmes. Paying people for community projects may have a negative effect on future projects. Methods for limiting this impact should be discussed with stakeholders.

In Turkana we tried to emphasise that the project was being carried out to help communities to recover from the drought. Cash was being distributed only for the purpose of recovery. The team also targeted households included in food relief. These were ways of demonstrating the cash was form of relief donation that was bringing an extra public good, not a direct payment for work.





Security

Will the activity make the community, individuals within the community or the organisation more vulnerable to insecurity? For example, communities or staff may be vulnerable to bandit attack when cash is being, or has just been, distributed. Individuals within the community may be targeted when people know they have received cash. Less obviously, vulnerable individuals may be pressured to hand over a proportion of their earnings to bullying relatives or dominant community characters.

It may be necessary to take mitigation measures as detailed below.

Impact on community & household-level relationships

As in any programming that may benefit some community members more than others, intra-community conflict is a risk. Nevertheless this is manageable with proper accompaniment as described elsewhere.

One risk rarely considered is the potential for conflict within households. The distribution of commodities such as food is relatively neutral, with established systems for management at household level. These systems may not be appropriate, but they rarely involve conflict. Cash can be another matter entirely.

Box 5: Threat of conflict in families in Wajir.

We wanted to target women beneficiaries for CFW programming, even where males were present. This is because experience of food distribution and other activities showed that women, as household managers and carers, were more likely to use the resources for the benefit of the whole family.

When we surveyed communities in Wajir before starting CFW, one of the main fears mentioned by women was an increase in conflict in the family (including domestic violence) as a result of disputes over how to use cash. In families where the availability of lump sums of cash was rare or even unknown, they feared that their priorities would not be respected despite the fact they had earned the money.⁷

Monitoring has shown that in general these fears were not realised. Nevertheless, mitigation measures must be in place.

Mitigation measures are based on ensuring that the whole community plays an active role in planning activities and selecting beneficiaries. These issues must be discussed openly and traditional or community structures used to ensure women can have confidence in their personal security.

Misuse of cash

In some communities the misuse of cash by beneficiaries is a greater risk than others. Typical misuse includes excessive consumption of alcohol or other drugs, gambling, spending on commercial sex workers or purchase of weapons.

Again, the best way to reduce the risk of misuse is to raise community awareness during planning, repeatedly explaining the purpose of the programme and the positive impact of spending cash wisely. It may be useful to get the support of community leaders (particularly religious leaders or elders) in emphasising the negative consequences of misuse using terms that the community can understand. In addition, targeting of beneficiaries by their peers in communities can act as a moral pressure on individuals to use money appropriately, thereby justifying their targeting.

⁷ Wajir Household Food Security Survey, Ahono Busili, Oxfam, 2000





Cash can also be misused unintentionally. Sometimes beneficiaries are not experienced enough to know how to use it for effective investments, for example. Impact assessment from Wajir suggested that where people had previous experience of business or trade, they made more long-term investments and these investments were more likely to be successful. Fatuma Adow Malicha's story reflects this finding.

Box 6 - the story of Fatuma Adow Malicha

Fatuma is one of the displaced people who migrated to Danaba from Bute during the clan clashes between the Ajuran and Garre in 1999.

Her husband died after they settled in Danaba, leaving her with her co-wife and the children. During the clashes, she also lost a son from the other wife. She now has six children to support.

Three out of her six children are attending school with her brother in Moyale. This does not mean that her responsibility is reduced she says, because she supports another three children from her co-wife. Two of her children are below school going age and one of her daughters is married.

Back in Bute, Fatuma and her husband were peasant farmers. They earned their living through the sale of firewood and building posts. They had lost most of their livestock to the past droughts. Although they were poor, she recalls they were settled and had a shelter. On top of that Bute was a bigger settlement than Danaba, which meant she had a good market for the firewood and the building posts, but in Danaba, with a much smaller population, it is harder to make ends meet.

When they migrated to Danaba they had only two cows, a calf and a donkey between her and her co-wife.

The community identified her to work on the CFW project because she supports two families. She worked at the reservoir project for one month and earned about £70.

She used this money to start a small kiosk in the open-air market, where she trades in sugar and other household necessities. The small business helped her to buy six goats, essential household utensils and marry off her daughter. The last happy event is significant both economically (fewer dependents, more external support) and socially (self-respect through increased value in the community).

When asked how she managed to do all this with £70, she mentioned two key factors:

- Her experience of dealing in firewood and building sticks helped her start and manage the small kiosk. She knew how to set prices to make sure she made a small profit. She knew how to encourage people to buy.
- Relief food supplemented part of household food requirement.

The programme helped her establish an income-generating activity and rebuild her assets. The goats will act as her bank savings, which will be ploughed back into the kiosk if the need arises. At the time of the interview she said she had £20 in cash.

Where communities are not so confident in managing cash, it may be necessary to go through extra discussion and support processes with them. Annex 2 suggests how you can go about this.





4.4. Examples of cash for work activities

Table 1: Examples of CFW activities and their scope

Type of activity	Typical number of households involved ⁸	Typical cash transfer possible ⁹ (GBP)	Type of work
Rehabilitation of existing water supplies			
Pan or dam de-silting	200	100	Heavy – digging & carrying
Improvement of shallow wells	40	100	Mixed – some skilled labour required.
Construction of reservoirs	20	125	Mixed – some skilled labour required.
Construction of troughs for watering animals	5	30	Mixed
Sanitation			
Construction of refuse pits	5	45	Heavy - digging
Construction of night soil disposal pits	100	100	As pans
Town cleaning	400	125	Mixed – light
Infrastructure			
Road bush clearing, rehabilitation of access roads	1 km per hh	125	Mixed - heavy
Construction of community centres, schools, dispensaries etc.	20 - 50	100	Mixed – some skilled labour required
Shelter			
Manufacture of <i>dufuls</i> (mats for Somali huts)	6,000	20	Light
Collection of timber for shelter construction	1,200	125	Medium

⁸ Direct beneficiaries of the CFW project.

⁹ Based on Kenya rates of about GBP 3 earned per person per day & based on the average number of days worked on that type of project at standard rates





4.5. Lessons we learned the hard way

During our experience of planning CFW, we found a number of challenges that should be noted. Many of them are rather basic development lessons. They are easy to forget in a more pressured humanitarian situation!

a) Careful how you discuss CFW before finding a project!

Discussing CFW as a possible solution to a community's problems may result in communities concentrating on finding any work in order to secure an opportunity to earn money.

This occurred in Turkana in a number of villages. During discussions with communities, cash was cited as a need. When it was clear Oxfam had cash available for projects, communities suggested projects that were of no long-term use to the community.

b) Be careful not to raise expectations!

Avoid discussing projects and CFW before establishing a realistic possibility for a project.

c) Be aware of history of work projects in the area – innovation may be necessary!

In Turkana, we found roads were often suggested, because the communities had worked on them before for food for work schemes - but once cleared these roads had not been used. Other villages had history of poor maintenance of water systems previously funded by Oxfam.

It was also observed that in Wajir, work projects tended to be limited to the familiar. They were effective, but there may have been other ways to be more effective.

d) Never allocate projects to communities!

In some communities, particularly where there is routine distribution of free food relief, there is a heavy dependency on aid. It appears that communities have rarely been asked to find solutions to problems. Sometimes communities need encouragement to think of solutions but this needs to be a participatory process.

e) Be aware of authorities influencing projects to meet their own needs!

Some projects may be proposed by local authorities because their perception of need is different from that suggested by livelihood analysis, or the community itself.

Roads, for example, are a common request as they enable administration and security forces to visit areas with vehicles. However, roads may be of little use to the communities themselves. If the population value the road in terms of access to medical facilities or security then they may be appropriate, but if it is only the authorities that want it, then the road is unlikely to be maintained.





5. Implementation

5.1. Management & staffing

There is so much emphasis on appropriate community participation, that the implementing team must have the capacity to do this well.

Ideally, the team should have a good understanding of the community. Staff who carry out assessments and discussions with communities about projects should use participatory techniques and have a keen awareness of issues like gender.

If the livelihood analysis and project selection is not carried out properly in the first place the programme will suffer in the long term.

a) Managing and supervising projects

CFW is demanding in terms of time. The process of accompanying and encouraging communities needs a lot of commitment. Consideration should be given to the number of projects proposed and how they can be managed.

- How often should the supervisor visit each community?
- How much time does each one need?
- How mobile does that supervisor need to be?

A large number of projects may be proposed but the supervisor needs visit each project regularly. Ideally, once work is under way, an Oxfam supervisor should visit each location no less than once every 2 weeks, depending on the type of activity. The number of supervisors should be based on the location of sites and mobility of supervisor.

Another way to improve supervisory capacity is to work with reliable local organisations.

b) Logistical and technical support

It is advisable to have a logistician working on the project, particularly where there are construction projects. Government and other organisations can support, but effective logistics management is crucial.

Most activities will require the provision of basic tools and equipment (hoes, machetes, rubber gloves) and construction projects will require materials too.

A logistician can also stay in the field with government staff if necessary and ensure accountability for materials. They can also assist in the planning and supervision of the projects.

c) Site Supervisor

Each project should have their own supervisor elected by beneficiaries to record attendance and work progress. The site supervisor needs to be given stationery and any equipment required to carry out their job satisfactorily. Where there is no literate community member, other arrangements will have to be made.

d) Technical Staff

Technical supervision is of the utmost importance to ensure good quality activities. Employing a range of technical staff to supervise diverse programmes may not be cost effective, however.

Seconding staff from local government or other organisations can provide assistance. This can also be a way of building the capacity of local government and other organisations.





If the quality of government staff is assured, it may be possible to simply second the staff to carry out the work with an input from the Technical Advisor. In cases where skills levels and reliability of government staff are not known, an Oxfam technician should work with the government staff on a day to day basis to ensure the quality of work and share skills.

It is vital to ensure that technical staff have the community development skills to enable them to support the communities effectively. Work activities need someone skilled in organising the communities, communicating effectively what is required and then monitoring progress tactfully and supportively.

Issues to consider when seconding staff from outside Oxfam:

- A clear term of reference is required, including clarity about standards.
- Management and reporting arrangements must be clear. Means of resolving disputes or performance problems must be made clear.
- All stakeholders must understand roles and responsibilities.
- Seconded staff need to understand Oxfam's expectations, including code of conduct and other behavioural standards.
- Budget for food, accommodation and transport needs, out of station allowances is agreed in advance.

e) Contracting technicians

In projects where there is need of a skilled technician, contracts should be agreed for each job. Examples of these kinds of projects include spring protection or reservoir construction, where masons and other skilled workers are required.

Like the technical supervisors, contracting technicians must be prepared to work and organise assistance from the local community.

Beware of staff (especially seconded staff) contracting friends - tender for contracts or use communities to help selection if labour is locally available.

An experienced Oxfam technician should check the standard of work carried out before any payments are made.



**Box 7: Implementation constraints in Turkana**

In 2001, Oxfam decided to implement CFW in Turkana. As far as we were aware, this was the first time it had been done in Turkana. Oxfam already had a food distribution programme. The Oxfam team did not have much experience but staff were enthusiastic.

There were some initial problems with community mobilisation. The inexperienced team were not sure how to involve the communities in developing project ideas. They ended up offering them a shopping list of projects and asking them to choose. Many were inappropriate and the community did not understand the idea of CFW. The team was also male-dominated and had their own views about what was appropriate for women. They didn't understand how to structure meetings and conversations to capture women's views. The exercise had to be done again.

The team finally decided on 13 micro-projects spread over an area of 200 km x 200 km approx. They were mainly water and roads activities. The funded proposal included a logistician and other support, but the team felt they had enough capacity with a Project Coordinator and Recovery Programme Supervisor. A local government water supervisor was seconded to help with technical supervision.

The programme ran into some management problems. There were too many activities being carried out at the same time. Distances were huge. Communities had little experience and needed a lot of support. The team tried to use Oxfam food monitors to help supervise in their locations, but they did not have the right skills and they were often absent from their locations between food distributions.

There were logistics problems, with slow delivery of materials and sub-standard equipment delaying activities.

The programme was also troubled by problems with the government secondments. The first officer seconded lacked skills and experience, and was replaced. The second was untrustworthy and lacked interest. The Nairobi-based Oxfam water technician didn't have enough time to be able to support technical supervision for every activity in Turkana and elsewhere. Eventually, negligence on the part of the technical team resulted in a construction activity having to be pulled down and restarted at considerable cost.

However, the team managed to get the programme back on track. The combination of an HSP Project Coordinator and local Recovery Supervisor worked well. They complemented each other's weakness – strong knowledge of project management and Oxfam standards, coupled with a good understanding of the local communities and how to mobilise them. The secondment of a government public health technician to work alongside an Oxfam Public Health Promoter was also a great success. The Oxfam staff member came from Uganda, bringing experience, a fresh perspective and a real work ethic. The government technician gained new experiences and skills, as well as motivation, which continued well after the Oxfam staff member left.

Technical constraints were addressed by making sure more technical supervision was provided from Nairobi, and by more supervision visits from the project headquarters. Some of the government staff agreed to work for free to make up for mistakes. A driver/logistician was deployed with a pick-up, based largely in the field. He was able to meet logistics needs more effectively, as well as being able to play a supervisory role at work sites.

Later, when the project faced challenges such as security problems, the team was able to manage them effectively.





5.2. Beneficiary selection

It is unlikely that any activity will be able to target all the population; therefore some form of selection procedure will need to be used. Methods of selection have to be adapted according to the community.

In East Africa, there is an existing system of community-based management of food relief. This means that many communities have elected relief committees that can be effective in establishing targeting criteria and selecting beneficiaries against them.¹⁰

Even with these systems, adjustments may have to be made locally. For example, in Turkana the method of selection had to be adapted to each community. It was initially thought selection could be carried out with the assistance of relief committees that already existed for distributing food. However, it became clear that some villages did not trust their relief committees and elders. Therefore a basic procedure of selection was decided on which was adjusted to the local situation.

a) Deciding who to target

The livelihoods assessment should give the basis for the number and identity of people need to be targeted by the programme. The detailed targeting decision is likely to be based on a judgement of who within a community is most vulnerable - those in the community worst affected by the crisis. Some form of initial criteria will need to be decided on by Oxfam to assist communities with the targeting. However, it should be communities themselves who actually decide who is to benefit from the programme.

Box 8: Methods of selection in Turkana.

In order to start beneficiary selection process, a *baraza* (a large community meeting) was held. The objective of the CFW project was explained to the community emphasising the dual purpose and benefit of the project. Then we discussed why Oxfam wanted to target the poorest in the community. The community was asked who the poorest people were.

Initially, the response was that all people were poor - all people had lost animals in the drought. Explaining that it was not possible to help all people, they were asked who was more vulnerable. The community began to define the most vulnerable. Suggestions given included widows, concubines, those with no animals, the last wife of a polygamous marriage, the elderly and sick. At the end of this discussion the Relief Committee, elders and trusted community members were asked to select a set number of households that they believed were the most vulnerable in their community. Oxfam would verify the names with all the community at the next *baraza*.

On returning to the community a few days later, another *baraza* was held. The issue of vulnerability was discussed again. Then the listed people were called out to stand in front of the community. The meeting was then asked to confirm the selections.

If the community had failed to select beneficiaries, a random selection was held. One person in the community was selected at random by the Oxfam member of staff and asked to name a number of vulnerable people. These people stood up in front of the village for the community to confirm. Once the community had discussed, the process was repeated. Once there was a sufficient number of beneficiaries, the community was asked to confirm everyone selected, and to discuss whether or not there was anyone more vulnerable who had been left out.

¹⁰ Manuals exist for managing this process. See “Working in emergencies; practical guidance from the field”, Birch, Oxfam 1996, or “Community Based Targeting and Distribution Manual, WFP, 2000” (based in part on Oxfam GB system).





These methods of selection can work well in small communities where Oxfam is already working. A representative group elected from a few hundred households knows the community well enough to have detailed discussions about assets, family size, special circumstances and so on. People in the wider community know each other well enough to challenge these decisions. Oxfam staff have a good enough understanding of the communities to assess whether the process is going to plan.

In other circumstances, the “total involvement” approach may not be appropriate. The size of the community may make general public meetings impossible to manage. Power structures in the community may mean that people cannot be honest or challenge decisions. Cultural perceptions of vulnerability and what it means to be poor may lead people to prioritise inappropriately or avoid being labelled vulnerable. Some communities just don’t know each other well enough (urban, displaced etc.)

Many of these problems can be worked through with appropriate support and supervision. However, other approaches may need to be developed.

Box 9: Beneficiary selection in an urban setting

One activity proposed in the Turkana CFW programme was town cleaning in Lodwar, the district capital. Oxfam was not working in Lodwar and so did not know each of the communities well. Lodwar also has a large population. Time pressures meant that rather than go to each area of the town and carry out our own sensitisation, Oxfam met with the councillors from each of the wards in the town. The project was explained to the councillors and the criteria for selecting beneficiaries discussed. Councillors were then asked to inform elders and relief committees so that they could nominate people 50 people from each ward. Using this list, the community would narrow it to 30 beneficiaries at small community meetings in each ward, facilitated by Oxfam. Oxfam also met the heads of relief committees to explain the programme and beneficiaries.

At the first meeting, only those nominated came to the meeting. Others had been told to stay away as names had already been chosen. Checking the list independently, Oxfam found that it was made up of elders and various other people who were not vulnerable. The list had to be ignored. Once again, the project was explained to the community and the criteria for beneficiary selection was discussed. The meeting was re-scheduled for a few days later.

Oxfam staff then carried out a mobilisation within each community to inform the community of the selection process. Elders were still asked to put nominees forward. However, this time there was a large number of people present at each meeting to verify the nominees.

Some meetings became very disorganised due to large numbers of people turning up. It was worse in the afternoon when people had taken alcohol. These meetings were cancelled and held again at village level in the mornings. Holding the meetings at village level was more manageable due to the smaller numbers and there was no inter-village rivalry. There were several villages where communities could not choose whom to select, therefore a number of people were put forward and then names were 'drawn out of a hat'.

When supporting the communities to establish criteria for selection, it is advisable to keep records of what criteria were used and why. This supports a deeper livelihood analysis, as well as allowing for monitoring against project objectives. It also allows comparisons of targeting between communities.

b) Issues in beneficiary selection

Vulnerability and ability to take advantage of cash.

As we already know, vulnerability is perceived differently in different communities. This is the logic behind enabling the community to develop targeting criteria. The people whom outsiders perceive as the most vulnerable may not be in reality. If a project is to target the





most vulnerable, some information must be gathered on how communities care for the sick, elderly, disabled and destitute.

For example, different cultures have different ways of dealing with disability. A disabled person may be cared for within a family and treated well. In other cultures, physical disability may be stigmatised and people may not care for their own disabled family members.

Nevertheless, as mentioned above, there is a degree of contradiction in trying to target the most vulnerable members of any community with work projects. The most vulnerable people may not be able to work. In Kenya, some communities included people unable to work, who were then asked to choose someone to work on their behalf - a member of the family, or a trusted friend.

In some cases, it may be that the most vulnerable are not likely to be assisted by CFW, and a parallel intervention needs to cater for their needs. In Kenya, we have always run CFW alongside other initiatives.

Ability to take advantage of cash

The other issue with giving cash for work is how the person benefiting will actually be able to use the cash for long-term benefit. They may not have the skills, capacities or circumstances to enable them to use it. Misuse is another risk.

In a CFW programme where the objective is to rebuild livelihoods, it would be better to find a method of selecting those in the community who are able to make a positive use of the money given. Communities should be allowed to introduce this as a criterion in this case. This may mean the needs of the most vulnerable are not met, and a parallel initiative would do so more effectively.

c) Targeting households vs. individuals

In Kenya we have always targeted households. The reasons are as follows:

- Maintains consistency with other programmes. The programme was part of the wider relief process, so selection was on the same basis as food relief - by household.
- Targets vulnerable people – experience of food distribution suggested that targeting a household would benefit children, sick people and the elderly.
- Provides flexibility, as any member of the household can participate. Therefore if one member of the household was sick or had another household job to do, another member could participate.
- Increases the speed of work. Allowing the whole household to participate meant that the work was carried out faster. In projects such as pangs, where payments were made per area of ground cleared, the more household members who participated, the quicker money could be earned.

d) Number of beneficiaries to select

The number of households to select for a particular project should be based on an estimate of the number of people required to complete the work. The technician overseeing the project should do this assessment.

The other issue to consider is the amount of money you want people to earn - if a hundred people can do a job in two days, would result in many people receiving very little cash. Using fewer people over more days would give a fewer number of people a more significant amount of cash.





5.3. Coordination

The objectives of a CFW programme and the target population need clear explanation to all levels of authority and stakeholders in the community. In many places, CFW is a relatively new idea and may be met with resistance and fear on the part of some stakeholders. Others may try to hijack the programme to meet their own needs. In our experience, the idea of dual objectives (resource transfer and public good) is one with which many stakeholders struggle.

Meetings need to be held which explain the programme. Writing a summary of the programme for distribution to NGOs and authorities is one way to avoid confusion in programme objectives. Annex 3 is an example of an information sheet produced by the Oxfam GB Turkana team for other stakeholders.

Experience shows that higher levels of authority should not always be relied to pass on information about the programme accurately to lower levels. If working with lower levels take time to hold meetings and explain objectives particularly with those actually involved. Ensure that those selecting or participating are given information first hand.

Box 10: Communicating effectively

When initiating activities for a CFW programme in Lodwar town, Turkana, several meetings were held to explain the objectives of the project to a few key councillors. The meeting went well and the project got the go-ahead.

On seeking assistance from other councillors, the explanation process was repeated. This information was then relayed by the councillors to the elders and relief committees who were actually being asked to select beneficiaries. Oxfam did not communicate with the community members directly until the actual selection meeting. There was a high degree of confusion about the purpose of the programme, and the communication process had to begin again.

5.4. Organising the work

a) Day to day supervision

In order to supervise work on a site, beneficiaries should select one person among them who could read and write to be the supervisor. This person could be paid slightly more cash than the other beneficiaries as they must attend work daily and are not able share the workload with other members of the household.

The Community Supervisor's role is to keep a register of attendance and record work carried out by each household.

Where there is no one suitable to supervise, an monitor may have to be employed.

b) Division of work/rate of payment

By far the easiest method of ensuring work is equally carried out is to divide a job into equal units. This also provides an incentive to finish work promptly.

- When digging a pan or dam, households can allocated a unit for clearing (2m*2m*1m is ideal). A rate can then be paid per unit cleared based on an estimate of how long it will take¹¹.
- Roads can be paid per km cleared.
- Materials collected can be paid for by volume (bags of sand, numbers of sticks).

Where it is difficult to divide a job into units, make an agreement between beneficiaries/technicians on how many days the job should take and only pay for that number

¹¹ Oxfam Kenya pays about GBP 4 per unit, based on standard local rates.





of days regardless if they take longer. Tasks that cannot be divided up will need more teamwork and good supervision to avoid disputes between those beneficiaries perceived as working harder than others.

A basic daily rate should be set according to local standard labour rates. Rates should take into account rates paid by other organisations managing similar projects, if applicable.

c) Sensitivity to gender and disability

Supervisors and all programme participants should be sensitised to take into consideration marginalised or weaker members of the community. Where possible, women should be allowed to work flexible hours to fit in with childcare and household duties. Weaker members of the community should be allocated less strenuous tasks - if the project is for the community it is hoped that fitter/stronger members of the community will accept to work harder than weaker members for no extra charge.

d) Working hours

Each community should agree on the hours they wish to work. The distance the community has to walk to the project needs to be considered, as do the needs of vulnerable beneficiaries as mentioned above. Security may also be a factor.

5.5. Transferring the cash

a) Making payments

The following issues need to be considered in planning payments:

- Ideal frequency to pay beneficiaries.
- Access to cash from bank. If money needs to be ordered in advance it may take some days.
- Order small denominations and try and get the same denominations for each beneficiary for ease of counting and distribution. It can also reduce suspicion if beneficiaries get similar looking bundles.
- Counting money takes time (counting for 100 beneficiaries can take several hours).

b) Security of cash disbursements

Planning

- All stakeholders in the community (elders, politicians, non recipients) should be informed about how payments will be made.
- Other organisations should be consulted.
- Ensure understanding of consequences of any security threat i.e. withdrawal and suspension of programmes in the area. Sensitisation is the best strategy – communities will protect you to protect themselves.

Who pays & who knows

- Limit the number of people who have information about payments. Only 2-3 people should have access to information about when a payment is to be made.
- Beneficiaries in the field should not know when a payment is to be made.
- Staff local and/or long standing staff should be involved in making payments (lessens the risk of theft long standing staff have a job at stake and local staff are less likely to steal from their own community)

Handling the money

- Allow plenty of time for counting cash.





- Count and package cash for each beneficiary in the bank.
- Money, once counted, should be kept in the bank safe in a sealed box until the day of payment.
- Avoid keeping cash at office.
- Decentralise distribution as far as possible, so smaller amounts of money are travelling to different locations.

Timing

- Payments should be made on a random basis. Do not always leave to make payments the day after counting at the bank. Observers will start to notice the pattern.
- Disbursements should be little and often - however this may not be preferable to the community (See Annex 2).

Movement

- Divide cash at least in two and hide in different parts of car (attackers may leave once they have some money).
- Vary locations of payments if possible, especially in towns.
- Vary routes to and from the field.
- Using non-Oxfam vehicles is a possibility, although once it is known other vehicles are being used, every vehicle in district could be at risk.

Paying people in the communities

- Ensure that the community selects a safe, controlled location for cash disbursements.
- Call in 3 beneficiaries at a time, to receive money. Calling in individuals can lead to accusations of wrongdoing; failure to control numbers can result in chaos.
- Select a numerate beneficiary to count the money and ensure that each beneficiary understands the denominations received.
- Payment sheets need to be produced for each community with name and ID if possible. A copy of each payment sheet should be filed per community for ease of checking the number of payments made.
- All beneficiaries must sign or give a fingerprint for money received.
- In absence of formal ID system (cards etc), ensure a community member or an Oxfam staff member from that village can assure the identity of the beneficiary.

c) Other security measures

Police or other armed escorts

It is not normally Oxfam policy to use armed escorts. Special permission must be sought to do so¹².

In our experience, using a police escort may not improve security in this kind of operation. It means that the information of when a payment is due to be made is shared amongst a greater number of people. If you do not normally use escorts, cash movements will be easy for observers to monitor.

¹² See Oxfam Security Policy.





Using couriers from community for payments

One option for disbursement of cash is to ask beneficiaries from community to come into the office to collect cash. One beneficiary could be elected to represent a group of people and Oxfam could cover travel expenses. This would reduce risk to Oxfam staff but might create other obvious problems.

5.6. Monitoring & impact assessment

This is vital to ensure that the risks identified have been mitigated, and that CFW has contributed to programme objectives.

The purpose and anticipated outputs of the programme are based on a series of assumptions detailed in the risks and assumptions section of the programme proposal. To ensure that the purpose of the programme is achieved, it is vital that these assumptions are tested through impact monitoring. Proper monitoring will enable us to adjust the programme approach if anticipated impacts are not being achieved.

Monitoring needs to focus on a range of areas including:

- Broad economic impacts (inflation, trading activity, terms of trade)
- Household level impacts (use of cash, impact on family relations, gender impact).
- Impact of activities.

Baseline information is vital for meaningful monitoring and impact assessment. Annexes 4 & 5 are some tools used by the Kenya programme, including a list of questions and household survey sheets. The examples will need to be adapted according to specific programme priorities.

If you want reliable information, concentrate on a small team of people who can move around collecting quality information. They should have time and speak to people in their homes away from influences of other members of the community.





Annex 1: Assessment

a) Structures

- Local administration systems, what exists and their reliability.
- Community and traditional structures, and how they relate to local administration.
- Committees, CBOs, NGOs - their activities, possibilities for co-ordination and co-operation.
- Communities' perception/trust of authorities. (This is very important to ensure smooth selection of beneficiaries & distribution of cash).
- Strength of communities, level of co-operation? Are the community experienced in working together? How long have they lived together as a community?
- How are the vulnerable perceived in the community? Are the existing support systems for the vulnerable?

b) Population

- Population figures, livelihoods, distribution.
- Target population who are the most vulnerable.

c) General Situation

- Security: relations between different groups.
- Geographical environment.

d) Needs

- What are the priority needs for the community? If possible this should include a consideration of nutritional and other deficits, as well as longer term needs. This will enable an analysis of the amount of support required, and indicate possible work projects for delivering it. Examples:
 - Shelter: Are there any needs, if so why, are there resources available.
 - Water: Water quality, quantity, sources accessibility.
 - Education, food access, infrastructure, security, health data.

e) Logistics

- Access to area
- Communications
- Availability of local materials
- Tools and equipment
- Building materials in local towns
- Storage facilities.

f) Economic Data

- What do the community trade in cash or barter?
- What do people commonly buy and sell? Do they normally source food through purchase? Which foods are on the market?
- What would do people if they had money? Who keeps the money in the household and who decides how to spend it?





- What is the level of economic activity? Level knowledge of cash/business? What is the level of trading? Who controls trade?
- Level of household debt.

g) Labour

- What kind of work do communities normally do? Who does it?
- How do the most vulnerable community members normally meet their needs?





Annex 2 - Community Sensitisation Sheet: Use of Cash

a) Objective

To raise awareness in a community on the use of cash from a CFW programme.

b) Background

Before implementing a CFW programme use of cash and the level of financial awareness in a community should be examined. Raising awareness of economic issues and how money can be used sustainably should be considered an essential component of implementing a CFW scheme.

c) Why raise awareness?

- Beneficiaries may have little experience in handling cash; they may only be used to barter trade. If beneficiaries have little experience of cash, they will have little knowledge of the value of goods and are at risk of being misused.
- Beneficiaries may have limited skills in managing larger quantities of money.
- Ideas should be shared on how to use cash - investing, starting small businesses, sustainability of cash etc.
- Beneficiaries need to be warned against fraudsters, dishonest traders.
- Beneficiaries need to be warned against officials asking bribes.

d) Process of Raising Awareness:

Stage 1: Understanding the context

In the initial baseline survey carried out before implementation, questions should be included that establish the financial awareness in the community and level of the cash economy. The baseline must also provide information on what people currently spend money on, what they would plan to spend money on if they had it available and what is the minimum sum of money that would actually make an impact in their current situation.

Stage 2: Clarifying purpose

Before implementing discuss with communities why the CFW is going ahead what the money is intended to do.

- Money is a one off donation in exchange for work.
- This is a one off programme by Oxfam to help the most vulnerable; communities should not expect to be paid for community work in future. The project that they are to work on is a benefit to the whole community it belongs to the community, they must maintain it.

Stage 3: Practical matters

Once programme is being implemented, a discussion must be held with beneficiaries on the following:

- Discussion with beneficiaries on how they want to receive payment
- Do people want it as cash or in a good they can barter?
- Do they want it paid in one payment or several?

Oxfam should initiate a discussion with beneficiaries all the pros and cons of the questions posed.

For example, having money in small amounts means it can easily be spent on a number of small items therefore leaving none for investment. Family members will start arriving asking





for contributions. Let the community decide through discussion what is best; try to avoid a few people influencing the majority.

A problem for Oxfam is taking all money at once creates a security issue. This needs to be balanced with community preferences.

Stage 4: Discussion with community on the use of cash

This is a real opportunity to make a difference if used well.

Ideally the livelihoods assessment will have formed a basis for developing an appropriate training or sensitisation session on the use of cash. Obviously the training/sensitisation needs relates the level of awareness in the community.

Issues to discuss:

- Value of cash - at the most basic level it may be necessary to sensitise communities on what money actually is: the colour and design of the notes and coins, what can be brought for different amounts.
- Inexperienced communities are vulnerable to dishonest members of community.
- Information on local taxes, ask the chief/local government to make clear if there are any local taxes that people are supposed to pay. Chief/elders to state in public that the money earned belongs to that household no money should be given to anyone outside the household unless in exchange for goods.
- Investing cash or saving money (inc.: methods of keeping money safe.)
- Starting a small business.
- School fees, medical care.
- Buying animals.
- Discuss with elderly and disabled what they are going to do - how to avoid relatives taking and wasting the money.

Hopefully once a discussion session is initiated and community will suggest ideas to each other, Oxfam role should be point out the practicalities involved try and move from the idea to implementation process. Give ideas how to get started.

This session could or should be repeated and sensitisation reiterated when cash is distributed.

Stage 5: Monitoring

- Changes in the economy increase and decrease in exchange of goods.
- Trader interviews.
- Price surveys.
- Interview beneficiaries,
- Interview non-beneficiaries in the village (they may give a different point of view - beneficiaries have spent money on alcohol, guns, etc.)





Annex 3 – Example of CFW information sheet for communicating with stakeholders.

Oxfam GB Turkana - Recovery Programme November 2001

The Oxfam Recovery Programme - Turkana intends to introduce a programme of Cash for Work (CFW) projects in Lokitaung sub-district. The programme has three aims:

- a) To provide support to drought-affected communities through a direct cash transfer.
- b) To select appropriate and technically viable work projects that will benefit the wider community.
- c) To contribute to Oxfam's understanding of alternatives to free food distribution and the impact of CFW.

Why cash for work?

Food relief may save lives but it only solves the immediate problem. If pastoralists are to recover from drought, further resources are required which will allow them to rebuild their livelihoods, pay for essential basic services and thus enable a rapid recovery from the effects of the drought.

Advantages of Cash for Work:	Disadvantages of Cash for Work:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It provides households with a degree of choice with regard to their own spending priorities. • Cost effective in comparison to alternatives (restocking, seed distribution etc.). • Low distribution costs. • Beneficiaries receive greater proportion of donated money. • Boosts the local economy. • The CFW projects themselves provide social benefits to the community as a whole. • Can improve women's and marginalised groups status. • Self-targeting because wages will be at an unattractive minimum wage. • Reduces risk of corruption (money is earned and hence more valuable to beneficiaries). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work is often inappropriate for the most vulnerable (sick, old, children). • The workload of women is increased. • Women may not retain control of income. • May be abused e.g.: purchase of tobacco and alcohol. • Only viable in cash economies. • Higher security risk. • Inflationary pressure. • CFW may effect community participation in the future community projects. • Potential for corruption.

Measures to reduce disadvantages:

- Community sensitisation and training of effective methods of managing cash.
- Clear criteria for selection of beneficiaries.
- Ask communities for solutions to assisting most vulnerable.
- Extra security measures and close monitoring of payments.
- If cash is not commonly used, give out goods for barter.

Projects:

- Communities have been asked to suggest projects/activities that they believe will improve their lives.





- Other stakeholders (government and NGOs) are being consulted as part of the selection process.
- Oxfam staff and the relevant government departments will provide technical support.
- Proposed projects include: de-silting or digging pans, building reservoirs, shallow wells, troughs and clearing roads, if communities have other ideas these will be considered.
- Lasting impact and sustainability will be a key criteria in the selection of projects, communities must see the potential benefits of the project and therefore have an interest in the project being a success.

Beneficiaries:

- It will be the responsibility of Relief Committee and the community to select beneficiaries.
- Selection will be based on a criteria outlined by Oxfam but clearly defined by the community through discussions based on what constitutes vulnerability in their community.
- Beneficiaries must be the poorer members of the community, those unlikely to recover from the effects of drought without assistance (i.e. households with no animals).
- Women will be targeted in order to have an impact on nutritional status.
- Possible solutions to targeting the most vulnerable the sick, old and disabled will be discussed with the whole community e.g.: paying per task which adds flexibility and selecting HHs as beneficiaries therefore different members of family can contribute.
- Screening of beneficiaries will be done with the involvement of the beneficiary community.

Measuring Impact:

- Use of cash, comparing with data on use of income from Food Security Assessments over past to 2 years.
- Market prices will be monitored and traders interviewed.
- Access of CFW to the most vulnerable, though discussions with the community.
- Movement of people will be monitored into CFW areas.
- Number of CFW Community Projects started and successfully completed and maintained.





Annex 4 - Areas of interest for monitoring

Who are the beneficiaries of cash for work?

- What kinds of people benefit directly from cash for work?
- What is their profile? (Male / female? Old / young? Pastoralists / destitutes?)
- How vulnerable are they within the context of their community?
- Where are they?
- How were they chosen?
- Are there any indirect beneficiaries and how do they benefit?
- How are people using the money?
- Is trading activity increasing? How is the livestock market?

What is the impact on livelihood recovery?

- How is the income being used?
- Who is controlling the income and deciding how it will be spent?
- What is the impact on the wider economy? (Private traders, people who did not benefit directly)

What is the impact of the activities themselves?

- Are the work projects useful and relevant to the community?
- How will the outputs be managed in the longer term?
- Which activities seem to be the most cost effective?
- Some activities are not producing public but private goods (shelter). This means that some of the activities are producing benefits that will be controlled by individuals, not communities. How are these resources being used?
- Are the activities having a negative impact on anyone? For example, will the supply of shelter materials in Wajir undermine private individuals or community groups trying to provide the same service?
- What is the impact of the work itself? Who is doing the work (beneficiary profile)? How are they managing to fit in the extra work? Have they stopped pursuing other livelihood recovery activities in order to join the CFW?

Other impacts?

- Is the CFW supporting or damaging prospects for improved gender relations?
- Is the project having any impacts that we did not anticipate? Has it affected the consumption of alcohol or miraa, or the price of firearms, for example? Security?
- Is there any evidence to suggest that people might be displacing themselves or abandoning other coping mechanisms to join CFW projects?

Other

- What are we learning about how to manage these kinds of projects? If another organisation came to ask our advice about how to implement CFW, what is the most important thing that we could say to them?





- Is cash the best way to make resource transfers in the areas where we work? If not, what else should we be doing?

Impact monitoring by activity

Attached is a pro forma for the collection of monitoring information for each activity. This monitoring sheet is designed to systematically gather information about the impact of each activity.

These monitoring sheets should be completed for each activity. Some small-scale short activities may only require one sheet to be completed. Others may require several sheets to be completed over time (at least one per month) to try to track changes.

There are bound to be some gaps in this pro forma – modifications may need to be made.

Impact monitoring in areas where no activities are being implemented

It is important that we have some way of comparing the data collected to what is happening in other areas. This will help us understand how far changes in the situation are due to cash for work. It is important therefore to select some areas where CFW is not being implemented and also collect the same monitoring information.

Monitoring at district level

There is other information needed that is not going to be easily available at activity level. There may be other information sources at wider levels that can support analysis (e.g. Early Warning Bulletins).

It may also be useful to look for indicators at district level such as school attendance figures, trading information from key contacts, health centre attendance information. This could all be proxy indicators of an improved or worsening economic situation.

All this information has to be coupled with a really good analysis of the economy, impact of external events etc. so that we can understand whether or not the prevailing trends are positive or negative, and place our impact analysis firmly in this context.





Annex 5 - Checklist for monitoring the CFW project

(To be used at project level)

Name of project: Date commenced: Date project ends:

Major project activity

Location:

(I). RISKS AND ASSUMPTIONS

1. Current rains have a lasting impact.

Amount of rainfall (tick one)	Impact on CFW project	Impact on livelihoods
Adequate and well distributed		
Inadequate		
Scattered showers		
Other		

2. General food distribution continues at appropriate levels:

No of beneficiaries for:	Planned ration	Actual ration distributed	Percentage distributed planned Vs	Reason for the difference (if any)
a). General ration				
b). Food for work				
c). Other				

- Any other form of food assistance to the project area (e.g. food for work)





3. Inflationary impact of CFW is limited and manageable

o Total amount of cash distributed this month: _____

	Current Price per unit	Indicate if price is 1. Low 2. High 3. Fair 4. Normal and acceptable	This is attributed to: 1. CFW 2. Other source of cash ¹³ 3. Both None	Is it related to food aid available?	What is the impact?
Mature cattle					
Mature goat					
One bag of cereal/maize					
One litre of milk					
One bag of pulses					
Amount of cash distributed this month					
Other					

4. Beneficiaries use cash for livelihood recovery

How is cash from CFW utilized?	Proportion	Reasons (e.g. health services provided)

5. CFW in a mixed cash/non cash economy

a). Indicate whether this location is urban, peri-urban or rural _____

b). Effect of the CFW on the economy

Effect	Proportion
1. Magnetic effect (people settling because of CFW)	
2. People moving away?	
3. Lack or increased food available?	
4. Pastoralists purchasing power (terms of trade) improved	
5. Recent drop outs able to return to pastoralism	

¹³ Indicate source of cash





6. Herd sizes grow	
Other	
Other	

6. Security remains stable

- a). How was security this month?
- b). How did it affect staff movement?
- c). How did it affect CFW project implementation?

II. OUTPUT ORIENTED ISSUES

Output 1		
70,000 vulnerable people including at least 6,000 women-headed households benefit from improved income through cash for work projects that benefit the wider community in Turkana and Wajir Districts b March 2002	Number of people directly participating in this project	
	Number of women participating directly	
	Total number of people benefiting directly	
	Number of households represented by participants	
	Number of female-headed households participating in the project	
	Criteria used in selection of beneficiaries (Community based targeting or other*)	
	<p>Inputs</p> <p>1. Amount paid per participant this month: _____</p> <p>2. Quantity of work completed this month: _____</p> <p>3. Total amount paid this month: _____</p> <p>Problems encountered and how they were resolved</p> <p>1.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>3.</p>	

* If other, indicate the modality in this space.





b). Indicate whether the purchasing power of the community has improved (e.g. better terms of trade etc)

Output 2 (Wajir only)		
Pastoralists from 12 divisions in Wajir District benefit from improved income through sale of healthy livestock at fair prices by September 2001	Number of pastoral households benefiting from improved income	
	Number of households selling healthy livestock	
	Indicate whether reason for selling is related to a) distress or b) income	
	Indicate whether the price this month, is fair, too low or too high	
	Total number of pastoral associations in the location	
	Total number of pastoral associations that received subsidized drugs this month	
	Describe the selection criteria of the participating pastoral (CBT or other)	
	Number of heads of livestock purchased by households this month	
	Number of heads of livestock purchased at good market prices through subsidized purchase programme.	
	<p>Inputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amount of subsidized drugs distributed to ___ pastoral associations this month 2. Other (specify) <p>Problems encountered and how they were resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 	





Output 3		
Oxfam & partners capacity to monitor, implement responses & influence action on effects of drought maintained	i. Number of staff on the ground	
	ii. Oxfam staff participating in DSG meetings this month	
	iii. Number of coordination meetings held with other agencies	
	<p>Inputs</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. <p>Problems encountered (refer to Output 1&2) and how these problems were resolved.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2. 3. 	

III. ANY OTHER ISSUE

