

CASH Working Group Syrian Refugee Response in Jordan

Meeting Location	UNHCR–Large Conference Room	Meeting Date	28.10.2013
Chair Person	Volker Schimmel Kate Washington	Meeting Time	15:00-16:00
Minutes Prepared by	Angeliki Panagoulia		
Purpose of Meeting	Regular CWG meeting (focus RRP6 Review process)		

1.) Summary of action points

Number of action point or discussion	Action point	Focal Point / Organization
1.)	Final comments and remarks on the CASH draft chapter to be submitted no later than the 5 th of November	Volker Schimmel-UNHCR /Kate Washington-CARE
2.)	RRP6 CASH Chapter: to include cooperation with other Appeal procedures (SRC, ICRC and IFRC Appeal)	Volker Schimmel-UNHCR /Kate Washington-CARE
3.)	Organisation of the upcoming meeting on CTP strategy 2014	Kate Washington-CARE

2.) Attachments and References

Documents	Location	Contact Person
CASH WG October 2013 (final draft) baseline		Volker Schimmel-UNHCR
RRP6 CASH WG final draft chapter		Volker Schimmel-UNHCR /Kate Washington-CARE
CWG - RRP6 (List by Activity + Chart on Location/Prioritization)		Volker Schimmel-UNHCR

3.) Minutes

Item	Discussion
<p>RRP6 CASH chapter review process</p>	<p>Presentation of the review process of the RRP6 by Volker Schimmel (UNHCR) and Kate Washington (CARE).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → The CASH Response Plan was reviewed by FOOD and SHELTER sectors during the inter-sectorial meeting on the 24th of October. → Comments on the narrative: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The figures have been added under achievements. • The added value of cash assistance to other forms of support has been underlined. • The data took by the baseline should be reflected to the narrative. • At the population planning figures it has been added the targeted population under the contingency planning. • Under the response strategy, there is a need to elaborate on the cash system for 2014. • We were encouraged to address the coordination among us but also among other organisations and sectors → Ms Merrin Waterhouse, IASC GenCap Advisor, addressed her remarks and positively commented the CASH chapter by giving a 2A. → Activity Info: seems to be a useful tool and transparent. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • After the quality control of the submitted activities, we will contact each partner individually. • Comments on the activities should be added in order for us to be able to understand the flexibility of the project.
<p>Baseline discussion</p>	<p>After technical meetings with limited feedback, a draft baseline was prepared and circulated for feedback:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> → Average family size: The CWG agreed to use 5 as an average family size. → Average vulnerabilities: Based on assessment data, the CWG identifies the average vulnerability rates (the table has been shared to partners). Upon the remark of a partner about people not receiving any health support especially in the south we could reconsider the inclusion of health condition as one of the vulnerability criteria. The size of the family is also a vulnerability issue that should be discussed. Livelihood approach and vulnerability approach is also an issue for further consideration (cf. CTP Strategy 2014) → Average HH Expenditure Structure: Based on a large sample of UNHCR home visit data, a more nuanced cost structure was offered. → Sizing: determination of the appropriate sizing of assistance. The CWG needs to look at the NAF scale and process in more detail.
<p>Reporting on activities</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> → CWG should work on reporting the activities in a monthly basis. The database will be used by all partners as a monitoring tool as well as a tool to design and implement the projects. Everyone should submit the same kind of information so that we have a more comprehensive formula for 2014. Comments or points to be raised about the submissions most welcome.
<p>Next Meeting</p>	<p>The next meeting is scheduled for 4th Nov 2013 at 15:00.</p>