

Projects Funded by START

- Mostly cash based intervention- Reached 88K in 2017 for Flood, cyclone,
- Low to medium scale disaster
- Life saving and good value for money
- Any sectoral response but focused more on Food security and WASH

Why MPG

- To support disaster affected people to meet their basic immediate needs
- To ensure survival Minimum Expenditures Basket (MEB) through one-off grant.
- To prevent affected people from using negative coping mechanism practices among severely vulnerable people and uphold their dignity
- To complement the Government efforts during any humanitarian crisis and maximize the impacts for emergency response.

Transfer Modality

- The Cash transfer modality should be selected based on considerations of market proximity and functioning,
- Risk analysis,
- Proximity of financial institutions,
- Security issues,
- Beneficiary preferences,
- Cost efficiency,
- Gender consideration and women accessibility.

Cash based interventions and livelihoods assistance that were implemented

- Disaster affected people but focusing more on women, children, PWD, aged and did not receive adequate support (flood, cyclone, mud slide, urban fire)
- Cash Based interventions in Recovery projects for Flood and flash flood 2017 in the Northern districts and in Haor
- Conditional (CFW, Cash for Training, Tube well installation, agriculture, shelter repairing etc. and unconditional
- Standard package
- Support after training
- PDM conducted

Lessons learnt

- Cash based intervention is so far the best “*lifesaving*” but needs to have market functionality monitoring (e.g. access, availability, price etc.); and if required, to engage/influence local government in market regulations e.g. price-hike.
- Cash gives households a greater degree of choice and permits them to spend money according to their own priorities
- Cash can be spent on both food and non-food items and is easily invested in livelihood security.
- Empower the beneficiaries and increase the dignity of women and other vulnerable groups
- Cost efficient for programme operation


Lessons Learnt

- Positive impact to strengthen local economy
- The transaction costs of cash distributions are substantially lower than those of food or shelter NFI distribution including costs associated with handling, transport, storage and administration.
- Easy to monitor and evaluate project outputs and outcomes
- Reduce selling of assets or avoid negative coping strategies

Recommendations for future implementations of cash based programmes

- Cash based programme is very suitable for all affected people if market is functional
- Well trained and Experienced staff for cash based programme is essential
- Training per business category is essential and post response linkage and follow up is required for sustainability
- Beneficiaries are mostly women but very few %of female colleagues and should make adjustments
- Never allow to recover loan money by anyone
- Functional CRM
- MMT is suitable/acceptable even though there are operational issues

Utilization of Cash in Northern Flood - START



Any drawback?

- Some may not control cash- male domination
- Some repay loans
- Some use for single purpose although huge other needs are there
- MMT is a must
- Emergency response or recovery is not the solution – long term intervention is required
- Market functionality
- Enabling environment for all but more for women and disadvantage group

Picture says

