The gFSC Cash & Markets Working Group meeting was held on November 14th and was attended by approximately 30 people from NGOs, Donors, CLAs and other UN agencies and Food Security Cluster/Sector Coordinators.

The aim of the meeting was to assess the progress against the workplan agreed in the last May 2018 WG meeting, to discuss and finalize a number of products/activities and to agree on the WG way forward/revised workplan for the next six months.

After a welcome speech by the Co-chairs, Aftab from Plan International and Belete from WVI and a round of introductions by participants, the work conducted around the MPC indicators under the Grain Bargain Cash Workstream was presented by Dina CRS and Ruco USAID as leads and a brainstorming session was
initiated to gather feedback on specific food security as well as general well-being indicators. Some of the recommendations provided by the participants include: importance of engaging with all clusters/sectors at global level and not only at agency level and particularly with clusters/sectors at national level as well; make sure that the list of indicators is being linked to all other MPC guidance efforts initiated by clusters and organizations and not as a stand-alone; link up with the work of the gFSC Programme Quality WG on the indicators handbook for FSCs.

Another related activity of the CMWG included the development of a MPC Guidance for Food Security Clusters/Sectors for which a survey was initiated earlier in the year and to which around 20 cluster coordinators replied. Marina Angeloni from gFSC put together a very first generic draft based on the results of the survey and presented the output. Next steps include sharing the document with all FSC/FSS and the CMWG members to gather feedback and inputs and including practical case studies around methodologies for FSC/FSS to be engaged in the MPC implementation, good practices that can serve as examples for all clusters and cluster partners reporting on MPC. The guidance it’s not intended to be a “how to” document but rather a menu of options that can guide FSCs/FSS in adapting their MPC engagement to their humanitarian context. the guidance was very appreciated by Cluster/Sector Coordinators present in the room as well as all other partners and a few recommendations for the way forward include: add an IM practical component on reporting to the Cluster/Sector; include the GB MPC indicators in the guidance; share the product with other global clusters to get input and use/adapt it to their sector.

A brief session on the achievements of the CashCap in 2018 and the way forward was also included in the agenda and provided by Thomas Byrnes from the Response Team of CashCap. The session was also used as an opportunity to provide information on the CashCap mechanisms overall and how partners can access the roster experts. A brief survey for NGO partners was shared ahead of the meeting to have an idea of the knowledge of CashCap and the access to the Roster and results showed that he mechanisms is not well known by the NGO partners and more advocacy and efforts can be done to increase that.
A session on “Gender and Cash Evidence Generation” was held by WFP Gender Office and Office of Evaluation showcasing the work and activities that WFP is doing with regards to mainstreaming gender into Cash-based programming. The session was very much welcomed by all participants. Results from the WFP studies will be shared through the WG.

**WHY?**

1. Evidence-based programming
2. Gender equality results
3. Exponential increase in the use of cash

*1997 to 2017 – from 2 to 67 countries implementing conditional cash transfer programmes*

*In 2017, WFP provided 1.3 billion USD in cash transfers to 19.2 million people, across 61 countries = 30% of food assistance provided.*

A discussion on the WG way forward and proposals for new activities for the next six months followed and the participants felt that the deliverables related to the MPC and Cash for Work guidance will take up a lot of time and effort already and that are very important pieces of work that should be prioritized. However, the regular organization of webinars for capacity building of FSCs and WG partners have been welcomed by all participants and a few ideas for topics have been put forward including: diversion of aid from in-kind to CBT: examples and lessons learned; protection and CBT; CBT and shock responsive social safety nets; CBT for nutritional outcomes.

The meeting was overall rated very useful and interesting for all participants and participation of FSC/FSS Coordinators was particularly appreciated by WG members and the way other way around, Coordinators found the WG activities responding to realistic requests and needs from the field.