

CTP OPERATIONAL MODELS ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

CTP OPERATIONAL MODELS ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Authors:

Kristin Smart

Independent Researcher

ksmartconsulting@gmail.com

supported by

Isabelle Pelly

CaLP Technical Coordinator

techco@cashlearning.org

and

Abigael Baldoumas

CaLP Knowledge Management and Research Coordinator

abaldoumas@cashlearning.org

Date first drafted: October 2017

Last reviewed: February 2018

CONTENTS

Overview of CTP operational models and the analytical framework	5
How to use the framework	7
Overview of tools	7
Data analysis	8
Tool 1: General information	8
Tool 2: Operational model and influence on quality	10
Part 1 – Project cycle and the operational model	10
Table 1: CTP project cycle and the operational model	11
Part 2 – Operational model and drivers of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability	12
Table 2: Areas of influence on efficiency, effectiveness and accountability	13
Part 3 – Total cost to transfer ratio (TCTR) for the operational model	14
Part 4 – Operational model and broader influences	14
Tool 3: Stakeholder survey	15
Table 3: Questions for external stakeholders about the operational model (OM)	16
Bibliography	18
Annexes	18
Annex A: Contextual factors influencing quality outcomes	19
Annex B: Potential drivers of efficiency and effectiveness	21
Annex C: Optional indicators to support findings	22
Annex D: Terms of Reference template	28
Annex E: Inception report template	30
Annex F: Final report outline/template	32

OVERVIEW OF CTP OPERATIONAL MODELS AND THE ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The State of the World's Cash Report¹ launched by CaLP in February 2018 highlights trends in the uptake of various operational models² for the delivery of cash at scale in humanitarian response. The report broadly categorizes operational models adopted for cash transfer programming (CTP) as follows:

- **Consortia and alliances** are formed on the contractual and funding relationships between members, usually with funding channelled through a lead agency and disbursed to other members as sub-grantees (examples: Cash Consortium of Iraq, Cash Consortium of Ukraine, ECHO-led Cash Alliances).
- **Shared cash delivery mechanisms** entail collaboration in the financial delivery of cash transfers but not necessarily in other areas of programming, although linking to shared registration systems may feature. There are broadly two types of shared cash delivery mechanisms: (i) one where a single contract exists between one agency and the financial service provider (FSP), but other agencies may use the platform (examples: WFP One Card in Lebanon); or (ii) one in which each participating agency has a contract and relationship with the FSP (example: Jordan Common Cash Facility).
- **Broad integration of systems** are models with highly harmonized and collaborative systems for CTP delivery and project cycle management, which build on the comparative advantage of each stakeholder (examples: LOUISE – Lebanon, Greece Cash Alliance).
- **Single-agency delivery** separates cash and voucher programmes into two components: (i) all the humanitarian programming elements of the intervention (assessment, monitoring, targeting, etc.) and (ii) the financial delivery of cash transfers. This model was first proposed by ECHO's guidance on large-scale cash transfers in 2017.³ To date, this model has not been fully implemented.
- **Collaborative modular approach**, e.g. common cash delivery (CCD) platform which groups different activities and competencies in the CTP project cycle. Taking a modular approach allows the platform to provide a more nuanced, localized approach, depending on the context and active agencies.

Current decision making on the choice between these various operational models is highly influenced by context, and by the policies and approaches of donor agencies. Decision making on operational models is often also influenced by the commonly held assumption that highly collaborative operational models result in greater efficiency and effectiveness. This framework aims to reform this approach to decision making on operational models, by unpacking assumptions on collaboration and quality. As such, it provides a systematic approach to identifying features within an operational model that influence quality.

This analytical framework provides a toolset that can be used to draw out how aspects of an operational model influence quality in CTP. It also draws out the role of contextual factors in the formation and evolution of operational models, and in supporting or hindering positive outcomes. The information gathered from this toolset can be used, by extension, to:

- Build a knowledge base around operational models for CTP and support policy makers, donors and humanitarian agencies at the global level.
- Ensure that models for the delivery of CTP are tailored to meet the specific needs of a response, including by recommending adaptations to ongoing responses.
- Inform practical decision making on operational models, including programme design and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

¹ CaLP (2018) The State of the World's Cash Report: Cash Transfer Programming in Humanitarian Aid, available at: www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calp-sowc-report-web.pdf

² Working definition of operational model – 'The overall structure through which agencies work jointly (either through a partnership, consortium or another form of collaboration) to deliver a CTP, specifically in the situation response and analysis, programme design and implementation.'

³ ECHO (2017) Guidance to partners funded by ECHO to deliver medium and large-scale cash transfers in the framework of the 2017 HIPs and ESOP Ref Ares(2017)516771-31/01/2017. Available at <https://ec.europa.eu/echo/sites/echo-site/files/guidance.pdf>

This framework was initially designed as a tool to assist research and assessment teams in objectively collecting and analysing data on operational models in different contexts, with the aim of providing an overview of what is working well and under what contextual conditions. It is intended to facilitate the building of an evidence base by comparing learning and findings from across the case studies. The framework can be used either in its entirety or adapted as needed for a specific case study. To date, it has been used selectively to guide recently completed studies of the Jordan Common Cash Facility, Philippines Cash Working Group, Cash Consortium of Iraq, ECHO Alliance in Afghanistan and Cash Consortium of Ukraine, and in its entirety to guide reviews of the Nigeria and Ethiopia pilots of the ERC MPG Consortium⁴ and the Greece Cash Alliance. As the evidence base generated using this framework grows, it can be revised as a practical decision-making tool and can offer guidance on programme design and M&E for various forms of operational models.

For more background on the development of this framework and how it will be used to generate learning and recommendations from operational models across various contexts, see CaLP's 2017 *Discussion Note: Building Evidence and developing guidance on operational models for CTP*.⁵

The toolset presented below requires mainly qualitative data and analysis, supported by standardized and comparable quantitative data analysis wherever possible. It includes three separate tools for data gathering for each individual case study, a series of annexes to support the use of the framework, and an additional tool for collating and comparing findings across case studies. The first two tools collect perspectives of practitioners, meaning those directly involved in the formation of an operational model or in the implementation of CTP, and the third tool collects perspectives of external actors, meaning those who are aware of the operational model and its activities but are not involved in its formation, internal operations or decision-making structures.

These three tools collect the following:

- **General information on the operational models:** Gathering general information on the structure and formation of an operational model.
- **Operational model and influence on quality:** Mapping out aspects and actions of the operational model that have a positive or negative impact on key areas of quality.
- **Stakeholder survey:** Collecting feedback from external individuals and agencies on various aspects of the operational model.

This toolset includes three annexes to assist review teams with the analysis:

- A list of identified contextual factors and their potential impact on the operational model's contribution to quality CTP.
- A list of potential drivers of efficiency and effectiveness
- A list of optional indicators that can be collected and analysed to support findings on the influence of the operational model on various aspects of quality.

⁴ ECHO Emergency Response Capacity (ERC) Multipurpose Cash Grant Consortium

⁵ Available at: www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calp-discussion-note---building-evidence-and-developing-guidance-on-operational-models-for-ctp---jul17.pdf

HOW TO USE THE FRAMEWORK

Use of the framework requires assessment teams to collect the information and indicators outlined in each tool below. This requires a mixed-methods approach using both qualitative and quantitative research methods, including key informant interviews, focus group discussions, a desk review and data collection (where available). The tools provide a list of optional indicators that can be collected wherever possible, giving assessment teams the flexibility to select indicators that are feasible and most relevant to their specific context.

Tips and recommendations for using this framework:

- Draft the Terms of Reference (ToR) and inception report early on for each case study, and ensure there is an agreement with stakeholders as to which indicators will be examined (see Tool 2). The selection of indicators should be based on existing M&E frameworks and data already being captured in each country, and should refer to CaLP's Monitoring⁴ CTP guidance.⁶
- The framework is a broad tool and has been designed to capture a wide range of information. However, this is not necessarily feasible or valuable for every study. The information collected through the desk review and key informant interviews should be used to narrow down the focus of the study to the most relevant topics within the broader discussion of quality included in each tool below. This narrowing down of focus areas should also inform the structure of the overall findings.
- To maximize the potential comparability across case studies, it is recommended that assessment teams document their findings using the structure and format of the tools below and the supporting documents provided in the Annexes. These include a standardized ToR, inception report template, data analysis tables and a final report outline (see Annexes).

OVERVIEW OF TOOLS

Tool 1: General information on the operational model

The purpose of this tool is to collect general information on the operational model itself, highlighting its structure, membership, process and context of formation, decision-making arrangements, objectives, key achievements to date and evolution over time. This information can be used to build a general understanding of the model as well as the contextual factors driving its formation and evolution.

Tool 2: Operational model and influence on quality

This tool outlines a set of steps for data collection and analysis to draw out the relationship between various aspects of the operational model and quality. It includes four main areas of investigation:

- **Project cycle and the operational model.** Identify and explore areas of the project cycle that are positively or negatively influenced by aspects of the operational model, as well as the role of key contextual factors in these influences.
- **Operational model and drivers of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.** Review the list of potential drivers of quality and optional indicators (see Annexes B and C). Based on the desk review, interviews and focus group discussions, identify drivers to focus on in the study (areas of investigation) and supporting data (indicators) that are most relevant and feasible for the study. Collect and record the relevant data.
- **Total cost to transfer ratio (TCTR).** Calculate a standardized total cost to transfer ratio (TCTR) for the model as a whole and for each individual agency (if possible). Indicate the size of the transfer value used in the model.
- **Operational model and broader influences.** Identify and explore aspects of the operational model that have had a positive or negative influence on the broader humanitarian response and/or on the target communities. These could include, for example, influences leading to the increased use of CTP or multipurpose cash grants (MPGs) by agencies outside the model, government acceptance of CTP, changes to the financial services sector, or improved financial inclusion and literacy of target communities, etc.

⁶ CaLP and USAID (2017) *Monitoring⁴CTP: Monitoring Guidance for CTP in Emergencies*, available at: www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calp-ctp-monitoring-web.pdf

Tool 3: Stakeholder survey

This tool is designed to collect general perceptions of individuals and agencies outside of the decision-making structures of the operational model. This includes, where appropriate and feasible, beneficiaries, coordination actors (UNHCR or OCHA and the cash working group or CWG), operational humanitarian agencies, national or local authorities, and FSPs.

DATA ANALYSIS

Once all the data has been collected, the next step is to analyse the data in relation to key research questions around operational models. The analysis should:

- Unpack the commonly held assumption that higher levels of collaboration within a model result in greater efficiency and effectiveness, and therefore improve the quality of a model.
- Document and recognize how the context itself led to the selection and development of a particular operational model.
- Identify key features of the operational model, highlighting the evolution of the model over time as well the reasons for any changes to the model.
- Compare the TCTR with that of other models using similar transfer values.
- Highlight aspects of the operational model that influence quality outcomes and related drivers.
- Identify which contextual factors have influenced the operational model's effect on efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.
- Recommend adjustments to the operational model to increase the likelihood of higher-quality outcomes.
- Determine in which contexts or contextual conditions the operational model would be most effective, and identify opportunities for replication in other contexts.
- Provide information to inform the revision of this framework to be used to support decision making on operational models, including programme design.

TOOL 1: GENERAL INFORMATION

How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect detailed answers on the questions below, focusing on the reasons, logic or processes involved. • Data can be collected through a document (desk) review, key informant interviews, focus group discussions, or any combination of these methods. Other sources of data can be referenced as needed.
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information included should be from individuals, agencies or groups that have played an active role in the formation, development and/or implementation of activities within the operational model. • Information must be collected from several sources (documentation, individuals and agencies) to verify and confirm details provided.

An Excel template for Tool 1 is also available on CaLP's website

General information

1 Background information on the humanitarian response and operational model includes:

Humanitarian context and CTP

- Type of crisis or humanitarian response
- Scale of humanitarian response and needs, including key beneficiary groups (e.g. IDPs, refugees, host community, etc.)
- Duration of humanitarian response
- UN and/or government lead agencies in the response
- Ownership of any registration databases for beneficiary groups in country
- Coordination system for CTP in country

Operational model structure

- Type (brief description of) operational model (e.g. consortium, led by implementing partners, partnership with technical or functional split, etc.)
- Organizational and governance structures (e.g. steering committee, working groups, etc.)
- Lead agency (if any)
- Number and names of agencies or partners
- Interaction with in-country coordination systems for CTP

Operational model and CTP

- Types of CTP being implemented and any formal linkages to other complementary services or non-food item (NFI) activities
- Number of households or beneficiaries covered by the operational model (indicate planned or actual)
- Size of the geographic area covered by the operational model
- Donors and other funding streams supporting CTP within the operational model
- Total value of CTP within the operational model:
 - Total value of CTP = total value of transfers received by beneficiaries + direct delivery costs + other staffing + operational costs
 - Collect and record the costs for each cost category separately
- Modalities, delivery mechanisms and FSPs used
- Relevant links/reference docs for context and operational model

2 Guiding questions for detailed feedback on the operational model include:

Contextual factors and the formation of the model – What role did the context, and any specific features of the context, play in shaping the operational model? What additional factors were key in its formation? What were the hindering and supporting factors?

Donors and key stakeholders – What role (if any) have the funding mechanisms, donors and other key stakeholders in country or at the global level played in the formation of the operational model?

Evolution – Have there been any key points in the evolution of the operational model? What were the driving factors, contextual or otherwise, in the evolution or adaptation of the model over time?

Comparative advantage – Why were these specific agencies involved? How was the lead agency determined? What is the added value of each agency? Why was this particular structure adopted for the operational model? What would be different for beneficiaries in the absence of this operational model for the delivery of CTP?

Membership and decision making – How are strategic and financial decisions made? Technical decisions? How is membership determined and formalized?

Adaptation – Are there aspects of the operational model’s structure or decision-making processes that should be changed or adapted? Is it feasible to make these changes? What are the supporting or hindering factors?

Replicability and scale – Are there aspects of this operational model that would be easily replicable in similar contexts? Under what conditions would they work best? Can the model easily expand or reduce to meet changes in needs or the scale of the response?

TOOL 2: OPERATIONAL MODEL AND INFLUENCE ON QUALITY

How	<p>This tool has four parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project cycle and the operational model: Identify and explore areas of the project cycle that are positively or negatively influenced by aspects of the operational model, as well as the role of key contextual factors in these influences. • Operational model and drivers of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability: Review the list of potential drivers of quality and optional indicators (see Annexes B and C). Based on the desk review, interviews and focus group discussions, identify drivers to focus on in the study (areas of investigation) and supporting data (indicators) that are most relevant and feasible for the study. Collect and record the relevant data. <i>Note, additional drivers can be added to the list in Annex B as needed to reflect key findings from each study as they arise.</i> • Total cost to transfer ratio (TCTR): Calculate a standardized total cost to total transfer ratio (TCTR) for the operational model as a whole and for each individual agency (<i>if possible</i>). Indicate the size of the transfer value used in the model. • Operational model and broader influences: Identify and explore aspects of the operational model that have had positive or negative influence on the broader humanitarian response and/or on the target communities. For example, positive influences could result in increased use of CTP or MPG by agencies outside the model, government acceptance of CTP, changes to the financial services sector, or increased financial inclusion/literacy of target communities, etc. <p>Complete each part of the tool following the guidance below, using the tables and questions provided as a template for data collection.</p>
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information should be collected from individuals, agencies or groups that have played an active role in the operational model. • Information can be collected through key informant interviews, focus group discussions and a desk review of key documents and data. • Information must be collected from several sources (documentation, individuals and agencies) to verify and confirm details provided.

An Excel template for Tool 2 is also available on CaLP’s website

Part 1 – Project cycle and the operational model

1 Complete the table below

Complete the table below, indicating the level of influence that aspects of the operational model have had on each activity across the project cycle and a detailed explanation.. This should also include a reference to the role of contextual factors – both as driving factors as to why these influences came about, and as factors facilitating or hindering successes.

Table 1. CTP project cycle and the operational model

CTP project cycle – key activities	Level of influence ⁷	Nature of influence on quality (positive, negative, or mixed)	Contextual factors (Refer to Annex A for list of factors to consider)	
			Facilitating positive outcomes	Hindering positive outcomes
Preparedness				
Situation analysis				
Response analysis				
4 Programme design				
4.1 Targeting				
4.2 Selection of delivery mechanism				
4.3 Transfer value				
4.4 Selection of indicators				
5 Implementation				
M&E				

⁷ On a scale ranging from none to limited, medium, strong, and very strong.

2 For areas strongly influenced by aspects of the operational model (scoring 4 or 5), provide a detailed explanation as to:

- What about the model was most important in relation to this particular influence?
- What areas of quality (efficiency, effectiveness and/or accountability) have been influenced? How have they been influenced? Does this have a positive, negative or mixed impact on quality?
- How is this different or distinct from what other cash actors or models in the context have been able to deliver?

Part 2 – Operational model and drivers of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability

This tool presents a systematic approach to drawing out and detailing findings on how certain aspects of an operational model influence quality, as defined in terms of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability. The steps are as follows:

- Review the list of potential drivers and indicators in [Annexes B and C](#). Additional drivers or areas of investigation can be added to the list in Annex B; it is only included to provide a starting point for consideration of the potential ways in which an operational model can influence quality.
- Analyse data from the desk review, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions to identify key areas for further investigation; these should be the pathways (drivers) by which quality is influenced through the operational model.
- For each area of investigation (driver of quality), collect detailed information regarding its influence on the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of the CTPs led and delivered by the model.
- Complete the table below for each of the areas of investigation (drivers of quality) identified. In the 'description' section, provide a narrative overview of how the operational model has influenced quality. In the 'contextual factors' section, highlight any relevant contextual factors that also played a role in facilitating or hindering quality outcomes.
- Where possible, support this analysis using the list of supporting indicators in Annex C or other relevant indicators as available in country.

Note: Additional areas of investigation (drivers) and supporting data (indicators) can be added to the lists in Annexes B and C to reflect key findings from each study as they arise.

Table 2 Areas of influence on efficiency, effectiveness and accountability

Areas of investigation/ drivers of quality <i>(Ref to Annex B)</i>	Nature of the influence on quality <i>(indicate positive, negative, mixed or not applicable for each area of quality)</i>			Supporting data/ available indicators <i>(Ref to Annex C)</i>	Description – How have aspects of the operational model assisted or hindered these areas of quality?	Contextual factors <i>(Refer to Annex A)</i>	
	Efficiency	Effectiveness	Accountability			Facilitating positive outcomes	Hindering positive outcomes

Part 3 – Total cost to transfer ratio (TCTR) for the operational model

Calculating TCTR

This section outlines a standardized approach to calculating TCTR.⁸ Note that it is only possible to calculate TCTR at the agency level if each agency is individually paying for the cost of transfers. If the all of the transfer payments are done through one agency within the model, then two TCTRs should be collected: one for the model as a whole, and one for the agency paying for the total cost of transfers. To calculate TCTR, the following information is needed:

- A Total programme costs
- B Total cost of transfers
- C Total cost of delivery (i.e. non-transfer costs)

These costs can be looked at in two ways:⁹ either as **A (total programme costs) = B (total cost of transfers) + C (total cost of delivery)**; OR **C (total cost of delivery) = A (total programme costs) – B (total cost of transfers)**. Using this information, it is possible to calculate TCTR. **TCTR = C (total cost of delivery) ÷ B (total cost of transfers)**, meaning for every currency unit spent on transfer, X is spent on delivery. For example, for a total programme cost of \$10m, where \$3m is equal to the cost of delivery and \$7m is equal to the total cost of the transfers: If the full operational model budget is not available, you can calculate TCTR for each individual agency, and then aggregate the different TCTR's to get an overall TCTR for the model. In models where the TCTR varies significantly between agencies, it is advised that this is explored further and justified.

\$3m (total cost of delivery) ÷ \$7m (total cost of transfers) = a TCTR of 42.8 cents

In this example, **for every \$1 transferred, 42.8 cents are spent on delivery.**

Transfer value

This data is needed in order to determine whether the TCTR of the operational model can be compared to that of other contexts. Contexts where a similar transfer value is distributed provide an opportunity to compare TCTR and shed some light on the cost-efficiency of a model.

⁸ TCTR is one of the indicators within the framework that can be considered comparable across contexts, particularly in cases with a similar transfer value.

⁹ Taken from the International Rescue Committee (IRC) *Best Use of Resources, Team Guidance on TCTRs*.

Part 4 – Operational model and broader influences

1 Complete Table 3 below, indicating how aspects of the operational model have influenced aspects of the broader environment. These could be, for example, areas of influence on:

- The ‘whole of cash response’, including the acceptance of CTP, the design and type of CTPs, and linkages planned with existing social safety nets.
- The broader humanitarian response, such as response analysis and humanitarian planning.
- The financial infrastructure of the context, such as increased coverage of FSPs, uptake of financial services, etc.
- The targeted community, such as improved financial literacy or inclusion, community participation and increased social capital, etc.

Table 3 Other areas influenced by the operational model

Other areas – specify	Level of influence (0 = none and 5 = a high level)	Detailed explanation (Why/how has it had an influence? What about it is positive, negative or mixed?)
1	1 2 3 4 5	
2	1 2 3 4 5	
3	1 2 3 4 5	

2 For areas strongly influenced by the operational model (scoring 4 or 5), provide a detailed explanation as to:

- What aspect of the model was most important in reaching this outcome?
- How is this different or distinct from what other cash actors in the context have been able to deliver?

TOOL 3: STAKEHOLDER SURVEY

How	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect information against each of the ‘key areas of information’ in the table below with individuals and agencies outside of the operational model that are familiar with the model. • Suggested questions for each stakeholder group are provided in the table below.
Who	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information in this tool should be collected from representatives of five key stakeholder groups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiaries • Coordination groups (UNHCR or OCHA, depending on the context, and the CWG) • Humanitarian agencies (who are not members of the operational model) • Government or local authorities (where appropriate) • FSPs • In some cases, it may not be appropriate or feasible to collect information from each of these groups. It is the responsibility of the review team to decide who is most relevant to survey for the study. • Information can be collected through key informant interviews or focus group discussions. • Information must be collected from several sources (individuals and agencies) to verify and confirm details provided. It should also be triangulated with documentary sources where possible.

An Excel template for Tool 3 is also available on CaLP’s website

Questions for external stakeholders about the operational model (OM)

Key areas of information	Beneficiaries	Coordination groups	Humanitarian agencies	Government authorities	Financial service providers
<p><i>What has worked well?</i> <i>What hasn't worked well?</i> <i>What could work better?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What aspects of this CTP have worked well? • Are you content with the communication and delivery of the CTP? Why or why not? • Did you face any challenges in communication? What would you change? • Did you face any challenges in safely accessing your transfer? • Would you change anything about the delivery of your transfer? • What would you change about the communication or delivery of your transfer? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What aspects of this OM have worked well? What has not worked so well? • Are there areas of the OM that could be improved? How? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this OM had any influence on the work of your agency? Or the communities you work in? • What aspects of this OM have worked well? What has not worked so well? • Are there areas of the OM that could be improved? How? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What aspects of this OM have worked well? What has not worked so well? • Can anything be changed to improve the process for beneficiaries? • Are there other areas of the OM that could be improved? How? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In working with this OM, what has worked well? What could be improved? • Can anything be changed to improve the process for beneficiaries?
<p><i>Influence on coordination mechanisms?</i></p>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has the OM effectively contributed to the coordination systems in the country? In what way? • Have any aspects of the OM had an influence on the coordination mechanisms or systems in the country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you aware of any influence, positive or negative, that the OM has had on coordination mechanisms or systems in the country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has this OM coordinated at the right levels and with the right individuals across the design and delivery of this CTP? 	N/A

Key areas of information	Beneficiaries	Coordination groups	Humanitarian agencies	Government authorities	Financial service providers
<i>Influence on broader humanitarian response?</i>	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the OM effectively contributed (e.g. shared assessments or lessons learned) to the broader humanitarian response? In what way? Have any aspects of the OM had an influence on the humanitarian response in the country? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the OM influenced the broader humanitarian response in the country? In what way? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has the OM influenced the broader humanitarian response in the country? In what way? 	N/A
<i>Positive or negative impact on the community?</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has this CTP caused any changes in the community or in the marketplace? If aid agencies give money in the community, does this affect the atmosphere?* Do you feel the money received prepares you to cope with a future crisis? To live without aid in the future?* Do you think the money received went to those who needed it most?* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of any feedback from the community on the CTP designed and/or implemented by the OM? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of any feedback from the community on the CTP designed and/or implemented by the OM? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of any feedback from the community on the CTP designed and/or implemented by the OM? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are you aware of any feedback from the community on the CTP designed and/or implemented by the OM? Has this OM had any impact on the financial inclusion or financial literacy of the targeted community? Has this OM had any impact on the wider financial services sector? For example, technological innovation, expansion of coverage, etc.

*Ground Truth Solutions/CaLP, Cash Barometer Indicator, <https://www.cashbarometer.org>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Key sources reviewed include:

DFID's approach to value for money (VfM), policy paper available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/dfids-approach-to-value-for-money-vfm

K. Smart and R. Nataf (2017) A review of Inter-Agency Collaboration for CTP Delivery. CaLP/USAID.

C. Venton, S. Bailey and S. Pongracz (2015) Value for Money of Cash Transfers in Emergencies.

S. Bailey and S. Pongracz (2015) *Humanitarian CTs: Cost, Value for Money and Economic Impact*. Background note for the high-level panel on cash transfers, ODI.

ECHO/DFID. *If not now, when? Re-framing the response to Lebanon's protracted refugee crisis. Review of the Lebanon Cash Consortium partnership model, internal structure, and relevance. A joint 2017 approach by DFID and ECHO!* Presentation to stakeholders, Lebanon, December 2016.

Analysis for Economic Decisions (AED) (2016) *Evaluation of the Use of Different Transfer Modalities in ECHO Humanitarian Aid Action 2011–2014*, ECHO.

Core Humanitarian Standards (CHS) *Guidance Note and Indicators*. 2015 revision.

Ground Truth Solutions and CaLP (2017) Cash Barometer: www.cashbarometer.org

ANNEXES

A Contextual factors influencing quality outcomes

B Potential drivers of efficiency and effectiveness

C Optional indicators to support findings

D Terms of Reference template

E Inception report template

F Final report outline

ANNEX A: CONTEXTUAL FACTORS INFLUENCING QUALITY OUTCOMES

The table below presents a list of contextual factors that have a potential influence on the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of a CTP, and a list of examples illustrating ways in which this may happen. This list has been developed through a review of key resources and feedback from the CaLP Technical Advisory Group.

Contextual factors influencing quality	Examples of ways in which they can influence quality (efficiency, effectiveness and accountability)
Funding streams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining factor in the scale of response (funding available, multi-year/ one-off, pooled or bilateral, geographic coverage), which calls (or not) for a collaborative response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs in terms of grants management at both the agency and donor level
Agency/donor agendas (<i>agency mandates – independent of CTP</i>)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In support of a cost-effective approach? For example, use of multi-purpose grants (MPGs)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Linkages to government systems/mechanisms
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government agendas and pressure for response modalities/approaches
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desired outcomes and impacts
Prior humanitarian presence	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timely response capacity (speed) of agencies and humanitarian operations
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding of needs and local contexts
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preparedness planning conducted and pre-crisis capacities in place
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Acceptability of the response at the beneficiary level
Strength of coordination mechanisms/CWG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of common tools and platforms or technical guidance (e.g. Minimum Expenditure Basket)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce likelihood of beneficiary duplication and promote split areas of responsibility
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for shared or negotiated costs (e.g. M&E, common delivery mechanisms and FSPs)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Information-sharing platforms for best practice (e.g. selection of transfer mechanisms or FSPs)
Size of response	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determining factor in scale, the number of individuals to be reached/in need
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Geographic scope of need and coverage of response agencies
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity to effectively absorb and manage large programmes/funds
Government policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support (or not) for cash transfer modalities
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Financial legislation, e.g. government ownership or private ownership of banks
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Government-led response mechanisms and complementarity with cash transfers

Contextual factors influencing quality	Examples of ways in which they can influence quality (efficiency, effectiveness and accountability)
Government social safety net programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing social safety net platforms to base assistance on (scale up) • Familiarity of beneficiaries with social transfers • Platform to hand over to in scaling down a response • Natural link to development funding/programmes (on-budget support)
Market prices and integration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs to the beneficiary, market fluctuations and effective use of cash assistance received • Determines relative advantage of providing in-kind assistance (cost of in-kind versus cost of comparable goods in the market as determinant of the efficiency of a cash transfer response) • Availability and quality of necessary items (goods and services) in the market • Response capacity of market to adjust and provide supply to meet increased demand • Use of cash transfers and multiplier effect to support local economic recovery
Financial literacy of beneficiaries	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Familiarity with cash • Understanding and ease of use of various transfer mechanisms • Healthy debt-to-income ratios • Knowledge of households' costs versus savings • Knowledge of financial institutions
Capacity and availability of FSPs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of accountable and cost-efficient transfer mechanisms • Availability of e-transfer systems • Competition between providers to offer competitive prices for FSP service • Geographic coverage • Financial liquidity • Timeliness of response/speed of delivery
Level of social integration within community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Capacity of beneficiaries to effectively use cash assistance (safety, risks, incentives) • Use of cash transfers and multiplier effect to support local economic recovery • Debt-to-income relations
Access and security	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ability of agencies, partners, government counterparts and FSPs to access target communities • Capacity of agencies to safely delivery assistance at a low risk and cost (security services) • Capacity of beneficiaries to safely receive and use assistance at a low risk and cost (security services)
Other(s): _____ (add as needed)	

Table adapted from: K. Smart and R. Nataf (2017) A Review of Inter-agency Collaboration for CTP Delivery, CaLP/USAID.

ANNEX B: POTENTIAL DRIVERS OF EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

The table below presents a basic mapping of potential drivers of efficiency and effectiveness, as identified in CaLP’s Review of Inter-agency Collaboration for CTP Delivery.¹⁰ This list has been developed through a review of key resources and feedback from the CaLP Technical Advisory Group.

The list of drivers can be used to inform Tool 2/Part 2 of the framework and draw out ways in which an operational model may have influenced quality. For example, a cost-sharing agreement between agencies within a particular operational model could be a driver of efficiency. Referencing this table during the inception phase can help to identify drivers of quality to be further investigated throughout the study.

Note, this is not an exhaustive list of potential drivers of quality, but provides a starting point to which additional drivers can be added as they are identified in different case studies.

Drivers of efficiency (Outputs)		Drivers of effectiveness (Outcomes)	
Delivery mechanism – type	Operational structure (resources)	Prior humanitarian presence and capacity	Preparedness
Delivery mechanism – cost	M&E structure (resources)	Duration and level of response	Linkages to/combined with other forms of assistance/programmes
Common delivery mechanisms	Scale – size of programme (\$ value of programme)	Capacity of markets to effectively absorb assistance/supply chain	Impact on early recovery and longer-term resilience to future shocks
Transfer value	Scale – number of beneficiaries ('persons of concern' coverage)	Adequacy of transfer value – meets objective of programme	Targeting (quality and timing)
Type of transfer (modality)	Scale – areas covered (geographic coverage)	Speed of delivery – relation to responding to needs as quickly as possible	Meeting needs – geographic coverage
Frequency of transfers	Scale – number of transfers (total value of transfers)	Strength of inter-agency collaboration and coordination mechanisms	Engagement with private sector
Costs of goods, services, etc.	Speed of delivery – relation to costs and time/resources	Beneficiary financial and social inclusion	Empowerment, enabling beneficiaries to take control of their situation in times of crisis/providing dignity
Direct and indirect costs (TCTR)	Duration of programme	Debt/credit relations and norms within community	Accountability (beneficiary preferences, communications, etc.)
Shared costs (e.g. support costs) and cost transparency	System for registration/targeting	Beneficiary financial literacy	Assessments
Preparedness	Information/data management	Linkages to social safety nets	MPGs and use of multi-sector transfers

From K. Smart and R. Nataf (2017) A review of Inter-Agency Collaboration for CTP Delivery. CaLP/USAID.

¹⁰ K. Smart and R. Nataf (2017) A Review of Inter-agency Collaboration for CTP Delivery, CaLP/USAID.

ANNEX C: OPTIONAL INDICATORS TO SUPPORT FINDINGS

The table below presents a list of possible indicators of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability that can be collected and analysed to shed light on the influence of an operational model on various aspects (drivers) of quality. In some cases, one indicator or data point may be used to indicate an influence on more than one area of quality.

The table is used by:

- Determining which indicators ('Optional indicators to support findings' column) and what data ('Data needed for the indicator' column) are feasible and appropriate to collect in a given case study.
- Using the calculation guidance ('Calculation of indicator' column) provided for each indicator and the guidance note ('Guidance on the use and analysis of the indicator' column), collect the relevant data points for the selected indicators.
- Use this information to provide supporting data for Tool 2 in the framework.

Note, this list of possible indicators of efficiency, effectiveness and accountability is a working list and can be added to or revised through the use of this framework in different contexts.

Area of quality	Drivers of quality	Optional indicators to support findings	Data needed for the indicator	Calculation of indicator	Guidance on the use and analysis of the indicator
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of common FSP • Shared costs and resources • Transfer values • Costs of collaboration • Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector responses 	Cost savings as a result of the use of a single or common FSP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSP fees, services and related costs for transfers completed through the OM • FSP fees, services and related costs for transfers completed by agencies outside the OM 	Total FSP costs of OM – (minus) total FSP costs outside of OM = (equals) cost savings as a result of the use of a single or common FSP	This data point requires a comparison of FSP costs charged for transfers completed through the OM with FSP costs charged for transfers completed by agencies outside of the OM. This requires either data to be collected from the same FSP or from a similar FSP if rates are similar between all FSPs using the same delivery mechanism within a given context.
		Total costs saved through the use of shared resources within OM	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total value of all shared costs (e.g. M&E costs, if shared/ streamlined through one agency) • Aggregate estimate of the same costs for each agency in the absence of the OM 	Total value of shared costs – (minus) estimate of total value of same costs for each agency in absence of the OM = (equals) total value of costs saved through the use of shared resources	This requires a detailed estimate from each agency of costs that would have been incurred in the absence of the OM.
		Accurate valuation of needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market assessment data or post-distribution monitoring (PDM) data representing the costs of items the transfer is designed to cover 	Actual costs of items and services – (minus) total transfer value = (equals) difference between actual and transfer-value- estimated valuation of needs	The same data can be used as an indicator of effectiveness. For efficiency, the main objective of assessing accuracy of valuation of needs is to ensure there was not an over-estimate of the transfer value (with losses in cost efficiency). This indicator should be accompanied by qualitative information collected on the role of the OM in determining the transfer value (e.g. joint assessment and analysis, streamlined through one agency, value not decided by the OM but the CWG, etc.).
		Costs of collaboration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total \$ value of all dedicated and partially dedicated staffing resources spent on collaboration • Total \$ value of any other resources (non-staffing, e.g. developing database systems) spent directly on collaboration 	Total \$ value of staff + (plus) other resources spent on collaboration between agencies = (equals) total costs of collaboration	Calculating this requires data on the \$ value of each staff member of each agency involved in collaboration and an estimated proportion of time (0-100%) spent by each staff member. An additional estimate could be made of other resources (e.g. office space) spent on collaboration.
Efficiency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of common FSP • Shared costs and resources • Transfer values • Costs of collaboration • Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector responses 	Uptake of MPGs or multi-sector transfers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total transfer value of MPG or multi-sector transfers used in the response prior to the OM • Total transfer value of MPG or multi-sector transfers used by the OM 	Total transfer value of MPG or multi-sector transfers used by the OM – (minus) total value of MPG or multi-sector transfers used prior to the OM = (equals) total value of MPG or multi-sector transfers used as result of the OM.	The same data can be used as an indicator of effectiveness. If advocacy efforts were also made by the OM to influence the uptake of MPG or multi-sector transfers, the total value of MPG or multi-sector transfers used in the response following these advocacy efforts can also be considered in the calculation.

Area of quality	Drivers of quality	Optional indicators to support findings	Data needed for the indicator	Calculation of indicator	Guidance on the use and analysis of the indicator
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speed of delivery Meeting identified needs Meeting additional needs Capacity to easily scale up or down Integrated programmes Needs covered (scale) Targeting accuracy Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector transfers Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector transfers Transfer values and accurate valuation of needs Linkages to social protection/safety net programmes Improved financial inclusion and financial literacy 	Speed of delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For both the OM and a representation of agencies outside the OM Date of official 'start of response' (e.g. date needs officially identified or crisis declared) Date first transfer received by beneficiaries 	<p>Date first transfers received by beneficiaries – (minus) date needs identified = (equals) speed of delivery as a total number of days between identification of needs or crisis and reception of assistance</p> <p>Compare 'speed of delivery' between the OM and an agency/agencies outside the OM</p>	Before using this indicator, stakeholders must agree on the start date from which to determine the 'start' of the response – start of crisis? Identification of needs? Arrival of population? Ideally, two data points should be collected, one for the OM and one for an agency/agencies outside of the OM, allowing for a comparison point on speed of delivery as a result of transfers completed through the use of the OM.
		Meeting identified needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of programme identified needs to be addressed via the transfer PDM or other data on use of the transfer to meet programme identified needs 	<p>Average total value (as % of total transfers) spent by households on meeting programme identified needs</p>	This indicator indicates the OM's capacity to deliver against programme identified needs. It may also reflect the accuracy of the transfer value and households' capacity to meet the needs identified given the transfer value.
		Meeting additional needs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PDM data on additional needs that were addressed through the use of the transfer 	<p>Average total value (as % of total transfer) spent on meeting basic households needs outside of those identified by the programme</p>	This indicator should capture the broader use of the transfer to meet critical household needs.
		Capacity to scale up or down	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of actions taken by or aspects of the OM that allow it to easily scale up or down assistance as needed to meet changes in needs 	<p>Qualitative indicator – descriptions of actions or aspects of the OM that facilitate scaling up or down as needed. Include any examples of scaling up or down in the history of CTPs implemented by the OM</p>	This indicator is only reflective of the influence of the OM if the OM took specific actions to facilitate easily scaling up or down a CTP. These should be specified if this indicator is used.
		Use of complementary activities and services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> List of additional services, activities and NFI assistance provided alongside the CTP by the OM. 	<p>Mainly qualitative – descriptions of assistance (in addition to CTP) provided. Include specific examples</p>	This indicator is only reflective of the influence of the OM if the OM took specific actions to include complementary activities and services (e.g. improving access to education or health facilities, livelihoods opportunities, etc.). These should be specified if this indicator is used.
		Coverage of needs (geographic or total needs)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total geographic coverage of CTP achieved through the OM <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total % of needs (of total response) met through the CTP overseen by the OM 	<p>Scale of coverage (geographic or as % of total needs) reached through the OM</p>	The indicator assumes the use of a standardized CTP at scale. i.e. CTPs implemented by agencies within the OM are standardized in design and delivery. If this is not the case, they should be described in detail alongside the indicator.

Area of quality	Drivers of quality	Optional indicators to support findings	Data needed for the indicator	Calculation of indicator	Guidance on the use and analysis of the indicator
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Speed of delivery Meeting identified needs Meeting additional needs Capacity to easily scale up or down Integrated programmes Needs covered (scale) Targeting accuracy Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector transfers Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector transfers Transfer values and accurate valuation of needs Linkages to social protection/safety net programmes Improved financial inclusion and financial literacy 	Targeting accuracy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details on targeting and registration systems used, including verification systems Data on targeting accuracy and errors of inclusion or exclusion (PDM or M&E data) 	Mainly qualitative – descriptions of actions or aspects of the OM that facilitate targeting accuracy, complemented by data on targeting accuracy available from PDM or other M&E reports	This indicator is only reflective of the influence of the OM if the OM took specific actions to facilitate easily scaling up or down a CTP. These should be specified if this indicator is used.
		Accurate valuation of needs	<i>See the section in 'Efficiency' above</i>	<i>See the section in 'Efficiency' above</i>	<i>See the section in 'Efficiency' above</i>
		Uptake of MPGs/multi-sector transfers	<i>See the section in 'Efficiency' above</i>	<i>See the section in 'Efficiency' above</i>	<i>See the section in 'Efficiency' above</i>
		Formal linkages to social safety net systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Record details on any linkages to social safety net systems, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Formal integration or support to government-led social safety net systems Referral systems in place to government-led social safety net systems Data (if available) on beneficiary transfer to or from social safety net programmes 	Mainly qualitative – descriptions of actions or aspects of the OM that formally facilitated linkages to social safety net systems, complemented by data available on the transfer of beneficiaries between the OM CTP and government-led social safety net systems.	This indicator is only reflective of the OM's influence if the OM took specific actions to facilitate standardized and accurate targeting systems. These should be specified if this indicator is used.
		Improved financial inclusion and/or financial literacy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data on financial literacy and inclusion rates before CTP implemented by the OM Data on financial literacy and inclusion rates during or after CTP implemented by the OM <i>and/or</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Qualitative description of improvements to financial literacy and inclusion among the community members, as available from PDM reports, evaluation reports or direct beneficiary feedback. 	Qualitative descriptions of actions or aspects of the OM that positively influenced financial inclusion and literacy within the target communities.	This indicator is illustrative of the broader impact or the 'transformative' power of CTP, and can be included in brief through the use of qualitative information or in-depth with a quantitative analysis.

Area of quality	Drivers of quality	Optional indicators to support findings	Data needed for the indicator	Calculation of indicator	Guidance on the use and analysis of the indicator
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of assistance • Empowering communities • Use of complaints and response mechanism (CRM) and feedback systems • Adherence to protection and 'Do No Harm' principles • Communication and community participation • Transparency 	Beneficiary preferences for assistance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on beneficiary preferences for different modalities of assistance (cash, in-kind, vouchers, mixed) 	% of households or individuals identifying cash as the preferred response modality	<p>This indicator points to the overall accountability of the CTP, not specifically to the OM. The indicator should be complemented by further analysis as to why cash is preferred over other modalities of assistance, and benefits from the beneficiary perspective.</p> <p>Note: this indicator should be collected before the start of the CTP based on beneficiary bias to state preference based on the current or last modality of assistance received.</p>
		Community empowerment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data on beneficiary perceptions on ability to withstand future shocks or crisis <i>and/or</i> • Data on beneficiary perceptions on the role of the assistance in empowering them to live without aid in the future 	% of households indicating perceptions of increased ability to withstand future shocks and/or reduced future reliance on aid	<p>The indicator should be complemented by further analysis as to why and how cash has increased a households' resilience to shocks and/or dependence on aid.</p>
		CRM and feedback mechanisms	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record details on the CRM/ feedback systems in place, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of one streamlined CRM/ feedback mechanism • Database management • Data (if available) on time between receiving feedback and feedback being resolved • Examples (if available) of information from the CRM or feedback system being used to adapt programmes 	Mainly qualitative – descriptions complemented by data on use of the CRM and feedback mechanisms	<p>This indicator is only reflective of the influence of the OM if the OM took specific actions to facilitate a standardized CRM and feedback mechanism. These should be specified if this indicator is used.</p>

Area of quality	Drivers of quality	Optional indicators to support findings	Data needed for the indicator	Calculation of indicator	Guidance on the use and analysis of the indicator
Accountability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriateness of assistance • Empowering communities • Use of complaints and response mechanism (CRM) and feedback systems • Adherence to protection and 'Do No Harm' principles • Communication and community participation • Transparency 	Adherence to 'Do No Harm' principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record details on programme design and delivery that reflect 'Do No Harm' and protection principles, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiary data protection policies • Protection principles included in the programme design and delivery, including capacities of people requiring assistance and/or protection • Data from PDM or other M&E reports indicating if communities and beneficiaries felt any negative effects resulting from the actions of the OM or delivery of the transfers 	Mainly qualitative – descriptions complemented by data from M&E reports on beneficiary protection concerns	This indicator is only reflective of the influence of the OM if the OM took specific actions to facilitate a standardized approach to 'Do No Harm' and to mainstream protection principles. These should be specified if this indicator is used.
		Communication with affected communities (CwC)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record details of CwC across the programme design • Data from PDM or other M&E reports indicating if communities and beneficiaries felt that they had timely access to relevant and clear information 	Qualitative description of CwC actions taken through the OM complemented by data on the % of beneficiaries from among all beneficiary communities that felt they had access to timely and clear information regarding the CTP	This indicator is only reflective of the influence of the OM if the OM took specific actions to facilitate a standardized CwC. These should be specified if this indicator is used.
		Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Record details on transparency – sharing of budgets and financial costs – between agencies in the OM 	Qualitative description of budget transparency between agencies	Indicates the strength of the OM by examining the level of transparency between agencies within the OM.

ANNEX D: TERMS OF REFERENCE TEMPLATE

TERMS OF REFERENCE:

Reviewing operational models for CTP: country x case study

Commissioning manager	
Additional technical support:	
Start date	
Consultancy duration	
Time frame	
Location	
Type of consultant profile required ¹⁰	

BACKGROUND TO THE WORK

Multiple models are being proposed as a solution to achieving scale and quality in CTP, and in particular for multipurpose cash grants (aka MPGs). All of these models require operational collaboration of some form among key actors. Donors, UN agencies and NGOs are driving these operational models in different contexts. Evidence to date demonstrates that these different models have different strengths and weaknesses for the delivery of efficient, effective and accountable CTP, in different contexts¹². The debate is current and significant, affecting very substantial resource flows, business models and the global strategies of key actors.

To advance this debate, CaLP is currently leading a learning agenda which will result in the development of guidance to support donors and operational agencies to assess the suitability of different operational models, by context. The guidance will apply to large-scale CTP, and in particular to MPGs. This learning agenda aims to answer three related questions:

- First, what operational models are available to agencies implementing CTP?
- Second, how do different models improve the efficiency, effectiveness and accountability of CTP in different contexts?
- Third, which operational models are most appropriate in which contexts?

To date, CaLP has developed a [discussion paper](#) setting out the issues and a proposed approach to developing evidence and guidance. The discussion paper introduces CaLP's *Framework for building evidence on operational models for CTP*.¹³ This analytical framework provides a simple and practical toolset that can be used to identify features within an operational model¹⁴ that influence quality¹⁵ in CTP. It also helps to document the role contextual factors play in the formation and evolution of operational models and on supporting or hindering positive outcomes from CTP. The information gathered from the toolset can be used, by extension, to build a knowledge base around operational models for CTP and support policy makers, donors and humanitarian agencies in ensuring that models for the delivery of CTP are tailored to meet the specific needs of a response. This toolset can be used either in its entirety or adapted to be used as needed for a specific case study.

¹¹ CTP expert, materials development expert, trainer from the training roster.

¹² Key studies and evidence base to date include S. Bailey and P. Harvey (2017); K. Smart and R. Nataf (2017) *A Review of Inter-agency Collaboration for CTP Delivery*, CaLP/USAID.

¹³ This was formerly described as the 'Framework for building evidence on collaboration and quality', but the language has been changed in light of discussions at the Global Cash Forum and CaLP's members' day. It is currently in draft form, but please email Isabelle Pelly (techco@cashlearning.org) to access it.

¹⁴ Working definition of operational model – 'The overall structure through which agencies work jointly (either through a partnership, consortium or other form of collaboration) to deliver a CTP, specifically in the situation response and analysis, programme design and implementation.'

¹⁵ Quality is taken as including efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.

This study (in country x) will use the analytical framework as a basis for reviewing the operational model currently in place/under development for the implementation of large-scale CTP. It will use the framework as a basis for developing the research methodology, to which context-specific considerations will be added.

Primary objective of the consultancy

Assess the quality of the operational model for the delivery of CTP (in country x) against CaLP’s analytical framework.

Specific objectives

- Collect general information on the structure and formation of the operational model.
- Map key areas of influence on efficiency, effectiveness and accountability, and collect data using a set of standardized descriptions and indicators (selected/adapted for country x).
- Identify contextual factors facilitating and constraining efficiency, effectiveness and accountability.
- Provide recommendations on how the model can be optimized in country.
- Generate learning on what features of the operational model are optimal for quality in a given context.

Key steps/methodology

- Define parameters for engagement with key stakeholders in country x, including data-sharing agreements.
- Define specific research questions for country x, and use as the basis for identifying which elements of the analytical framework are most relevant.
- Define the methodology in an inception report. This will likely include:
 - Desk review of relevant documentation, including (inter alia): analysis leading to development of operational model; donor funding decisions; consortium documentation, etc.
 - Key informant interviews.
 - Focus group discussions.
 - Development of relevant tools for qualitative and quantitative primary data collection against the analytical framework.
- Analyse the data based on the steps in the framework.
- Document the findings as:
 - Recommendations on how the model can be optimized in country.
 - Learning on what features of the operational model are optimal for quality in a given context.

Management arrangements

To be defined for each study, but to include: CaLP management role, role of lead stakeholders involved in the operational models, CaLP membership engagement (through operational models working group).

Key deliverables/outputs, including time frame and project duration

Deliverables	Estimated number of days	Time frame
Inception report, including data collection tools		
Field work/data collection		
Draft report for validation		
Final report		

ANNEX E: INCEPTION REPORT TEMPLATE

I INCEPTION REPORT: CASE STUDY

'Building an evidence base on operational models for the delivery of CTP'

1.1 Introduction and background

Introduce the purpose of the document. For example: *'This document serves as a working document to outline in detail the steps to be taken under the review of (case) as part of the CaLP-led learning agenda on operational models¹⁶ for CTP. This includes an overview of the objectives of the review, detailed methodology, constraints and limitations, and a work plan. As such, it is an internal CaLP document to be updated as needed to reflect agreed changes, additions or modifications to the review work plan and/or deliverables.'*

1.2 Overview of case review and the CaLP-led learning agenda on operational models for CTP

Provide brief introduction to the learning agenda (see CaLP ToR) and link to this case study.

Provide brief introduction on the country or case and the humanitarian context as relevant to the study.

1.3 Objectives, purpose and scope of the case study

State main purpose and objectives of the study.

Indicate anticipated 'users' of the study findings.

Clarify the scope of the study (time frame covered and focus of study).

Where possible, use information from the desk review to indicate key areas of focus for the study.

1.4 Methodology

Detailed methodology to include:

- What (information to collect)
- How (research methodology and supporting tools)
- Who (detailed list with organization, names and position of key informants)
- When (timeline of key phases or activities)
- Steps (or information assessed) as part of the analysis phase.

It is suggested that tools, for example key informant interview tools or review and analysis matrix are included in a set of attached annexes.

1.4.1 Data collection tools and timeline

The data collection tools will be used across each area of review within the study, as outlined in the following table:

Data collection tool/process (How)	Sources of information (Who/what)

¹⁶ Working definition of operational model: *'The overall structure through which agencies work jointly (either through a partnership, consortium or other form of collaboration) to deliver a CTP, specifically in the situation response and analysis, programme design and implementation.'*

1.4.2 Constraints and limitations

Indicate potential constraints and limitations of the study due, for example, to limited access to key personnel or documents, or other factors.

The review will not:

In terms of limitations:

1.4.3 Field work plan

Outline specific steps and key phases in the field work plan.

1.4.4 Timeline

Key tasks and activities are listed for each step, with key milestones in bold and italics.

Key steps	Dates				
1					

1.4.5 Feedback on key deliverables and engagement with key stakeholders

The review team will work in close coordination (insert stakeholders and process of engagement/feedback from the CaLP working group, in-country stakeholders and others as needed).

1.5 Draft structure for final report

[See Annex F below.](#)

ANNEX F: FINAL REPORT OUTLINE/TEMPLATE

- 1 Executive summary
- 2 Introduction to operational model and context
- 3 Methodology
- 4 Detailed overview of the operational model (draws on Tool 1 of the analytical framework)
- 5 Quality within the operational model and the project cycle (draws on Tool 2/Part 1 of the framework)
- 6 Findings:
 - a Drivers of quality within the operational model (draws on Tools 1 and 2)
 - b Sub-section on each of the drivers of quality identified through the review of the operational model
 - c Calculation of total cost to transfer ratio (TCTR) (draws on Tool 2/Part 3)
- 7 Recommendations for the operational model and the specific context
- 8 Conclusion: Broader learning and recommendations
- 9 Annex 1 – List of documents consulted
- 10 Annex 2 – List of interviews conducted
- 11 Annex 3 – Data analysis tables (as analytical framework)
- 12 Annex 4 – Study Terms of Reference



The Cash Learning Partnership

Recent policy debates and developments in humanitarian responses have driven greater focus on the potential benefits of collaboration between actors on Cash Transfer Programming (CTP), and on the different operational models for collaboration (e.g. consortia, common cash delivery platforms, single agency delivery, etc.)

Current decision making on the choice between these various operational models is highly influenced by context, and by the policies and approaches of donor agencies. Decision making on operational models is often also influenced by the commonly held assumption that highly collaborative operational models result in greater efficiency and effectiveness. This framework aims to contribute to decision making on operational models, by unpacking assumptions on collaboration and quality. As such, it provides a systematic approach to identifying features within an operational model that influence quality.

The framework provides a toolset that can be used to draw out how aspects of an operational model influence efficiency, effectiveness and accountability in CTP. It also draws out the role of contextual factors in the formation and evolution of operational models, and in supporting or hindering positive outcomes. The information gathered from this toolset can be used, by extension, to:

- Build a knowledge base around operational models for CTP and support policy makers, donors and humanitarian agencies at the global level.
- Ensure that models for the delivery of CTP are tailored to meet the specific needs of a response, including by recommending adaptations to ongoing responses.
- Inform practical decision making on operational models, including programme design and monitoring and evaluation (M&E).

The development of the CTP Operational Models Analytical Framework was funded by the Federal Foreign Office of the Federal Republic of Germany and the European Commission Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations.



Humanitarian Aid
and Civil Protection

