# Scenario exercise: CEA in Implementation and Monitoring

# Facilitator notes

**Time**

* 30 minutes group work + 20-25 minutes presenting back

**Materials**

* CEA in Implementation and Monitoring Scenario Participant handout, a few copies for each group

**Instructions**

* Hand out a few copies of the CEA in Implementation and Monitoring Scenario Participant handout per group and ask them to read through the scenario and tasks. Explain that after they have completed the task they will break into two to four (depends on the number of participants, ideally 4-6 people in each group) groups and take it in turns to present to each other. Explain which groups will work together, and where they will go to do that.

1. Signpost people to tools which could be useful - the minimum actions for CEA in implementation and monitoring (which they should have on their tables form the earlier exercise), [pages 61-68 of the CEA Guide](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-guide/), and [Tool 24 (a) in the CEA Toolkit the CEA in CVA Checklist](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-toolkit/).
2. Give people a few minutes to read the task and circulate to check everyone understands the task.
3. During the group work, give guidance only where needed. Do not give groups the answers but do try to help groups who are struggling or going down the wrong path. Some possible answers to the tasks are below, but this list is not exhaustive – participants may come up with their own creative solutions and you will need to use your judgement and experience as to whether these are valid.
4. Close the group work after 30 minutes, even if groups have not finished the task

* Groups will present back in two groups (groups 1 and 2 will present to each other in one group and groups 3 and 4 will present to each other in a separate group, in case a group remains they can present to the facilitator directly), ensure there is one facilitator to support each of these, ensure the presentations run smoothly and to time, and to manage discussion. Each group will have five minutes to present their ideas, while the group they are presenting to takes on the role of the Head of Programmes to scrutinise what they come up with. After each presentation, allow five minutes for discussion/questions. The facilitator can also ask questions and provide feedback during this time. Allow 20-25 minutes in total for this process.

1. Bring all groups back to plenary for reflections and overall feedback on the exercise, including addressing any common mistakes made by all groups. Questions could include:
   1. What challenges did you have with this task?
   2. Did the other group suggest anything that surprised you?
   3. Would you change any of your suggestions now?
   4. What did you learn from this experience?

**Hints**

* If groups are struggling, encourage them to think about the fundamentals of CEA – two-way-communication, information as aid, participation, and effective feedback. How would each of these apply to the scenario? Reemphasise that tools are available to help - the minimum actions for CEA in implementation and monitoring (which should be on their table), [pages 61-68 of the CEA Guide](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-guide/), and [Tool 24 (a) in the CEA Toolkit the CEA in CVA Checklist](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-toolkit/).
* In particular, groups should think about how they can use communication and engagement to address the misinformation, rumours and complaints that have sprung up, and how improved participation and other changes to the programme design could improve cash distributions in future.

**Potential answers include:**

1. **How will you address this situation in the affected communities? What approaches will you use and who will you speak with?**

* Ensure all programme staff, branch staff and volunteers understand the feedback received, the implications, and how the cash distribution process is supposed to work so they can explain it clearly to people.
* Provide additional training sessions or briefings for staff and volunteers if necessary.
* Meet with community leaders and community committees to discuss the issue and how best to address it within the community. Find out what information was shared about the cash grants and how the process to prioritise households was handled.
* Ask people in the community what they feel are the most effective ways and channels to engage with them on this (radio, leaflets, posters, meetings, social media, religious or other community leaders, volunteers going door-to-door, through the Access App etc.)?
* Has there been favouritism towards local Fidda households? The rumours could be true – you will need to find out, address this internally if it is a genuine issue, and make sure it doesn’t happen again.
* If it is just a rumour, what is it about the programme that caused/enabled these rumours to appear and how could this be avoided in future? The staggered distribution delivering cash to different households in each phase means people not included in the first tranches have to understand the approach, and trust and be patient that their turn will come – this may not be realistic. If the demographics of those receiving cash each time is skewed at all, it is likely to fuel rumours that one group is favoured over another. This requires greater (clearer and more widely shared) explanation of the programme modality and ensuring an even demographic mix for each tranche. It would be worth considering if this staggered approach is a good idea – this needs to be balanced against the reasons for choosing it in the first place, but it may be better to distribute cash to everyone prioritised for the grants at the same time, rather than in three phases. **This is not a decision for CEA to take**, but it is a suggestion/recommendation to the CVA program staff/ decision makers that CEA colleagues could make based on observation of the rumours and the issues causing them.
* The decision to distribute in three phases was taken by the National Society and IFRC programme management together – it is unclear if there was any participation from or consultation with affected people on this. People from affected communities should have been involved in deciding this piece of programme design.
* Attend community meetings with the affected communities and, along with the community committees, explain how cash will be distributed and how households are prioritised. Answer any questions people have and address any tensions over how local host communities, displaced Ukamanians, and refugees from Nizania, are being supported.
* Reach people through preferred communication channels e.g., conduct some interactive radio shows with the expert in charge of the cash distribution alongside community committee members to explain how the programme will work and answer listener questions on air.
* Information on the prioritisation and distribution process could also be shared on social media (or other preferred communication channels), including answering any questions.
* Meet with women’s and other civil society groups, and religious leaders to ensure all groups and different profiles in the community understand the process and can explain it clearly to their members.
* Promote the feedback mechanism during the community meetings, radio shows and social media and encourage people to get in touch if they have questions about the process or think things have not been handled fairly in their communities.

1. **Why have these issues arisen and how could they have been avoided? What changes will you recommend to prevent similar issues in future cash distributions?**

* Provide more support and training to the community committees on their role and responsibilities and involve them more in the process overall. Ensure there is clear, effective communication about the cash programme and how households are prioritised.
* Increase inclusion and participation of community members in planning and decision making – there was some allowance for this in the original plan, but it didn’t happen.
* Ensure there is clear communication and community involvement at all stages, including before the activity starts - attend community meetings in advance to discuss how plans are taking shape, share information on the radio, through social media, or other existing local networks (religious groups, marketplaces, taxi drivers etc).
* Ensure a clear and transparent verification process prior to distribution.
* Ensure a clear and transparent feedback and complaints system is in place which people know about before the distribution.
* Ensure a clear, transparent and accessible appeals process is already established before the distributions begin.
* Provide more information and briefings to community volunteers, and other influential people, in the community so they understand how the cash grant process should work and can help monitor it and provide information to community members.
* Strengthen monitoring processes of community committees and others to check community members are able to access information from and give feedback to the National Society, and that people feel this feedback is attended to.

**The scenario**

A pilot cash distribution is underway in one of the priority affected communities in Fidda.

To help manage the risk and the workload, senior programme managers at the National Society and IFRC jointly decided to stagger distributions in the community over three phases, with different households receiving cash in each phase.

Since the programme started, there have been a lot of complaints received through the feedback mechanism.

Some people are asking why they have not received any cash when other people have.

There are rumours that Ukamania National Society is prioritising cash support to local people from Fidda because the Secretary General is from there.

The CEA team contacted some of the people who had provided feedback to get more information and discovered people did not understand that the grants would be staggered over three phases.

Community committees and volunteers were supposed to explain this to their communities, and agree together with the community which households would access the grants in each phase, but it seems this has not happened.

This has now stoked up tensions between local people in Fidda, Ukamanians who have been internally displaced to Fidda, and refugees from Nizania, who each feel they are being unfairly discriminated against.

**Your tasks**

The Head of Programmes has read the latest community feedback report and wants to know how the the CVA and CEA teams plan to solve these issues. Prepare your responses to the following questions, and be ready to meet with the Head of Programmes in **30 minutes**:

1. How will you address this situation in the affected communities? What approaches will you use and who will you speak with?
2. Why have these issues arisen and how could they have been avoided? What changes will you recommend preventing similar issues in future cash distributions?