

Generalized Model for Implementation of Cash for Work Program during Post-war Recovery: Based on the Experience Gained from Emergency Northern Recovery Project

S.S. Janen

Northern Agri Operations, CIC Agri Businesses (Pvt) Ltd, Sri Lanka
ssjanen@gmail.com

Abstract: Livelihoods of the resettled IDPs were critically poor, immediately after the resettlement process of post war recovery in Sri Lanka. Cash for Work (CFW) was implemented by Emergency Northern Recovery Project to facilitate them with mental and financial stability. It facilitates the community for their short term employment; in the mean time it creates a community ownership in the village, by renovating the community assets with the participation of community itself. This facilitated the community strengthening with livelihood development. This was identified as an ideal method for emergency situations such as, post conflict, post war, and post disaster. This study area confines in Northern Province. Continuous review was carried out since the beginning of the CFW programme up to the final stage of CFW programme. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was carried out to find out the strength and weakness of implementation of CFW programme and recommendation for improvements. Impact assessment survey was done to visualize the livelihood development of CFW beneficiaries during and after the CFW programme. Modification in Implementation of CFW programme was undertaken throughout regular Monitoring and Evaluation process. Finally, Generalized Model for Implementation of Cash for Work Program for post emergency situation in Sri Lanka was developed. The common recommendation for CFW were; carrying out baseline data collection, developing overall objective, setting target for CFW program, determine the wage rate for CFW program, recruitment and motivation of staffs, decide whether to collaborate with local NGOs, select community based existing committee or new CFW committee, strengthening the community groups, baseline profile of beneficiaries, selection of subproject, design and implement the selected project, chose a reliable method for payment, set up monitoring and evaluation system and develop a phasing out strategy to meet the sustainability of the CFW programme. By implementing the proposed structure of CFW program will help to uplift the community's socio economic status with sustainable manner in the future CFW programme.

Keywords: Cash for Work, Community Resource Person, Emergency Northern Recovery Project, Livelihood.

I. INTRODUCTION

CFW is a short-term intervention used in the Emergency Situation by Government and International organizations to provide immediate assistance through fabricating temporary employment in community based projects [6] CFW should be involving in repairing roads, clearing shrubs in the public properties such as school, temples, hospitals, etc, clearing debris, clearing canals to uplift the livelihood of the vulnerable segments of the community [5]. The methodology is relatively new, but its use has become increasingly common in food insecure, disaster-affected or post-conflict environments.

In Sri Lanka in 2005, following the destruction ensued by tsunami, through USAID/OFDA grant in order to provide income generating opportunities through reconstruction of vital community infrastructure and livelihoods CFW was carried out [6]. The program employed nearly 1,300 villagers from Ampara, Galle and Trincomalee districts who worked for 28,959 person days for a total of \$164,655 (including wage, lunch and equipment). Some of the outputs generated by CFW activities include clearing roads, lanes and beach line. In addition, the program rehabilitated ten religious buildings and fourteen other public buildings [6].



Figure 1: Implementation of CFW by ENReP

This study examines the process of CFW implementation and provides a general methodology that can be adapted to the many different countries and contexts in which CFW to be implemented. Based on Emergency Northern Recovery Project (ENReP) experience, the rationale of CFW describes when the use of the methodology is most appropriate. The Guide prepared based on this finding provides simple, useful tools for determining the appropriateness of CFW, a general framework for implementation, and the forms and documents necessary for implementing CFW programs. This is meant to act only as a general guideline. Each programme will vary in context, and the CFW process should be adjusted accordingly.

1.1. Background of CFW

Emergency Northern Recovery Project, under Ministry of Economic Development started the first CFW programme in the Northern Province after the post war recovery in terms of highest disbursement and highest beneficiaries through the Cash for Work program [2].

Main focus was given by CFW program which was expected to improve the community participation in the villages [3]. This CFW program consists with two stages named as one and two. Stage 1 was included with home land clearing and the stage 2 with the common works [3]. By doing the CFW program, it contributes to re build the unity among the peoples and facilitated to improve the village access and other immediate needs. Totally 49068 families have been benefited at the end of CFW program undertaken during 2010, 2011 and 2012 which incurred an expenses of Rs. 1184.55 million.

1.2. *The Rationale for CFW Implementation*

While the financial resources provided by CFW programming are short-term in nature, the positive results were optioned by the CFW program [1]. Employment opportunities generated by CFW programming enable many individuals who would otherwise be reluctant to resettle after the post conflict situation which will create abundance their homes and preserve their communities, families and neighborhoods [1]. CFW provides assistance not only in the form of the restoration of livelihoods through economic stimulation and opportunity, but is an impetus for affected individuals to reinvest back into the community. CFW can be a powerful instrument for positive change but it is not appropriate in all cases. Reunion of communities and mental relaxation was also achieved through the CFW program. It is also facilitated to strengthen their communities. Following advantages and disadvantages of CFW for the beneficiaries, the implementing team, and the local population can be expected.

II. OBJECTIVE

- To Review each and every activities of CFW programme undertaken by ENReP
- To recommend a generalize model for implementation of CFW program during post emergency context.

III. METHODOLOGY

The study area confines in to Vavuniya, Mannar, Mullaithivu, Kilinochchi and Jaffna district in the Northern Province.

Continuous review was carried out since the beginning of the CFW programme in December 2009 up to the ending of CFW programme in March 2012. Focus Group Discussion (FGD) was carried out among CFW beneficiaries, Community Resource Persons (CRP), Village heads and Institutional Higher-ups such as Gramaniladari, Divisional Secretariats etc to find out the strength and weakness of implementation of CFW programme and recommendation for improvements. Impact assessment survey was carried out in early 2012 to find out the livelihood development of CFW beneficiaries during and after the CFW programme. This survey consists of the question to identify the comparison before and after implementation of the CFW programme. Modification of Implementation of CFW programme was undertaken throughout regular Monitoring and Evaluation process. Finally, from the information gathered from the study and the suggestion made by key informants the Generalized Model for Implementation of Cash for Work Program for post emergency situation in Sri Lanka was developed.

IV. FINDINGS

Focus group discussion indentified that CFW programme was contributed drastically to uplift the livelihood of the people soon after the emergency situation like post war in Sri Lanka. It was identified by the fact finding mission of World Bank identified that implementation method adapted by Emergency Northern Recovery Project was highly addressed need of IDPs soon after their resettlement. Twenty eight percentage of the individual participated in the FGDs suggested needs of improvement in the CFW implementation by ENReP. Regular monitoring and evaluation identified some improvement to be made to carry out the future CFW more effective than the current.

4.1. *Baseline data collection*

It is collection of data, through household interviews and target group discussions to find out the appropriateness of the CFW program in the emergency situation. Income factors, market availabilities, needs of the communities and the damaged resource.

4.2. *Develop an overall objective*

Once an assessment has ascertained that CFW is an appropriate intervention, the first step is to develop an overall programmatic objective. This will define and prioritize the purpose of CFW, while facilitating monitoring, clarifying results and developing effect and impact indicators. There are four general objectives of CFW program.

4.3. *Set target for CFW program*

The target is to supply people with cash when the community does not have assets to purchase food and necessary item when they are available in the market.

4.4. *Determine wage rate for the CFW program*

The eventual success or failure of a CFW program is often a function of the care taken in setting the wage rate. It must be sufficient to inject needed cash flow into the local economy without causing unwanted economic ramifications such as price fluctuation, dependency, or competition with local producers. In order to minimize market distortion, the agency needs to ascertain wage rates for skilled and unskilled labor before and after the disaster through cooperation with government, local leaders, and/or local business people. The wage should usually be fixed at an amount lower than the market rate to ensure that CFW projects attract the most economically disadvantaged individuals. A general target is 10%-20% lower than the regular market rate. If wages are too high, CFW projects may entice people away from their regular livelihood activities. However, in the immediate aftermath of a large-scale disaster, the majority of employment activities may be interrupted. In this case, it may be appropriate to adopt wage rates comparable or even superior to those previously in existence to rapidly reintroduce economic activity.

Surveys of the local economy, including an overview of market prices and the availability of employment, should be performed on a regular basis throughout the project to ensure that CFW wages stay at the appropriate level. In instances where local businesses continue to have difficulties hiring sufficient laborers because of competition with CFW programs, then it reflect that the labour market have been activated. In that point the CFW is recommended to close because it will ensure the livelihood of the individuals. If the CFW is not close even after local labour market is activated, then it will lead to dependences in the community. An inquiry into the condition of the local market and wage rate appropriateness should include the following steps:

- *Recruit and orient project staff:* In case of emergency scenario, when CFW program follow an initial distribution of emergency materials then the rapid recruitment of CFW staff is essential. In acute emergencies, when CFW programs follow an initial distribution of emergency material, CFW project staff members are often the same employees involved in the first emergency response. Ideally, the project manager who is an expatriate or national has had previous CFW experience to expedite program startup. Whatever the final structure, the initial team should include individuals familiar with the agency, its operational procedures, and agency values. The exact number and structure of staff will vary depending on context and size of the operation. It is important to provide a general agency orientation and specific CFW program

orientation to all new employees, including reviewing the relevant job description. Particularly important is to provide on-the-job mentoring by experienced CFW staff to new team members.

- *Decide whether partnership with local NGOs is needed:* CFW program can be collaborated with other local entities, NGOs and INGOs. Decision should be made in the initial stage of the program to ensure the responsibilities of partner organization. It is essential to classify the forks according to their experience and get the optimum output from each organization. Clear agreement should be essential among the partner organization to avoid conflicting interest among the organization.
- *Select community based existing comities or new CFW comities for CFW program:* Community participation is essential in the CFW program to empower the community. To ensure this, existing community based organization such as RDS, WRDS, FO, etc., can be involved in the decision making of the CFW program. If those comities are not functioning or non active, then the decision can be made by the newly formed CFW comity. CFW comity will be the representative of the village.
- *Strength community based groups or established new CFW comities:* Proper training should be given rapidly to the CFW comity to make decision, prioritize the village needs and the community needs. Facilitate the comity with an office space, instruments and stationeries for their day to day activities.
- *Collect baseline profile of beneficiaries:* With the involvement of the CFW comity, GS and DS select the beneficiaries for the CFW program. The income level and the livelihood standard should be considered during the selection. NOTE: it is recommended by the ENReP to have provision facilitate the elderly people and differently able people [4].
- *Selection of Sub Projects:* The process of choosing communities for CFW activities relies largely on the initial assessment, the agency's target area and existing activities in the region. The initial appraisal may involve discussions with existing local government and community structures, religious or tribal leaders and elders.
 - a). Interest and receptivity: The community must be supportive of the program activities.
 - b). Level of infrastructure damage: This level must be within the agency's capacity to address.
 - c). Commitment of local government officials: The support of local leadership is crucial to the success of the program.
 - d). Labour availability: There should enough laborers.
 - e). Commitment: Local community structures should pledge to be inclusive and allow for input and decision making by women, men and marginalized groups in the community.
 - f). Accessibility: The site must be accessible to permit start-up and continued monitoring.
 - g). Other actors: Avoid working in areas where other NGOs are running similar or contradictory programs.
 - h). Potential for longer term engagement: Determine if the program fits with other areas of operation and if there is potential for long-term recovery and development activities.
 - i). Community Responsibilities: The responsibilities of community representatives can include:
 - Defining selection criteria for beneficiaries.
 - Disseminating information on objectives and the size of cash payments.
 - Selecting beneficiaries.
 - Selecting appropriate Cash-for-Work activities.
 - Maintaining order on payment days.
 - Providing feedback on activities.
 - Liaison for the provision of government permissions if needed (i.e., licenses).

- *Design and implement community selected projects:* Through the CFW comity select the sub projects to be undertaken by the CFW program and prioritize them according to the village need and implement them. The goal is to improve basic assets or to accomplish a community-defined project. Unlike the activities that may be implemented under the previous objective, projects in this category are chosen according to their usefulness and sustainability. Possible projects include clearing irrigation canals, repairing schools, fixing water and sanitation systems, planting greenbelts, or repairing roads. It is essential to inform officials and community members from the outset of the purpose of CFW programming and its general methodology. In many areas, CFW is a relatively new form of programming, and a lack of knowledge about the principles of the program can create suspicion on the part of some community or government stakeholders. The following issues should be considered:
 - a). The community should be made fully aware that CFW is being provided during a limited timeframe for a specific and limited purpose. There should be no expectations from the community members that the program will run indefinitely, nor should CFW be regarded as a long-term source of employment.
 - b). Aid agencies should underscore the importance of broad community participation (not only community leaders and government officials) in the processes of selecting development projects and programmatic activities.
 - c). Agencies should establish links with relevant government officials, prior to the onset of programmatic activities, that CFW is a temporary form of disaster relief and is not meant to serve as “employment” in the traditional sense. Apart from the obvious utility of maintaining clear lines of communication with the host government, it is important to note that an accidental classification as an “employer” can have significant legal and tax ramifications.
 - d). It is important to educate beneficiaries regarding the more common forms of fraud (i.e. bribes, dishonest traders). In order to avoid unjust extortion of money in form of “taxes” and “fee services,” try to ensure that the community members know about existing taxes by inviting local authorities/leaders to discuss this issue within the community.
- *Chose a reliable method of payment:* Direct payment to the beneficiaries is a rapid method for the CFW payments. But, there is a possibility for the corruption. ENReP recommends direct deposit in the beneficiary’s bank account weekly. If there is an accessibility issue, then mobile banking should be arranged during the week of payments. An agreement should be made with the bank in the initial stage to avoid the delay in payments.
- *Set up monitoring and evaluation system:* Works and the targets and the beneficiary’s achievement should be closely monitored to achieve the purpose of the CFW program. To avoid corruption monitoring and evaluation should be in the higher level.
- *Develop a phasing out strategy:* Implementation of any livelihood program should be sustainable. To ensure the sustainability continuous livelihood facilitation is essential. Providing employments, micro financing for small industries and facilitating community contracting can be practices as phasing out strategies. After a large-scale emergency, CFW programming may be desired by host governments as a way of producing employment and keeping an impacted population from migrating or abandoning their communities in search of new livelihoods. This purpose should be attaining in the end of the program.

- *SWOT for the generalized model*

Strength

- Community participation.
- Shortterm employment generation.
- Moral strength.
- Indirect need assessment.
- Involvement of professionals.
- Exposure.
- Village level database.

Weakness

- Different in opinion.
- Flow of funding.
- Low labour wage.

Opportunities

- Emerging leadership.
- Sustainable environment.
- Different donors can involve in development.
- Avoiding of duplication.

Threats

- Miss handling of Community procurement.
- Create lethargic labour.
- Instability in job.

V. CONCLUSION

Generalized model for implementation of Cash for Work programme for post emergency situation in Sri Lanka will provide and basic implementation framework for future implementation of CFW programme. 79% of the Focus group discussion participants identified that CFW programme was contributed drastically to uplift the livelihood of the people soon after the emergency situation like post war in Sri Lanka. 93% of the percipience mention that Implementation method adapted by Emergency Northern Recovery Project was highly addressed need of IDPs soon after their resettlement. 28% of the individual participated in the FGDs suggested needs of improvement in the CFW implementation by ENReP. SWOT analysis of the model emphasize that the strength and opportunities are higher than the threats and weakness. Hence, the frame work was made-up for generalized model to implement the CFW (Figure 2) will facilitate to uplift the socio economic standard of the affected community with Sustainable manner.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank the Ministry of Economic Development for facilitating this study on the CFW programme. Also sincere thanks go to the World Bank, who has given the technical support for carrying out this study in Northern Sri Lanka.



Figure 2: Recommended CFW implementation structure

REFERENCES

- [1]. Cash for Work Workbook Sri Lanka Red Cross – British Red Cross, 2005.
- [2]. Environmental and Social Assessment and Management Framework, Emergency Northern Recovery Project, Ministry of Economic Development. 2009.
- [3]. Project Paper, Emergency Northern Recovery Project, World Bank and Government of Sri Lanka, 2009.
- [4]. Sivakumar, S.S. Investigation of Emergency Northern recovery Project (ENReP) in conflict affected north Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Science and It Management*, 2013.
- [5]. Sivakumar, S.S. Post Conflict Socio-Economic Recovery of a disaster Affcted Society by engineering intervention of restoration of blasted Kalmadu Irrigation scheme with Environmental mitigation methods. *RJSITM*, 2013.
- [6]. Thatcher Cook, Shirine Bakhat and Jason Sangster, Guide to Cash-for-Work Programming, Mercy Crop. 2007.