

# CASH, SHELTER & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS



Implications and opportunities associated with Cash Transfer Programming in humanitarian response



# Research Questions

<b>Question One</b>	To what extent have environmental considerations been taken into account in the past when using CTP as part of humanitarian assistance?
<b>Question Two</b>	From an environmental perspective, what implications and what opportunities are associated with CTP? What factors should be considered for humanitarian cash across sectors?
<b>Question Three</b>	Is it possible to identify environmental pre-conditions to determine when CTP, in-kind or a hybrid option should be the preferred modality employed as part of a humanitarian response?

## Project Outputs

- **Report – “LOOKING THROUGH AN ENVIRONMENTAL LENS”**
- **Shelter Sector Specific ‘Briefing Note’**

# Implications

- Unconditional, unrestricted or multipurpose cash grants give beneficiaries control over how they use funds and build regardless of environmental conditions.
- When environmental risks are high, sourcing local materials for shelter may compromise fragile environmental conditions (e.g. deforestation, soil erosion, etc.), creating more harm than relief.
- When sourcing materials for shelter programming in a market-based response, strong regulatory policies are key to ensure sustainability and quality.
- When the amount of cash transferred is insufficient to cover all shelter reconstruction demands, beneficiaries may opt for cheaper materials that are typically less environmentally sustainable and lower quality.

# Opportunities

- CTP provides beneficiaries with greater choice and ownership over recovery and the recovery of their local environment.
- Conditional and restricted cash transfers provide practitioners an opportunity to positively shape beneficiary behavior towards sustainable, certified and durable materials that ‘do no harm’ to local environments.
- Cash linked technical assistance should include sensitization on construction linked environmental factors that support ‘build back better’, linking preparedness and recovery to environmental management/ resilience.
- CfW programmes such as clearing debris enables the disposal of materials while allowing for the collection and reuse of certain materials.
- In addressing MEAL, CTP shifts actors’ away from volume based output measures towards impact-based which may be more conducive to assessing environmental impacts.
- Within coordination systems, joint monitoring and assessment can facilitate informed decisions on CTP, which opportunity to bridge environmental linkages around modality selection within the sector.

# Recommendations

## **The GSC should;**

- Coordinate efforts to determine how environmental risk can be standardised into the modality selection process, linking to criteria of context, markets and protection.

## **Implementers should;**

- Conduct environmental modality selection diagnostics for all programme inputs, allowing for hybrid assistance when inputs do not meet standards for sustainability, quality and environmental protection.
- Strengthen their use of features of CTP including technical guidance, restrictions and conditions where local sources of materials present environmental risk to ensure only materials of appropriate quality and sustainability are used.
- Incorporate environmental considerations into M&E systems to allow for adaptation of modality used in shelter programmes as contexts and the sourcing of inputs change and to offset a loss of control.
- Conduct EIA's of all programmes in order to build evidence for linkages between programming, modality choice and environmental outcomes.

Report due soon..... Hopefully.



For more information contact;  
Jake Zarins  
[JZarins@habitat.org](mailto:JZarins@habitat.org)