

Contents

1. MPC response overview
2. CWG survey highlights and recommendations
3. Strategic/operational coordination updates
(PTT updates and survey results; donors on MPC; a note on surging experts)
4. Technical coordination updates
(early market indicators from REACH RNA; planned JRAM)
5. Links to key resources

Prepared by the CWG coordination team:

Bihter Moschini, CWG Coordinator
cbr.twg@gmail.com

Fe Kagahastian, WoS Cash and Markets
Advisor cashcap.syria@gmail.com

1. MPC response overview

The data below correspond to **emergency MPC one-off** for EQ survivors, as reported by partners to the FSL EQ Response Tracker **for the period of 9-13 February**. A total of 7 implementing partners were able to distribute emergency MPC within the first 7 days following the earthquake. Others indicated plans to distribute during the second week; their response will be included in the next bulletin.

Totals

of implementing partners: **7** (ACTED, Bahar, IRC, IYD, NRC, Orange, PIN)

of families assisted: **13,317**

of individuals benefiting from this assistance (indicative): **66,635**

Total value distributed (in USD): **\$1.87 million**

By governorate

Aleppo

Total # of individuals benefiting from this assistance (indicative): **24,835**

Total value distributed (in USD): **\$618,150**

Idleb

of individuals benefiting from this assistance (indicative): **41,800**

Total value distributed (in USD): **\$1.25 million**

Highlights:

- **Relevance/Cost-efficiency, cost-effectiveness/AAP.** Emergency one-off MPC as a rapid, no-regrets, first-line response is the only standalone type of aid that could address multiple needs in one distribution, while respecting the agency of affected people to prioritize their needs according to their unique situation. Many CWG partners, including national NGOs, have been at the forefront of distributing this type of assistance in previous emergencies in northwest Syria, and have been pre-positioning emergency MPC in rapid response mechanisms even before the earthquake.
- **Appropriateness.** Emergency MPC is appropriate particularly in the context of assisting homeless, displaced earthquake survivors, who are in trauma and have to endure below-freezing temperatures. Under these conditions, MPC would likely be spent by recipients on services and communication needs, e.g. transportation to reach safer grounds, or to rent a room where their children could get warm; to reconnect with relatives who can host them; or to travel to other areas where they can safely seek medical services for families with injured and sick members.
- As such, rapid assessments of markets for goods pre-distribution would not be relevant at this moment in time, and may only cause additional grief to people in shock, who may have already been subjected to numerous assessments that asked the same questions. This will be revisited as the response evolves.

2. CWG survey highlights and recommendations

Out of consideration for earthquake-affected staff, who are also hard at work on their rapid response, the CWG conducted a 2-minute survey to collect information on 13 Feb., instead of holding a meeting. A total of 34 organizations participated in the survey.

Highlights

- **Distribution capacities and plans.** 7 organizations plan to distribute MPC within the 2nd week of the response, while another 10 organizations plan to distribute in the following 3rd and 4th weeks.
- **Design/transfer values.** 58% of partners selected the Emergency MPC design option of distributing **150 USD** one-off first, plus two succeeding rounds of **100 USD**, covering a period of 3 months.
- **Currency of distribution.** A glitch in the survey tool led to diluted results and no clear consensus. (Refer to recommendations below)
- **Main challenges.** The top 3 challenges identified by partners within the first week were: PTT-related¹, lack of coordination, and IDPs without identification.

CWG RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Transfer values. Distribute emergency MPC one-off at **\$150** as rapidly as possible, prioritizing families in temporary, informal shelters, including reception/collective centers and makeshift tents. They can use the cash to displace somewhere else, or to repair minor damages to homes cleared for return. For those sheltering in place because their homes are fully destroyed or unsafe to return to after the first month, distribute two more consecutive rounds of MPC at **\$100** to cover a total period of three months. This recommendation reflects partners' survey feedback and the anticipated massive needs against over-stretched resources in the coming months.

2.2 Transfer currency. Coordinate with other cash actors at distribution-point level and decide collectively on a common currency of transfer (USD or TRY) as this involves a number of unknown variables. Joint currency decision-making must be informed by people's preference, balanced with expediency (what is most convenient and practical for recipients) and cost-efficiency considerations (which currency requires less transaction fees and overhead costs that could stretch funds and allow organisations to help a greater number of people in need?).

2.3 Modality. Vouchers (paper or electronic) are not recommended at this time as they require a longer procurement process, including vendor vetting and capacity assessments. However, those with e-transfer systems in place pre-earthquake may begin preparations for the next phase of relief operations.

2.4 No ID. Partners responding, especially in reception/collective centers in the hardest-hit (intensity 7) areas should not require identification from affected families as a pre-condition to receiving cash. Syrian NGOs and long-serving INGOs in the cross-border response have SOPs adapted at the height of the conflict when people also lost everything, while escaping daily bombardments that reduced their homes into rubbles.

2.5 Market assessments. Skip pre- and post-distribution rapid assessment of markets for goods at this time. Cash is likely to be spent on services, rent, and mobile credit, enabling displaced people to organize relocation if they have this option. Remember that market actors are affected people themselves, struggling to deal with the trauma while balancing concerns over the safety of their families and livelihood recovery.

2.6 PDM. Conduct household-level post-distribution monitoring within the first week of distribution, as lightly as possible, to capture information before people move.

2.7 Reporting. Thank you to partners for swiftly reporting their emergency MPC one-off distributions and plans to the FSL Cluster EQ response tracker as recommended by the CWG. Please continue doing so until the CCCM's multisector EQ response tracker is up and running in the coming days.

2.8 Coordination. Given the enormity of the earthquake's impact, lack of coordination at reception/collective centers can be expected. If your organization has the capacity, step up and lead the coordination until formal arrangements are in place.

¹ PTT is Türkiye's postal system, which has been facilitating fund transfers from Türkiye into northwest Syria for cross-border operations. Pre-EQ, PTT mandated humanitarian organisations registered in the country to sign a Protocol Agreement with them as part of their due diligence and adherence to regulations on anti-money laundering and countering the financing of terrorism. Most partners have Protocol Agreements in place, while others were at different stages of the application process when the earthquake struck.

3. Strategic/operational coordination updates

3.1 Important updates from PTT

The CWG, in collaboration with OCHA Gaziantep, has obtained the following information from PTT HQ in Ankara:

- Functional and non-functional branches as of this reporting period (see table)
- PTT is provisioning to fast-track registered humanitarian organisations submitting a Protocol Agreement (PA) application for the first time.
- Per PTT, they can finalize complete applications within 3-4 days following a security check.
- The 100k TRY daily transfer ceiling to NWS applies only to organisations without a PA in place, or those with an active PA but are not abiding by its provisions, including payment of the mandatory 1% commission rate applied by PTT per transfer.
- For organisations with PAs in place and are adhering to the PA provisions, **there is NO fund transfer ceiling**. To avoid any liquidity issues and delivery delay, partners are requested to communicate the transfer plan in advance to PTT Ankara, especially for large amounts.

NAME of (SUB)DISTRICT	BRANCH/ATM	STATUS
Jarablus	ATM	Functional
Al-Bab	ATM	Functional
Cobanbey/Atmeh	ATM	Functional
Azaz	ATM	Functional
Mare	ATM	Functional
Tel Abiad	ATM	Functional
Suluk	ATM	Not functional
Al-Bab (Hospital)	ATM	Not functional
El-Bab (Police station)	ATM	Functional
Kabassin	ATM	Not functional
Blizza	ATM	Not functional
Qundarah	ATM	Functional
Afrin	ATM	Functional
Afrin (Police station)	ATM	Functional
Jandairis	ATM	Functional
Soran	ATM	Functional
Azaz (Police station)	ATM	Functional
Raco	ATM	Not functional
Tel Abyad	ATM	Functional
Ras al-Ayn	ATM	Functional
Azaz-2	ATM	Functional
Afrin-2	ATM	Functional
Jarablus	SUBE	Functional
Al Bab	SUBE	Functional
Çobanbey/Atmeh	SUBE	Functional
Azaz	SUBE	Functional
Mare	SUBE	Functional
Afrin	SUBE	Not functional
Jandairis	SUBE	Not functional
Raco	SUBE	Not functional
Tel Abiad	SUBE	Not functional
Ras Al-Ayn	SUBE	Not functional

3.2 CWG advocacy/requests to PTT (already communicated through OCHA, awaiting response from PTT):

a) Consider the interim approval of new PA applications with partial submission of supporting documents, provided there is a written commitment from the organisation's highest official committing to forward all requirements within a month. This is in consideration of many humanitarian organisations whose offices are seriously damaged by the earthquake and who sustained casualties and injuries among their staff. Under such conditions, they may not be able to secure all supporting documents in a matter of days. If such organisation's management teams based in Turkiye are temporarily unable to retrieve/recover their documents, but have functioning field teams inside Syria, able to assist survivors of the earthquake, we should do all we can to facilitate their capability to provide rapid response.

b). Consider applying the same interim approval period to registered organisations, who have already initiated their PA process and whose applications were under review prior to the earthquake.

3.3 PTT survey

Shortly before the earthquake struck on 6 Feb., the CWG conducted a survey to assess the PA status of partners and identify the key challenges/bottleneck they experience throughout the PA process. The aim of the survey was to help the CWG craft advocacy messages to PTT with the support of OCHA.

Highlights

- Out of 32 partners, who participated in the survey, only 5 organisations said they have NO Protocol Agreement in place with PTT. The rest said YES.
- Among these 5 partners, only 1 indicated having no PA at all.
- The remaining 4 organisations indicated their PA applications were in progress, but has yet to be approved.
- The main challenge reported was the 100K TRY daily ceiling, which has been clarified above.

3.4 Donor support for MPC

- Our generous donors have been in communication with the CWG, committing to support emergency MPC.
- The OCHA-managed Syria Cross-border Humanitarian Funds (SCHF) and the Aid Fund for Northern Syria (AFNS) are coordinating to ensure complementarity of their reserve/special allocations for the EQ response, as the two funding facilities designed to provide access to funds to Syrian NGOs, including those with capacity to implement emergency MPC.

3.5 For organisations considering surging experts to support the NWS CVA response

- Please ensure that this decision is based on real demand coming from the ground.
- Consider that this cross-border operation is uniquely remotely managed and Syrian NGOs have been the ones implementing CVA in partnership with international organisations since 2014. As such, international expert support, if needed, can be provided remotely.
- Reflect on the cost against budgets of flying in international experts to a context with high capacity among national staff, seasoned by nearly a decade of CVA implementation experience in cross-border response. How many affected families could be assisted if the surge budget is spent on giving them the cash instead?

4. Technical coordination updates

4.1 Early market indicators from the REACH Rapid Needs Assessment carried out from 9-11 Feb in collaboration with the NWS NGO Forum:

- Top-level findings point to overall market resilience. Even in assessed communities that reported being directly impacted by either damage or service disruption, markets are generally not fully closed and increased item unavailability was not commonly reported. However, while overall numbers reflect market resilience and continued functionality, RNA data shows that some geographic areas are more commonly experiencing market-related issues. More information and links under section 5.

4.2 Joint Rapid Assessment of Markets (JRAM)

- The CWG and partners contributed to the JRAM tool developed by REACH's Cash and Markets Team and advocated for a coordinated assessment to be conducted the week of 20 Feb. This increases coverage capacity of affected while minimizing footprint and survey fatigue among respondents. Results will be widely shared.

5. Links to key resources

- [FSL Cluster EQ response tracker](#)
- REACH-NGO Forum RNA data set in [Arabic](#) and in [English](#)
- Market impact maps from the REACH-NGO Forum RNA (click on the underlined to view the maps)
 - **Increased item unavailability indicator.** [Increased item unavailability indicator](#). Among assessed communities where KIs reported direct earthquake impact (damage or service disruption), increased unavailability of items was not commonly indicated as an issue (11% of these communities). However, increased unavailability was noted more commonly in impacted communities in Ariha and Janudiyeh sub-districts and, to an extent, in Salqin, Al Bab, and Ar-Ra'ee sub-districts.
 - **General market accessibility indicator.** [Reported accessibility of markets to populations residing in affected communities](#). According to KIs, markets were generally accessible to all or most of the population in assessed communities with earthquake impact (reported by KIs in 79% of these communities). Sub-districts where KIs most commonly reported that markets were only accessible to half or less of the population included Janudiyeh, Ma'btali, Raju, Jandaris, and Raju sub-districts.
 - **Vendor/shop closure indicator:** [Change in number of vendors operating since the earthquakes](#). KIs in two-thirds of the communities directly impacted by the earthquake said that no or just a few vendors had closed shop since the earthquakes. Nonetheless, higher proportions of more significant shop/vendor closures (a lot/most/all vendors) were seen in impacted communities in some sub-districts more than others, including Darkosh, Harim, Qourqeena, and Suran.
- MPC 2023 Guidance (released Jan. 2023) in [English](#) and [Arabic](#)