Report on Annual Conference (SHOW ME THE MONEY) 2014 organized by ICVA.

Date: April 3, 2014

Background:
This year the theme of the annual conference of the International Council for Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) was “SHOW ME THE MONEY”. The conference was held in Geneva, Switzerland during April 1-2, 2014. Key objectives of the program were i) to explore the innovative funds for the humanitarian response and assistance, ii) to identify the partnership criteria, iii) to show the sources and donors of the humanitarian funds and iv) to way out of proposal writing for seeking humanitarian funds from the donors.

Participants
In the conference more than 150 participants were present from near about 15 countries and 50 organizations. I was also one of the participants in the conference as panellist.

Welcome Speech:
Nan Buzard, the Executive Director-ICVA gave her welcome speech and congratulated all the participants for attending in the conference. She also urged for active participation of all the colleagues and friends in the conference for making the conference successful.

Keynote Speech:
Judith Randel, Executive Director-Development –Initiatives presented the key notes to the conference. She mentioned that poverty can not removed without the humanitarian security. She said, it also needs to keep the commitment of the leaders of the organizations to the humanitarian actions when and where it will be needed. She added that crisis, vulnerability and poverty are correlated. The poor are the most vulnerable to any kind of crisis. Crises put the people into chronic poverty and make it harder for them to escape. Crises ruin the development gains at the family, community and national levels.

Innovation in Resourcing:
Three panellists delivered their experiences on innovation of resources in humanitarian assistance. I was also a panellist among other three. I gave a presentation about COAST and COAST experience on the innovative humanitarian fund and its management. The participants appreciated the innovative fund for humanitarian assistances for the disaster and climate vulnerable people. They also appraised that we are not dependent on the donors for immediate support to response the humanitarian assistance.
Introduction of ERF and CHF:
ERF means Emergency Response Fund and CHF means Common Humanitarian Fund.

Similarities of ERF and CHF:
• Managed by HC through OCHA with UN & NGO advisory board
• UN, Red Cross/Crescent, NGOs all eligible
• Each fund has global guidelines but some flexibility

Differences of ERF and CHF:
• ERF usually not in response plans where CHF mainly for projects in response plan
• ERF (<$10m/year) where CHF ($5 – $120m/year)
• ERF grant (<$0.5m) where CHF grant (>$0.5m)
• ERF mainly for NGOs but CHFs catching up, already >50%

Partnership Agreements with INGOs (START FUND)
International field director and International rescue committee and other 19 NGOs based in London, sitting on the committee and collaborative project initiated like START FUND.

How start fund works: A rapid response fund managed by NGOs for NGOs. The START does not work who are not giving effort to initiate their own funds. The START responses quickly for sub-grants just after any crisis. It addresses 8-40 crises and 10 million pound in a year. Its main role is to change the role of civil societies and NGO cooperation. It is also strategic player for the partner NGOs. It demonstrates the VfM (Value for Money). It can channelize the fund even within 48 hours. The START decides to allocate fund after recommendations from M&E team, learning evaluation committees, project selection committee and allocation committee.

CAFOD experience with START
CAFOD is a partnership based agency. An equitably is being managed relationship between CAFOD and a partners for the purpose of cooperation. CAFORD believes partnership for two reasons as for theological and development ground. Most of the CAFOD partners are the catholic based development organization. It believes that partnership is an alliance which expresses the solidarity and faith of commitment. The fund of CAFOD depends on the humanitarian grounds, relevance, effectiveness, partnership empowering and enabling for locally appropriate. CAFOD works mean the investing the people’s relation and recognizing the partners differences. Its partnership principles are: i) shared purpose, ii) mutual accountability, iii) equity, iv) subsidiarity, v) participation, vi) solidarity and vii) innovation, During partnership with any development organization CAFOD carry out an organizational assessment and financial profile for partnership. It also supports partners to the technical areas like reporting, capacity assessment or providing funds or WASH. It also develops the partners capacity building and mutual accountability.

Private Sector Funding (MM experience)
In this section Zu Mian, Senior Advisory Team of Mercy Malaysia (MM) shared her experience about the private donors in Malaysia. MM was established 1999 with some doctors from private sector. MM encourage private and public fund for implementing their activities. She told that, most of the funds of MM are coming from individual donors. During the disaster the group of staff of MM work with funding possibilities. Malaysia is a charity giving nation. She mentioned that, MM encouraged the corporate social responsibilities and corporate contribution along with sustainability. MM receives funds from corporate Malaysian sectors for its continuous improvements. MM is moving forward for strategic direction which is envisioning up to 2015. The main operation of MM is
mainstreaming resilience. MM also looks at the operation excellence and best practices in the international humanitarian assistance.

**Unicef preconditions for funding**

Unicef maintains three types funding relation with the CSOs like i) partnership-based on a written agreement and which may involve the exchanges of resources. ii) collaborations-based on an informal agreement and not involving transfer of resources and iii) contractual-based on a formal agreement which regulates the delivery of services or provision of goods. They also maintains the following characteristic for partnership like i) voluntary and collaborative, ii) between both public and non-public parties, iii) agreement to work together to achieve a common purpose or undertake a specific task, iv) a mutually agreed like sharing risk, responsibilities, resources and benefits.

**Country-Based Pool Fund (CBPF): Practical session for funding application to OCHA**

Technical proposal:
- Action is strategically relevant to the ERF strategy/CHF allocation strategy and to the strategic response plan.
- Action responds to greatest and most immediate humanitarian needs.
- Proposal defines acceptable methodology, standards and indicators.
- Partner has capacity and expertise in the proposed action and is capable for delivery.
- Proposal conforms the sectoral and geographical priorities.
- Duration and size of proposed action will have significant impact both geographically and thematically.
- Action includes relevant and appropriate monitoring, reporting and evaluation, both to the location and the type of work proposed.
- Proposal demonstrates strong gender analysis and strategies.

**Budget structure:**
- Direct costs have to be clearly linked to the project activities described in the project proposal and the logical framework. They are defined as actual costs directly related to the implementation of the project to cover the costs of goods and services delivered to beneficiaries and the costs related to the support activities (even partial, such as security guard or a logistician partially working to the project). Direct cost includes: staff and related personnel costs, including consultants and other personnel, supplies, commodities, materials, equipments, contractual services, travel costs including transport, fuel and daily substances allowances for staff, office stationeries and supplies, utilities such as telecommunications, internet and office rental and other direct costs including for monitoring, evaluation and reporting related to the implementation of the project. Indirect costs includes: maximum 7 per cent of the total direct cost of the actual expenditure, indirect/administrative costs of sub-implementing partners associated to the implementation of the specific project should be covered by the overall maximum 7 per cent of the actual project activities.
Ineligible expenditures: Purchase of capital asset such as vehicles, IT and communication and office equipment, unless exceptionally authorised by the HC (Humanitarian Coordinator), cost related to NGO governance structures and other general management, any cost related to the NGOs staff as consultant, the expenditures which are not mentioned in the approved project budget.

Inclusion for budget submission: These are i) budget tool template which will be three sheets i.e. initial, interim and final), ii) budget narrative, iii) project proposal narrative template, iv) co-funding contributions, v) third party request form, vi) bank information and bank statement/certification, vii) capacity assessment form and viii) memo of cash.

**My learning and follow up:**
- My presentation about COAST and its experiences about humanitarian innovative funds in a large audience.
- Big event management was learning and thoughtful.
- The relation established with the global persons of different INGOs, NNGOs.
- Follow up of ERF and CHF with OCHA.
- Keep communication with all the relevant persons from my end.
- Including all the participants with whom I had been introduced with my Face Book account.
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