

We feel that INGO and UN organizations should take a general and universal policy for not involving in direct operation of project implementation in the national level. Whatever projects should be implemented by their local partner organizations. In fact, this partnership approach promotes sustainability, accountability and strengthening the advocacy with local political rooting.

In some cases, INGO and UN organizations or their subsidiaries or local chapters are seen competing with local organizations to raise funds for project implementation at the national or regional level. These should be stopped, now. INGO should raise fund from their origin countries while UN organizations should run on fund contributed by its member countries. INGO must not take advantage of their international link and advance technologies to raise funds for their local subsidiaries/affiliation in local level. They should leave this scope and space to organically grown local NGO and CSO for the sake of the effectiveness of the fund and development initiatives.

6. Stop Brain drain from Local NGO. Introduce Equal Compensation for Same Level of Competency. Reduce the Gap in Salary and Benefits during Partnership. It is being observed that local NGO develop human resource with their precious and hard earned resources. INGO and UN organizations have more budget to pay higher salary and facilities. Finally while the staff has developed and

started to give quality output, INGO and UN organizations hire and benefit them. They hardly allow the partner local NGO to give same level of salary and benefits to their staffs having higher skills and competencies. This brain drain is ultimately counterproductive to the localization and accountability. So there should be an effort to reduce the gap of salary and benefits among partnership organizations and a simultaneous effort of reducing the level of competency standard among each other is also expected.

7. Partnership Agreement Must Include the Clause for Arbitration and Joint Evaluation:

The most of INGO and UN agency partnership agreements with local NGO, especially the ones for accounts and audit objections, hardly include the clause related to arbitration in respect of points of differences. If disputes arise both the parties hires arbitrators and will look for judgment. Especially in respect of accounts and audit findings, it seems that the decision of the INGO or UN agencies on the accounts verdict is final. They hardly give scopes to challenge. This is top down, unequal and unilateral. This practice, above all, is undignified and leaves scope of taking advantage of having higher position. This has to be changed.

INGO and UN agencies also hire consultants for project evaluation and conduct it. But we feel all the project evaluation should be joint initiative and there should be a representation from all project partners. Note of descents should be considered or at least should be documented.

Making Humanitarian and Development Activism Localized and Accountable

7 Initial Actionable Proposals on Reshaping Aid

It s a roll out process and is initiated by Bangladeshi NGO for WHS (BNfWHS) to make it final and a progressive document. We request all development organizations in the world, whether it is South or North, please consider to PARTICIPATE as SIGNATORY or as a SUPPORTER with comments in Notice Board of www.coastbd.org or mail it to reza@coastbd.org

A. WHS Opportunity for Local NGO

The Secretary General of UN Mr. Ban Ki Moon has initiated the discourse on WHS (World Humanitarian Summit) as a bottom up consultation process during 2013 for effective, accountable and innovative Humanitarian Activities around the world. Thousand of frontline humanitarian workers, humanitarian victims / affected populations including poor and marginalized and different organizations have participated in the process and raised their concerns. Localization and Downward Accountability are the common issues raised in almost all of the eight regional consultations held across the globe. Now the global consultation in Geneva is leading the discourse towards the Global Summit to be held in May 2016 in Istanbul. Therefore, it is the time for local and National NGO (Non Government Organizations) of South to propose concrete and actionable proposals on reshaping Aid and to think of solidarity mechanism to carry forward the advocacy even after the WHS.

B. Who We Are: Southern NGO and the Supporters

We consider NGO and CSO (civil society organizations) are synonymous. Organizations termed CSO or NGO involved in humanitarian and development activities are almost same. Organizations involved with long-term development

or poverty alleviation do contribute in humanitarian activism too. This representation is mostly from the local NGO as well as the NGO working at the national territory, or their networks working in the region. The representation is not only limited to the Southern NGO, it also includes the likeminded Northern NGO who support this initial proposals. We consider INGO (International NGO) who work in several countries both in south and north. Several Northern organizations or INGO also have raised voice in favor of localization and downward accountability, e.g. the one who have initiated charter4change.

C. Southern and Northern NGO: Complement to Each Other

We believe, we (the Southern and Northern NGO) have complementary roles to each other irrespective of our characteristics. We need the existence of the other to create a just world, free of poverty and exploitation, for humanitarian cause. We do acknowledge northern INGO's commendable role in developed countries in raising mass awareness to assist developing countries by raising funds and by facilitating political advocacy in favor of developing countries. While in south in most cases we have partnership with INGO for project implementation in humanitarianism, development and policy advocacy. We also have partnership with UN agencies, governments, and foundations etc. In fact, we all complement each other to build a better world altogether.

Signed by:



FDA, PGUS, Palli Mangal Karmasuchi, Shankalpa Trust and Sangram

Supported by:



Version:
October 2015

D. Localization and Accountability is inevitable for Sustainability

In simple terms, Sustainability means a certain effort including its outcome is sustaining for a considerable duration of time without any external help or fund. And it requires two fundamental issues i.e. localization of the effort and accountability to the people. Localization includes but not limited to: local leadership, local management with local culture, contribution from and partnership with locals. On the other hand, Accountability means basically Transparency and Participation to all levels including to locals. WHS has given the scope to raise these issues of concern. The major obstacle to achieve that sustainability is the current 'practice of mere sub-contract' with local organizations in respect of partnership. It cannot be acceptable while humanitarianism is universal and must sustain for human kind, should be in local level first.

E. Building Civil Society: The Third Sector or Non State Actors to Act with State and Market

We duly acknowledge the supreme role of the state for the well-being and development of the people. We also acknowledge the role of market including the private sector in the financial and trade development. In the state functionaries there are significant role of government and the political parties. Nowadays, however, the government institutions sometimes have limitations to fulfill the needs and requirements at every corner all the time. And here comes the Civil Society Organizations (CSO); we term them as third sector or as non state actors, who are organically growing to play a complementary role to reach all the hard-to-reach, in showing flexibility and innovations, in fulfilling the limitations of public management. CSO in one hand complements through positive engagement with government and on the other hand advocate for necessary pro-people changes in the policy and practices. Sometimes it seems political but it is necessary to balance in the political dynamics of the country. Now, therefore, it is a social and political reality that we need to create and urge for an appropriate enabling environment for CSO to grow and develop aiming to build a genuine democratic,

pro-people and responsive society, usually which should contains "Multi Drivers" for development with a complementary role to the government.

F. Visionary Thinking of the Tax Payers' in Developed Countries

In some respect, the tax payers of developed countries are contributing the most to the development aid. Their vision is to see the sustainability of the development efforts for the poorest and to see the resources are reaching to the frontline and humanitarian victims, to the poor and marginalized population as much as possible. So, here comes the necessity of revisiting the fact that how much of this great resource is really being spent for sustainability on the ground and how much is spent for the development of "top and mid level" and finally, how much is "trickled down" to the real victims, real poor and marginalized section of population.

We formulated our proposals keeping these questions in mind with full respect to the taxpayers' vision. In fact, we need to be accountable to both the taxpayers who are donating and also to the frontline humanitarian victims' i.e. poor and marginalized population who should be the real recipients.

G. The 7 Initial Actionable Proposals

1. Setting Indicators on Principles of

Partnership and Periodical Review: There are five principles of partnership have been set out with participation of local and National NGO, INGO and UN organizations in 2007. The principles are Equality, Transparency, Result Oriented Approach, Responsibility, and Complementarities. Setting essential indicators for these five principles are greatly expected. All the concerned actors should periodically review the adherence of these principles and indicators both in national and international level. Participatory and interactive ways should be followed for this review instead of mechanical means as it is all about the 'Actualization' and 'Behavioral Changes' of all the involved actors.

2. Prioritize Accountability in place of 'Accounts Ability'. Accounts Standard Must be Set Out according to the Local and Situational Context:

One of the major excuse or problem

for not going with partnership is the incapacity of local and national NGO especially their 'Accounts Ability'. They are accused for not having capacity of maintaining accounts in a level of standard. But we feel and the experiences shows that the organic growth of the local and national level organizations requires the first priority should be given on whether the organization or the leadership have the intention and capacity to be accountable to the people at the local level.

Most of the donor organizations including INGO, bilateral donors and UN agencies follow the 'international standards' that hardly considers the local and situational context in setting and maintain their accounts standards.

One of the major question in this regard, is the local organizations provided sufficient fund for hiring skilled staff to maintain that 'International Standard' or whether such a quality staff is available in the locality? The donors (whether it is INGO, UN Agencies or Foundations) in most cases allocates quite low level of compensation or salary for the project staff in local organizations but have expectations for international accounts standard are maintained by them. In fact this expectation creates difficult and risky situations for local or national NGO. And, eventually when they failed they are blamed for this. This is an outcome from an unfair and unjustified top down system, abusing or using local or national NGO. Local and national NGO also fall in this trap, when they compete each other to get the fund for survival.

3. Complaint Response Mechanism and

Protecting Whistle Blower: The core of the policy declaration of the most of the INGO and UN agencies nourishes the word 'partnership'. If this word really belongs to its meaning, there must be a provision of mutual accountability, i.e. transparency and accountability to reach other. Experiences show that it works well if there is a Complaint Response Mechanism for all at all level. Not only for the employed staff, should it also for the survivors who receive Humanitarian Support and program participants (targeted beneficiaries' e.g. poor or marginalized people).

We also expect a declared Whistle Blowing Policy including measures for protecting the whistle blowers. In fact, this is the effective way of facilitating the top executives and managers of the organizations to correct their policies and practice deviations, to sustain a conducive and acceptable environment, to minimize grievances and, above all, to keep dynamism in the organization or project.

4. Minimum 20% Overhead Management Cost to the Partner Organization, Not Only for Central Management, for Institutional Development

also: It is observed that the survival competition among the local organizations for receiving fund sometimes creates ill opportunity for the donor organizations (including INGO and UN organizations) to negotiate for drastically reduced or no overhead cost in project implementation. Sometimes donors demand cost sharing as most of the local NGO hardly have the capacity. Then in final negotiations it's boiled down to the free labor of some central staff of the local NGO. In fact, it creates stress for them. Instead, some of the donor organizations get opportunity to increase their own office facilities and number of staff, occupying the comfortable chunk of fund, in most cases as intermediary. Though the fund was supposed to be spent in the real humanitarian need on the ground zero. No doubt, the effectiveness of the humanitarian assistance mostly requires the capacity and sustainability of the local partner organizations. Donor INGO and UN organizations should promote this by allocating minimum 20% overhead cost for the sake of institutional development of the local organizations simultaneously to manage their central management.

5. INGO and UN Organizations Must Consider Getting Out of Direct Project Operation and Fund Raising in National Level:

This century sees the booming increase of local CSO in number. Some INGO and UN organizations still take policies for direct implementation of projects without local partnership. Some governments also progressively decided to allow INGO and UN organizations to implement development projects in the national level if it is only through partnership with local organizations.