

## **Annexes**

### **A. Study Terms of Reference 2007**

**'FINAL' DRAFT**

#### **Evaluation of Common Humanitarian Funds in Sudan and the Democratic Republic Of Congo**

##### **1. Objectives**

- 1.1 The study would aim to build on the 2006 'baseline' evaluation. As such, it would consolidate and augment existing evidence around the CHF pilots, now in their second year.
- 1.2 The overarching objective of the study is to inform key decision makers on the functioning of the main components of the pooled funds in both pilot countries.

As such, key objectives of the study would be:

- I. To bring up to date financial data collected in the 2006 evaluation
- II. To provide an updated review of the evolving policy environment in which the Funds operate
- III. To consider complementarity of CHFs and other multilateral flows
- IV. To collect and assess evidence regarding the Funds' ability to improve prioritisation, strategy and flexibility for humanitarian response
- V. To review the allocation process in each country (considering any changes / improvements in joint needs assessment mechanisms and the strategic nature of the Work Plan)
  - a. in terms of efficiency; against the stated strategy of the UN Annual Plan
  - b. against the original objectives of the funds as humanitarian instruments (noting the increasing levels of 'recovery' programming in large geographical areas of both DRC and Sudan).
- VI. To review the current strength of monitoring, evaluation and reporting mechanisms and make appropriate recommendations
- VII. To review major issues related to inclusion of NGOs within the funds, including the Funds ability to incentivise coordination.
- VIII. To assess progress against the stated goals of the recommendations from the 2006 study

##### **2. The Scope**

2.1 The study will focus on the whole period from the 2006 CIC evaluation to date, acknowledging that the first study did not include the final allocation rounds of 2006.

2.2 The study would encompass headquarters-based financial tracking as well as field research, including field visits to each pilot country, telephone interviews with Headquarters and other country offices as appropriate. The field trips would involve interviewing and data gathering, as well as establishing relations and working with the HC, the UNCT, other humanitarian agencies and relevant donors to agree on necessary data and timeframes for supplying it over the course of the study.

2.3 The study complements several other pieces of work which are being carried out concurrently through a 'working group of donors, OCHA and UNDP'. These include a specific piece on monitoring and evaluation and work on the design of a replicable model. The study will not make strategic recommendations on the direction of the CHF initiative or humanitarian financing more generally, but will refer to all technical debates about CHF architecture and function.

### **3. Methodology**

#### *3.1 Methodological approach*

In so far as possible, the review will adhere to a deductive methodology (i.e. extrapolation from empirical evidence), recognising that where gaps in data exist, the opinions of experts and participants in the CHFs will also underpin findings. This review will necessarily focus on 'process' and outputs / objectives of the CHF rather than impact.

#### *3.2 Data Collection Tools*

Objectives I through IV (above) will be undertaken through desk review and telephone interviews. This initial phase will further refine the focus of the field work to follow. In respect of the remaining objectives, the study will engage the range of stakeholders in country in interviews or focus groups as appropriate.

Within each pilot country, it is envisaged that the study team will travel to two field locations in which regional allocation decisions are made. Interviews will include as full a range as possible of stakeholders in the process.

3.3 Through the desk review, the study will bring up to date baseline aid funding data for each pilot country from 2003 (two years prior to the establishment of the common funds) through the end of 2007 (including the 2005 allocation model exercise in Sudan). This would provide five years of tracking official humanitarian aid and related disbursements, consolidating evidence regarding the difference made by the use of the Pooled Funds approach versus reliance on traditional financing mechanisms (taking into account that other external factors in this period may have had independent impact on funding flows).

Data collection and qualitative analysis would include a continuation of the 2006 analysis on:

- Total official humanitarian aid per annum (based on FTS figures); and the percentage of CAP vs. non CAP allocations;
- Total and percentage of funding allocated to common mechanisms in 2005 (allocation model in Sudan and OCHA's two-donor, pre-pilot approach in DRC), 2006 and 2007 Common Funds model;
- Comparisons of the proportion of funds disbursed through different channels over time (pre and post CHF);
- Comparison of funding levels across different sectors (pre and post CHF);
- Comparison of pre and post CHF disbursement rates (request-to-decision and decision-disbursement intervals);
- Examination of the rate at which CHF were disbursed in response to unforeseen crises.
- An examination of CERF flows into the pilot countries

As such, the evaluation would situate CHF's in the context of overall funding flows.

3.4 Also through the desk review, the evaluation will provide a summary of the evolving policy environment in which the CHF's operate. As such it will signal trends and emerging positive developments and/or potential obstacles to the effective implementation. This will be based on field and telephone interviews with major stakeholders.

### 3.5 Key Evaluation Questions:

In respect of objectives I through IV above:

- What was the CHF's relative importance as compared to other channels and mechanisms: CERF other multilateral and bilateral channels (%age of allocation of CHF compared to overall aid flows and specifically to other funding mechanisms as per above; FTS, HCT statistics)
- What proportion of funding went to NGOs, directly (through the MA / UNDP function) and indirectly (through UN agency partner agreements)?
- How does this compare to 2006? Can any conclusions be drawn from these data?
- to what extent are shared mechanisms used by CHF, CERF, ERFs
- In how far has the CHF helped to fill / cover priority unmet needs? i.e. (coverage of key priority sectors; FTS)

In respect of objectives V through VI above:

- In how far have the mechanisms set-up for submitting and vetting requests for CHF funding helped to foster prioritisation of resource allocations? What were the criteria used to assess / take decisions on funding requests? (% and typology of requests accepted / rejected; HCT, Clusters/Sectors, HC)
- To what extent are adequate support mechanisms in place for the allocation mechanism? Are roles and responsibilities clear? Are sufficient staffing levels in place?
- How flexible was the allocation of CHF handled with respect to the overall objectives of the CHAP/Plan, respectively the specific objectives of regions/ clusters / sectors and implementing agencies? (proportion of CHF funds allotted to key priority areas; FTS, HCT)
- How efficient was the allocation process with respect to addressing priority areas, including for recovery? (cost-benefit analysis of allocation process against transaction costs as compared to benchmarks in non-CHF situations)
- How fast were CHF disbursed and how consequently were commitments honoured? (time span between pledge or commitment to disbursement to the implementing partner; HCT)
- What key data are missing to assess CHF performance against its stated objectives? How can these data be provided and what are the resources needed for that purpose? (data sets needed as compared to those available, extrapolation of resources; HCT)
- How was the experience of NGOs within the CHF's funds in 2007?
- Have the CHF's adapted to NGO concerns in 2006?

### 3.6 Organisation of the evaluation

The study will be managed by OCHA ESS on behalf of the Common Fund Virtual Working Group (VWG), composed of representatives of seven CHF donors plus OCHA and UNDP.

The group will act as the advisory board for the evaluation. The donors within this group will divide the cost of the evaluation along lines to be agreed.

### 3.7 Key informants and Agencies

Key informants will include:

Humanitarian Coordinators; UN Agency Heads (UNDP and OCHA are critical); Cluster / sector leads and members at country and sub-country level., donor representatives at country and HQ level, NGO representatives at country and sub country level (agencies receiving CHF funds and not); UNDP trust fund unit, country and HQ, OCHA CRD representatives at HQ level.

### 4. Plan of work

Approximate milestones as follows:

<b>Task</b>	<b>Responsibility</b>	<b>Deadline</b>
ToR finalised and agreed by Advisory Group (AG)	AG, support from ESS	31.7.2007
Launch selection process for consultants Advertise on Reliefweb / ALNAP (1-pager) Submission by Consultants	ESS, support from AG	1.8.2007 12.8.2007
Decision on Consultants	AG (pre-screening by ESS)	17.8.2007
Contracting	ESS	7.9.2007
Inception Report	Consultants	14.9.2007
Feedback from ESS/AG	ESS/AG	18.9.2007
Final Inception Report	Consultants	21.9.2007
Desk Review / Missions to Kinshasa and Khartoum	Consultants	22.9.- 5.10.2007
Draft Report	Consultants	14.10.2007
Consultations with AG, Final Draft	Consultants, AG, ESS	21.10.2007
Presentation at Advisory Group meeting	Consultants	31.10.2007

### 5. Reporting / Deliverables

- Brief inception report (max 1500 words), outlining the key issues to be covered and the proposed methodology to cover these issues; the report should also include a stakeholder mapping
- One-pager on main findings at end of mission to be presented and validated by HCT
- Draft evaluation report of max 15'000 words and should include:
  - ⊖ *Executive Summary of max.2 pages*
  - ⊖ Performance assessment with respect to the criteria and key issues stated in section 2.
  - ⊖ Recommendations addressing key proposed improvements, addressed to who should be taking action (SMART)

- Final Report (same format as draft) after agreement with ESS/AG
- PPT presentation of main conclusions and recommendations

#### *6. Use of the Report*

The findings of the first phase of the evaluation shall inform decision on replication of CHF for 2008, in conjunction with other ongoing initiatives. Decision to be taken at a meeting to be scheduled end of October 2007.

No other consultation processes shall be foreseen under the present contract.

#### *7. Estimated Budget for first phase*

To be calculated

## B. Table comparing DRC and Sudan Funds

**DRC-Sudan comparison table**

	<b>Sudan</b>	<b>DRC</b>
CHF management	<p>OCHA Planning Unit serves as CHF Technical Unit (4 international one national). The unit also does Work Plan, financial tracking and manages CERF allocations</p> <p>UNDP Fund Management Unit undertakes CHF financial management (2 positions for AA function, 4 positions CHF NGO management, 3 officers for unit Ops support)</p>	<p>Pooled fund unit – joint UNDP &amp; OCHA since June 2007. 11 in total – 4 (two international, 2 national) OCHA &amp; 7 (3 expat, 4 national now +1) UNDP but not all posts filled. OCHA team also manage CERF</p>
Link to workplan	<p>For CHF funding, must be in Work Plan</p> <p>The same OCHA team manages the Work Plan process together with M&amp;E unit and RCO planning staff</p>	<p>2006 – had to be in Action Plan. 2007 – needs to address HAP strategic priorities, linkage validated by Cluster Lead and provincial CPIA.</p>
Sector support	<p>Sector Strategy and Coordination Advisor (SSCA) function (3 north and 3 south). The SSCA function is broadly in support of sector coordination including Work Plan and CHF processes</p>	<p>Mainly by OCHA. In provinces without OCHA presence, coordination support by UNDP, WHO (1 province) or MONUC CAS.</p>
Project selection	<p>Sectors/Clusters at regional and national levels in consultation with state teams (OCHA/RCO, UN and NGOs)</p>	<p>Clusters at province &amp; national levels; CPIA (provincial IASC); PF Board; Technical Review Committee, HC</p>
Contracting & Disbursement	<p>Separate UNDP fund management unit</p>	<p>Programmatic function in UNDP Post-Conflict Unit/PF Unit. Finance partly in PFU &amp; partly in UNDP Ops.</p>
Information systems	<p>Database and website managed by OCHA CHF unit providing online access to details of all CHF allocations and custom reports. Part of broader integrated Logical Framework Database which is also used for managing the Work Plan and Financial Tracking</p>	<p>PF website being discussed by Board. <a href="http://www.rdc-humanitaire.net">www.rdc-humanitaire.net</a> already available need to be improved.</p>
M&E	<p>4 person Unit reporting to RC/HC, co-located with OCHA CHF Unit. The mandate of the unit is monitoring implementation of the Work Plan. Progress has been slow. No separate CHF monitoring has taken place to date. CHF monitoring is within the overall framework of Work Plan monitoring. Work Plan monitored at Mid and End Year and report produced. Focus on strategic monitoring for 08. 3 sector reviews planned for 2007 likely only 2 will take place. Financial reporting by UNDP fund management unit</p>	<p>1 International and 3 national UNDP staff, members in PFU. Monitor NGO projects &amp; produce monthly reports. Info also fed into UNDP semi-annual reports on NGO funding. Not progressed to evaluation yet. UN Agencies have reported on the specific request of the HC for 2006. By the end of 2007 systematic reporting has been endorsed by UNCT.</p>
Composition and role of Advisory Board	<p>Advisory Board: CHF Donors and key humanitarian non CHF donors,. Chaired by HC.</p> <p>IASC/UN CT also serve in an advisory capacity to the HC</p>	<p>Pooled Fund Board: 3 donors, 2 (out of 3 pre selected on rotational basis) INGOs &amp; 3 UN agencies. Chaired by HC. DFID more active than other donors. PFB plays critical role in project</p>

	Focus on process. Review allocation policies, regional/sectoral allocations and project allocations. DFID plays a leading role. CHF donors participated in some sector allocation meetings in 2007. Not v active	approval.
ERF – size, %	An Emergency Reserve/ rapid Onset Reserve of max 10% of CHF – integrated. An existing dedicated ERF for Southern Sudan implemented as a window in the CHF as of July 2007	Joint OCHA-UNICEF RRM is separate because predates PF. US\$ 10.1 million in 2006 + US\$ 4.9 million form CERF. US\$ 15 million as of October
Management fee/costs	UNDP: 1% + 3.7% (NGOs) (going up to 5%) OCHA funding as CHF project	UNDP: 1% (AA) & 5% (MA). OCHA gets funding for coordination/PFU as a PF project.
No of geographical regions	7 planning regions + national 26 states	11 provinces
NGO disbursement pattern	Quarterly based on exp forecast + reporting	70% 1 <sup>st</sup> tranche, 30% 2 <sup>nd</sup> tranche subject to 70% expenditure of 1 <sup>st</sup> tranche, monitoring visit and substantive and financial report
Minimum project size	\$200,000 or 25% of sectoral allocation envelope (whatever is smallest) (sub to conditions). For projects with total budget below the allocation limit the limit does not apply.	No minimum specified Minimum 6 months: exceptions are accepted if justified.
No of projects funded 2006	431 allocations to 258 different projects	211 allocations for 142 projects
Total pooled fund size 06	\$168m contributed	\$92m contributed
Contributions so far 07	\$161m pledged \$126m disbursed @30 April 07	\$ 99.6 contributed \$ 118.7 pledged \$ 74.8 @ 18 October 07 \$ 28.4 under technical revision PFII
% CHF funding to NGOs	Direct: 2006 = 15% 2007 = 26%	Direct: 2006 = 28% 2007 = 31% Doesn't include exact WFP figures
Allocation rounds (when started, \$)	2007: 1 <sup>st</sup> : \$80m, Jan 2007 2 <sup>nd</sup> : \$45m, Feb 2007 Flood Response: \$4,7 mill (August)  2006: - 1 <sup>st</sup> Dec/Jan: \$106 mill - 2 <sup>nd</sup> July: \$36 mill - Targeted Allocations in Nov based on additional donor contributions	2007: 1st: \$65.9 2 <sup>nd</sup> : \$28.5 + 8.9 Fast track (rapid Response reserve) , Jul 2007  2006: March \$27.3m June \$30.6m September \$13.4m

## C. Donor contributions profile

### DRC Total aid flows 2004-07

	2004	2005	2,006	2007
Belgium	13,918,257	13,249,037	20,229,750	16,683,965
Canada	10,580,876	11,309,082	9,711,830	6,779,146
Ireland				9,416,750
Netherlands	7,681,168	11,149,405	18,215,658	22,863,699
Norway	3,120,054	5,281,869	12,466,216	8,642,200
Sweden	7,872,602	17,173,319	19,504,580	19,378,701
UK	16,825,966	30,617,487	84,308,401	58,592,500
	59,998,923	88,780,199	164,436,435	142,356,961

### Sudan donor contributions

Sudan: CHF donors contributions 2004-2007							
	2004	2005		2006		2007	
		Allocation model	Bilateral	CHF	Bilateral	CHF	Bilateral
Ireland	9,948,068		10,217,211	2,484,472	8,618,178	3,891,051	10,093,034
Netherlands	47,468,222	9,971,000	60,086,026	51,330,000	5,977,764	33,327,700	11,078,132
Norway	42,128,371		25,195,254	10,573,248	25,285,592	13,968,253	17,885,390
Spain	11,768,463		6,085,059		5,456,783	1,864,039	7,024,711
Sweden	28,805,035	15,106,048	8,668,151	15,479,839	16,450,123	17,166,547	8,687,096
UK	117,855,486	78,394,749	45,036,995	88,046,631	9,060,276	78,665,200	364,917
TOTAL	257,973,645	103,471,797	155,288,696	167,914,190	70,848,716	148,882,790	55,133,280

## D. Timings of process

**Table showing relative timings of processes**

	Sudan	DRC
Timetable days from policy paper to allocation – 1st allocation 2007	40	n/a
Actual days from policy paper to allocation – 1st allocation 2007	39	n/a
Timetable days from policy paper to allocation – 2 <sup>nd</sup> allocation 2007	40	76
Actual days from policy paper to allocation 2 <sup>nd</sup> round 2007	74	Allocation process underway
Timetable days from policy paper to disbursement – 2 <sup>nd</sup> allocation 2007	n/a	8
Average days from signature of agreement to disbursement (NGO) 1 <sup>st</sup> round 2007	5 (timetabled)	8 (actual)
Average days from signature of agreement to disbursement (UN) 1 <sup>st</sup> round 2007	3 (timetabled)	1.8 (actual)
Planning figure for days from allocation to disbursement (NGO)	21	8
Average actual days from allocation to disbursement (NGO)	63	8
Total average days from policy paper to disbursement (average of 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> allocations in 2007)	120 (actual)	84 (timetabled)

Sources: Common/Pooled Fund Units, reports

## **E. Select Bibliography**

### **General:**

Common Funds for Humanitarian Action in Sudan and the Democratic Republic of Congo: Monitoring and Evaluation Study, December 2006, CIC/ODI (+ component reports)  
CARE's Experiences with UN Humanitarian Financing, CARE, July 2007, Tania Kelly, Harin Song  
Cluster evaluation 2007 (draft)  
CERF evaluation 2007 (draft)  
Stockholm principles of Good Humanitarian Donorship  
Evaluation of Humanitarian Response Fund – Ethiopia 11<sup>th</sup> October 2006, United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator, Department for International Development (DFID), Stephen Anderson (The Food Economy Group), Tasneem Mowjee (Development Initiatives)  
Review of OCHA Emergency Response Funds (ERFs), December 2006, Tasneem Mowjee (Development Initiatives)

### **DRC:**

DRC Pooled Fund Annual Report to Donors, January 2006 – March 2007, UN Humanitarian Coordinator, Kinshasa, April 2007  
2006 Consolidated Emergency Thematic Report For Government Donors, UNICEF Kinshasa, March 2007  
UNICEF DRC Humanitarian Action report, Mid-year review August 2007  
UNICEF DRC reports on allocation process (Unpublished)  
OXFAM DRC report on humanitarian reform, Jan 2007 (Unpublished)  
Independent Evaluation of the Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM), United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), Democratic Republic of Congo, October 23 – December 12, 2006, Edward B. Rackley, Ph.D.  
DRC Humanitarian Action Plan 2007, UN Humanitarian Coordinator  
Tearfund DRC report on Pooled Fund Mechanism, Sept 2007 (Unpublished)

### **Sudan:**

2007 Work Plan for Sudan  
2008 Work Plan for Sudan, Framework and Process Guidance Note, 31/7/2007  
Guidelines for UNDP Project Co-operation Agreement (PCA), 28 January 2007, UNDP Sudan  
Policy papers and guidelines on Workplan and CHF from UN Sudan Information Gateway, [www.unsudanig.org](http://www.unsudanig.org)  
Final report on SSCAs, 28 August 07, Office of RC/HC, Sudan  
ANNUAL REPORT FOR THE SUDAN COMMON HUMANITARIAN FUND  
ADMINISTRATIVE AGENT, 14th FEBRUARY 2006 – 31st DECEMBER 2006, UNDP Sudan

## **F. List of interviewees**

### Headquarters

DFID, Glyn Taylor  
Netherlands , Tim Kos  
Sweden, Mikael Lindvall  
Canada, Stephen Salewicz  
Ireland, Ciara O'Brien  
Norway, Rigmor Koti

UNDP NY, Bisrat Aklilu and Sana Zemri  
OCHA Geneva, CAP section, Arnhild Spence  
UNICEF NY, Gary Stahl  
Former HC Sudan, now WFP, Manuel da Silva  
CIC NY, Abby Stoddard

### Sudan

Oluseyi Bajulaiye, Deputy HC  
Michael Jensen, Planning, OCHA  
Christine Kuhn, Planning, OCHA  
Kimberley Lietz, M&E, RCO  
David Joy, RC's Office  
IOM South Sudan  
Joint Donor Office, South Sudan  
Kiki Gbeho, Head of M&E, RC Office  
Mario Samaja, Returns Sector  
Adrienne Rashford, Malaria Consortium  
Ahmed El Ganainy, WHO/health sector lead  
Caroline Nursey, Oxfam  
David Gressly, DHC South Sudan  
Mike McDonagh, Acting Head of OCHA  
Mona Mohamed, S Sudan  
Sampath Kumar, UNICEF/Watsan sector lead  
Merv, PACT  
Seth Le Leu, World Vision (S Sudan)  
Tesfai Ghermazien, FAO/Food Security sector lead  
Josephine Ippe, UNICEF/Nutrition sector lead  
Prudence Chaiban, UNJLC/NFI sector lead  
Dr Adili, WHO, S Sudan health sector  
Emma Fitzpatrick, SSSA S Sudan Health & nutrition  
Alfred Dube, Health and nutrition SSSA  
Haraprasad, Watsan & education SSSA  
Jules Farrier Case, UNJLC/NFI S Sudan  
Cynthia Jones, UNJLC  
NGO Steering Committee  
S Sudan NGO health forum (Tearfund and Medair)  
WFP, Marian Yun  
UNICEF Representative, Ted Chaiban  
Annalisa Montecalvo, Craig Sanders, UNHCR  
Jerzy Skuratowicz, Auke Lootsma, UNDP  
Enrico Gaveglia, UNDP Fund management Unit  
Luca Trevisan, UNDP Fund management Unit  
Mark Blackett, GOAL  
Fernando Arroyo, OCHA EI Fasher  
Derk Segaar, OCHA EI Fasher

Siddiqui, WFP EI Fasher  
Paul Davies, IRC EI Fasher  
Joye Jimeno, ACF EI Fasher  
Vanessa Werner, Malteser EI Fasher  
Umair Hasam, Oxfam EI Fasher  
Hayder Nasser, UNICEF EI Fasher  
Jonathan Patrick, DFID  
Sam Grout-Smith, DFID  
Ulrika Josefson, SIDA  
Antoine Gerard, OCHA Darfur

#### DRC

Oxfam, Juliette Prodhan  
Ross Mountain, Humanitarian Coordinator  
Gloria Fernandez, Head of OCHA  
Andrew Wyllie, Deputy Head of OCHA  
Andrea Dedomenico/Salvatore Bijojoite, OCHA, Joint Unit  
Lassane, Finance, Joint PF Unit  
Brigitte, M&E, PF Unit  
Richard Guerra, Head of Rapid Response Unit, OCHA  
Dieudonné Bamouni, Head of OCHA Office, Katanga  
Meissa Cisse, UNDP Monitoring, Joint Unit  
Rene da Silva – Head of Finance, UNDP  
Fernando, head of Post-Conflict Unit, UNDP  
Patrick Ikansha, Head of UNDP Office, Katanga  
MONUC Civil Affairs Section  
Roy Hans, Netherlands  
Seb Fouquet, DFID  
Victoria Luque, AECl, Embassy of Spain  
Magnus Carlquist, SIDA  
Belgium  
OFDA – Jay Nash  
ECHO, Alain Decoux, Yvan Fernandez  
Luc Lompo – FAO, Food sec cluster lead  
Gibert – Logistics cluster head, WFP  
WHO – Francois, Health cluster lead, Jean de Dieu Lukwesa Mwati (Katanga)  
UNHCR – Jens, Ralph Groenner, Protection cluster, Madani Tall (Head of Sub-Office, Katanga)  
UNICEF: Tony Bloomberg (Director), Sylvia Danailov (Emergency coordinator), Katrien Ghoos (Nutrition cluster lead), Steven Michel (WASH cluster lead), Damian Lilly (Emergency Specialist, Katanga), Francois Bellet (WASH Cluster lead, Lubumbashi), Roger Bottralahy (Head of Office, Katanga).  
WFP – Claude Jibidah, Charles Vincent (PF Borrard representative), Paul Verhoestraete (Logistics Cluster Lead, Lubumbashi)  
FAO - Michel Ngongo, Head of Office, Katanga  
IOM – Bob Rodrigus, Noel Craven (Katanga), Michou Kabange (Katanga)  
UNFPA – Cheikh Cisse, Parfait Caba (Katanga)  
UNIFEM (Katanga) - Pitchouna Kisimba  
ACF – Isabelle D’Haudt, Paul Jonson (Katanga)  
Solidarites, Jason and Gaetan  
IRC - Aloyscia D’Onofrio  
SCF UK – Hussein Mursal  
COOPI: Director, Massimo Giovanola and Nicoletta, Head of Ituri office  
NRC - Florian Delauney, Director, Sandrine Huille (Moba)  
AIRSERV (Lubumbashi) - Lydie Mulenga

HI/Atlas Logistique (Lubumbashi) - Diego Rojas Coronel  
AASF (Lubumbashi)- Alexis Mbumb  
Equilibre (Kalemie) - Rodolphe Bled  
DanChurchAid (Kalemie)- Camille Aubourg  
IFESH (Kalemie) - Hudson Lugano

**Bas-Congo province teleconference**

MONUC/CAS (Andre Yokwa)  
WHO Dr Justin, ATACE  
Mr Mbuba Baylon (local NGO),

**Ituri province teleconference:**

Idrissa Conteh, OCHA  
Dr Eustace, WHO/cluster lead  
Rudi, German Agro Action

## G. Review of CIC recommendations

### Summary of CIC recommendations

<b>DONORS</b>	<b>Progress</b>
1. Early commitments Make the necessary arrangements in home governments, including if necessary, new legislative measures, that will allow special dispensation to commit and disburse to the Common Funds mechanism early. "Early" means commitments by November of the previous year, with first disbursements to be made by January 1 and with a majority of funds disbursed against the commitment by the end of the first quarter.	Some progress but more needed
2. Reserved portion of bilateral funding outside CHF Each year, decide on and reserve a reasonable portion of their total contribution for discretionary bilateral funding, emphasizing multi-year NGO programming, and other priorities within the current needs context that would not normally be funded through the Common Funds.	No specific policy
3. Continued core funding to UN Continue funding UN agencies directly at the Headquarters and regional level as well as through Common funds at the country level.	No specific policy but continues
4. Improved communication on aid flows to FTS Improve their communications regarding aid flows, in particular their reporting to FTS.	No specific action taken
5. Engage non-participating donors and push for better communication on funding intentions and actions.	Some progress in engaging ECHO and OFDA
6. Establish in-country donor forums where they meet regularly to dialogue with both Common Funds participating and non-participating donors.	Some progress but not consistent
7. Emphasize the importance of efforts to increase the participation of national NGOs in the mechanism.	Some progress but limited
<b>LEGAL STRUCTURE</b>	
8. Either remove need for MA role by direct NGO access to CHF or put out MA role to tender, with special consideration to OCHA	Not done
<b>PLANNING/ALLOCATION STRUCTURES</b>	
9. Draft new TORs to improve transparency on procedures and responsibilities	TORs revised but need further revision
10. Promote dynamic Plan models akin to DRC Action Plan	Workplan is a dynamic tool
11. Require each year's Plan to be based on current Needs Assessment. Consider multi-sectoral national-level team in both countries that would support the cluster system by coordinating a comprehensive countrywide needs assessment, as well as technical review of projects coming up from the regional level sectors/clusters, and M&E	Progress towards more robust Plan but full comprehensive assessment logistically challenging
12. Increase speed and flexibility, e.g. by expanding RRM criteria in DRC; reserve part of fund in Sudan for rapid response. Establish clearer rapid access procedures	Some progress
13. Avoid conflict of interest by agreeing rules and	Some progress

methods to increase transparency and impartiality of cluster decisions	
14. Increase participation by requiring cluster leads to actively engage all capable operators, including national NGOs	Some progress
15. Assign leadership only to operationally present agency	Not clear
16. Expand practice of NGO cluster co-lead at field level	Some progress but limited
<b>MONITORING &amp; EVALUATION</b>	
17. Consider the national multi-sectoral team for impact monitoring on a sectoral level against objectives outlined in the Plan	Not done
18. Use cluster system to monitor at project level	Limited progress
19. Ensure that organizations receiving funds undergo an annual financial audit by an external independent auditor	Not done