



SHF Advisory Board Meeting Minutes 11 May, 2017

Advisory Board members	Present
Humanitarian Coordinator (HC)	x
SHF Technical Unit (OCHA/UNDP)	x
FPDO (NNGO)	x
DFID	x
ECHO (observer)	
Germany	
INGO Steering Committee	x
Netherlands	
Norway	
OCHA	x
Sweden	
Switzerland	x
UNDP	x
UNHCR	x
WFP	
USAID/OFDA (observer)	
WHO	x
UN DF (observer)	
DCPSF (observer)	

Action Points:

1. Circulation of communication protocols and fraud reporting to the SHF Advisory Board

Funding decisions	<p>In the opening remarks the HC announced that with the annual rotation of UN agency board members there has been a change in the Advisory Board membership, WFP takes the seat previously held by UNICEF.</p> <p>The heads of the UN Darfur Fund and UN DCPSF are welcomed as observers to the SHF Advisory Board meetings.</p> <p>The HC then gave the floor to Bavo (SHF TU) to present the funding decisions for the Board.</p> <p>Four projects required decisions and were approved by the Board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A RRR (Health/Nutrition) sector project for Um Dukhun (\$300,000) allocated to CRS. This is a replacement for the withdrawn project of an INGO and is needed to maintain a comprehensive approach for the returnees in Um Dukhun. 2. A health project in Abyei (\$250,000) to GAH to respond to urgent health needs and where GAH is the only NGO health provider. 3. A multi-sector project in Kutum allocated to GOAL (\$500,000) due to the high needs of areas and their inability to apply in the first standard allocation. 4. A WASH project in Sortony allocated to OXFAM for a maximum of two months to respond to urgent water needs till the start of the rainy season. <p>Concerning the Reserve for Emergencies, the HC expects to use the available fund for three priorities, namely the areas with new access in the Jebel Marra, further influxes of refugees and localities in the Two Areas where access opens up.</p> <p>The following points were then raised during the plenary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Switzerland questioned whether with the steep decline in funding levels SHF is still capable to provide any significant response to the main gaps (such as the expected caseload coming from Chad) and still have an impact. He also questioned at what threshold should the fund remain operational and whether other pooled funds are facing the same decline. HC responded that the funding is clearly not at the level required to achieve the desired impact and naturally a better funded SHF would lead to more flexibility and greater impact.
-------------------	--

	<p>However, she confirmed that there is still some impact and although there is no threshold, further drops mean different options will be considered and alternative mechanisms to the fund.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID reiterated that there are new accessible areas and needs that emerged after the First Allocation and whether they could be covered from the Reserve for Emergencies. He also mentioned that DFID is preparing a new business case and has funding set aside for durable solutions; but it is not yet approved. The SHF TU confirmed that opening of access is one of the criteria in which the SHF Reserve for Emergencies can respond, this in line with Emergency Response Framework. HC confirmed that the programmatic aspects of the strategy are being developed and are moving ahead in collaboration with several stakeholders including the World Bank. • WHO informed the board that a in recent meeting on Jebel Marra, a recent report revealed alarming indicators; high rates of mortality and lack of basic services. • UNHCR requested clarification on the Al Lait SHF case for funding UNHCR already planned a response for refugees and the case has already been shared with the SHF TU. The HC explained that the response should be combined for both IDPs and refugees and limited to the Shelter, WaSH and Health sectors because of implementation difficulties and delays in previous large refugee responses. This will be evaluated later but is for now limited to the amount of \$1 million. • The INGO Steering Committee confirmed that the four presented cases for decision were indeed urgent and require fast-tracking. He commended SHF for the initiative of selecting the most urgent needs. <p>The HC mentioned that she decided to put the Protracted Displacement Strategy on hold awaiting further discussion of the locality by the Durable Solutions Working Group. She confirmed the humanitarian needs in Kereinik and the pilot programme itself remain the same, but she would like to consider the likelihood of reaching a durable solution and chances of success of the pilot. She stated that durable solutions are a difficult and necessary agenda although sometimes ambitious. There already exist some cases outside SHF, and currently she is not sure that Kereinik is the right choice.</p> <p>Following this discussion, the HC agreed on all four decisions, and might come back on the specifics for Sortony.</p>
Communication on performance and fraud cases	<p>The second presentation focused on how when and what to communicate on fraud.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID welcomed the transparency and informed the Board that DFID processes and policies require that any allegation or suspicion is immediately reported to their HQ. This means that DFID will be obliged to report any case communicated by SHF TU. • The HC responded that she would like to maintain two-way accountability and not to implicate partners before there is definite information although she recognises that donors want to ensure transparency of the fund. She stressed that she will not release organisation names before confirmation of allegations and will circulate the presented communication protocol. She added that an amendment will be made to the communication protocol to clarify that per the SHF rules, the SHF TU will not name a partner until under investigation which means that there is significant concern. • Switzerland approved of the communication protocols presented but voiced concern that the policy presented may not be in line with other donor policies. The OCHA TU responded that this was agreed at capital levels. • FPDO suggested that since the fund has good experience with fraud detection maybe it would be good to proactively inform partners of possible areas of leakages prior to releasing the funds., thereby alerting partners and reminding them of being aligned with SHF policies.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UNDP stressed that partners are encouraged to self-report and not wanting to penalise them for that. She added that FPDO made a good point and that indeed most fraud is found through information shared by partners which allows to further circulate these possible leaks with other partners. • The INGO Steering Committee noted that partners are more likely to report fraud to SHF than any other donor due to the far lower risk than other mechanisms. He continued that the SHF has stronger controls and higher standards than any other donor or agency. While the funding through the SHF is limited, it impacts the programming of the NGOs other projects and raises them to higher standards.
Operational Review 2016 – Annual Report	<p>The third presentation gave highlights of the SHF 2016 annual report. The comments received were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID was impressed with the annual report and that it was rich with information including gender disaggregated data. He added that DFID will make reporting on reporting on people with disability mandatory and what was the likelihood of collecting this information. The HC responded that it would be impossible to capture disability information now and that this would have to be a gradual process. • FPDO remarked that the female targets had not been reached and that should be a trigger to give more attention to ongoing projects. HC responded that deeper analysis of gender data is also needed and the focus on women will remain strong. • Switzerland thanked the SHF TU for the tremendous job. He added a small remark that 42% funding to UN is good progress in the right direction. Also, the results are more outputs than outcomes which is what donors are looking for. He acknowledged how challenging this is but is crucial to mobilise funds from donors. The HC responded that outcome reporting is difficult because of the existing reporting mechanisms/ systems which are more output oriented. There will be a change in reporting direction with the MY HRP.
AOB	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None