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Managing humanitarian funding

- Flexibility of funding
- Independence towards governments
- Transparency
1. Flexibility ?
Public funding

THE GOOD
» Large amounts
» Often multi-year funding
» Less linked to media attention (forgotten crisis)

THE BAD
» Delays
» Strict rules
» Not flexible
» Not neutral
Public donors requirements

- Thematic / focus
- Duration of contracts
- Eligibility of budget line items
- Purchase procedures
- Possible amendments
- …
The need

100%

2 years project – 2.500.000 EUR
The reality: a Tetris game

2 years project – 2,500,000 EUR
Private funding (individual donors)

THE GOOD
» No political strategy
» Often unrestricted

THE BAD
» Linked to media attention
» Not predictable
2. Independence
Following the VOICE recommendations on Civil Military relation

“No funding from countries with military forces on the ground”
Countries with forces in Afghanistan

Albania, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Mongolia, Montenegro, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tonga, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States

Source ISAF 9/9/2011
Does private means independance?
Doctors of the World’s rules on corporate funding

EXCLUDED

• Tobacco
• Alcohol
• Weapons
• Sex-industry
• Gambling
• Oil and extractive industries

WITH CAUTION

• Media
• Pharmaceuticals
• Food industry
Independence: best practices

- Diversification of funding sources
- Good public / private ratio
- Need to build reserves
- At the minimum: ability to say no
3. Transparency
## Public donors requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total questions</th>
<th>on the NGO capacity</th>
<th>on the project</th>
<th>% on project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>German MOFA</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG ECHO</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFID</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFDA</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands MOFA</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Transparency: at what cost?

- Additional work: additional costs
- Various requirements for each donor
- One format per donor. No common procedure in the EU
- Pressure from general public and the press
- Focused on costs vs. achievements
- Does not measure mainstream issues
- Does not measure beneficiaries participation

Towards better transparency

- Need for an open dialogue involving donors, NGOs and all stakeholders
Transparency towards the general public

Reports after the Haiti earthquake
(1 and 2 years after)

Annual financial report 103 pages
Thank you!
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