

# ANNUAL REPORT



International Council of Voluntary Agencies  
Conseil International des Agences Bénévoles  
Consejo Internacional de Organizaciones Voluntarias

2006

# ICVA Mission Statement

Adopted by the 12<sup>th</sup> ICVA General Assembly, February 2003

## ICVA – An Advocacy Alliance for Humanitarian Action

*The International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) is a non-profit global association of non-governmental organisations that works as a collective body to promote, and advocate for, human rights and a humanitarian perspective in global debates and responses. The heart of the ICVA mission is to support NGOs to protect and assist people in need, to address the causes of their plight, and to act as a channel for translating patterns and trends into advocacy.*

*ICVA seeks to strengthen NGOs as part of civil society through the relationships among member organisations from around the world. It facilitates the sharing and creative use of practical experience and strategies to promote and protect human rights, including those of refugees and displaced peoples, and to provide humanitarian assistance from the perspective of justice and sustainable development. ICVA fosters partnerships among agencies for the sharing and dissemination of information to attain consensus among member agencies on prioritised issues in order to effect change, particularly at the international level.*

*ICVA advocates vis-à-vis governments and international agencies for a strong NGO role in efforts to secure human rights, prevent conflicts, prepare for disasters, and improve humanitarian responses to distressed populations. Through its cooperative and catalytic nature, it gathers and exchanges information and raises awareness on the most vital matters of humanitarian concern before policy-making bodies.*

*ICVA has been in existence since 1962. It works to secure the commitment of the world community to address injustice, ensure dignity and rights, and promote international strategies that attend to human needs. Today's NGO members are strengthened in their missions to provide global assistance through the power and persuasion of the ICVA alliance. Tomorrow's members will continue to enrich the network with experience and opinion and will strengthen the impact of this alliance in bringing about a just world.*

# CONTENTS

- 2** From the Chair of the ICVA Executive Committee
- 4** Introduction
- 6** GHP: Another Talk Shop or a New Way of Working?
- 7** More Transparency in Recruitments
- 8** Clusters Continued
- 10** Ugandan IDPs and the Clusters
- 11** Building Safer Organisations
- 12** Advocacy on Neglected Crises
- 13** Appointing Qualified Humanitarian Coordinators
- 14** ICVA Assists in New NGO Commitments to Improve Performance
- 15** New ICVA Website Launched
- 16** Taking the Time to Discuss the Impact of Diversity
- 18** NGOs Get a Role in UNHCR's EXCOM Conclusions Process
- 19** Finances
- 24** ICVA Executive Committee and Secretariat
- 25** ICVA Members 2006

# FROM THE CHAIR OF THE ICVA EXECUTIVE

Dear Colleagues and Friends,

Where were you over the northern winter and southern summer holidays of 2004-5? How did the Pakistan earthquake and the tsunami impact your organisations in 2006? The corporate response may well have produced an historic “moment”. In my view, 2006 will be seen in the future as pivotal in how we think and act as humanitarians.

In large measure, as a result of these immense tragedies and the unprecedented humanitarian efforts that followed, the year was a period of major transition in the humanitarian world. With the post-tsunami evaluations and new accountability systems, there has been a growing awareness that none of us is equipped alone to face the immense challenges of human made and natural disasters. One of the biggest changes was that a commitment was made by the UN specialised agency executives to open the decision-making and prioritisation processes to all major actors, including the Red Cross/Red Crescent family and the NGOs. This UN humanitarian reform process highlighted the critical need for closer collaboration between us to be all that it is possible to be for meeting the needs of our mutual field partners and beneficiaries. For the first time in the post-World War II era we are seen as equal players.

Since the early 1990s, the NGOs have been suggesting a better way of operating in asking for full membership in coordinating committees, such as the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and in field technical/sectoral meetings, such as logistics and water/sanitation. As implementing partners with agencies, such as WFP and UNHCR, it has been increasingly apparent that we should be seen not only as field operators, but as a source of wisdom in decision-making, as well as a financial resource. The traditional UN IASC twice yearly meetings of 17 “principals,” including 3 NGO consortia representatives, provided space for issue discussions on matters such as “clusters”, security, and emergency funds. A new Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) format now includes a gathering of more southern consortia and 25 or so diverse NGO agency representatives. This has served to level the playing field of humanitarian operations and strategic thinking.

ICVA Executive Committee officers, particularly my predecessor Beth Ferris, and staff, played a major role in the investment of the intellectual formulation and moral capital, as well as the driving energy to bring the GHP from conception to birth. The 2006 ICVA General Assembly and Conference, with the theme *NGOs: The Principles and Politics of Humanitarian Action*, was a major impetus and led to inter-agency initiatives, including inter-agency missions to CAR, DRC, and to Uganda, the latter with the UNHCR ExCom Chair. A three year experiment has been established to further deepen the

# COMMITTEE

partnerships and suggestions that have been made, such as more joint field visits and tools for better coordination guided by the Principles of Partnership, the text of which is available at: [www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org](http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org)

The greatest challenge for us now will be to put aside our individual organisational pressures and priorities to share the spotlight with one another and set aside time to fulfil our pledges to promote other agencies and the larger cooperative agenda in addition to our own. The biggest test, of course, will come when the next major disaster occurs and we will be pressed to see if we can, in reality, share field operations and financial responsibilities; if we can put our recipients' needs before our own marketing and bureaucratic drivers. As one NGO executive said, "are we going to be three pillars of humanitarian action or three barriers to it?" If we are barriers then we may well be taken over by new humanitarian enterprises, such as the private corporate sector, the military, and new, more nimble non-profits.

My hope is that through the leadership of ICVA and other consortia establishing a more effective way of cooperative agreements, the best days of the humanitarian enterprise are in our joint future and in the lives of those we serve.

My sincere personal thanks and deep appreciation go to each of you who have embraced the reform agenda and to each member organisation of ICVA, which have provided the base for the highly successful contributions of our joint actions in 2006.

Courage,

Tom Getman  
Chair, ICVA Executive Committee

## ICVA'S STRUCTURE

### **General Assembly**

- ◆ All ICVA members
- ◆ Meets once every three years (13<sup>th</sup> General Assembly held in February 2006)
- ◆ Sets the strategic direction of the network, including agreeing a three-year strategic plan
- ◆ Elects the Executive Committee

### **Executive Committee**

- ◆ On behalf of the General Assembly, the Executive Committee (EXCOM) oversees the formulation and implementation of strategies, policy and membership decisions, and activities for ICVA
- ◆ 11 ICVA members (nine members elected by the General Assembly; two co-opted for gender and regional balance)
- ◆ Elects ICVA's Chair, Vice-Chair, and Treasurer, who are responsible for maintaining the humanitarian identity and integrity of ICVA's mission
- ◆ Meets twice a year and takes additional decisions electronically

### **ICVA Secretariat**

- ◆ Based in Geneva to implement ICVA's strategic and annual plans and priorities on a daily basis, as decided by the General Assembly and the EXCOM
- ◆ Maintains regular communication with the membership in order to provide and solicit information
- ◆ Represent members' views in various international forums

# INTRODUCTION

The gathering of the ICVA membership at the General Assembly every three years provides an opportunity to reflect on the work of the network and to set new goals and objectives. The 13<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, which met in February 2006, was preceded by a one day ICVA Conference, with the theme *NGOs: The Principles and Politics of Humanitarian Action*. The Conference brought ICVA members together with other NGOs, UN humanitarian agencies, inter-governmental organisations, and governments and allowed participants to take a step back, to discuss their differences, and to engage in a more honest reflection about the ways in which we work together. The Conference aimed to help kick-off the next three year strategic period for ICVA, following an external evaluation of the network for the period 2003-2005.

Despite the changing context in which humanitarian action is carried out, ICVA members saw the network as being as relevant today as when it was created in 1962. The membership adopted a Strategic Plan at the General Assembly, which set the direction for the network for 2006-2008 (available at [www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch)). Drawing on the recommendations of the external evaluation, the Strategic Plan laid out ways for ICVA to become a more powerful advocacy alliance by the 2009 General Assembly.

As a global network of NGOs that aims to be “an advocacy alliance for humanitarian action,” ICVA needs to set the agenda, while also following various processes, particularly UN ones. During the General Assembly, there was a desire to see the net-

work being more proactive and less reactive to the UN’s humanitarian priorities. Throughout 2006, however, the sheer number of processes around the UN-led humanitarian reform, particularly the cluster approach developed in the context of the IASC, and the desire

## ICVA’S ROLE AND ADDED VALUE

The five primary functions through which ICVA adds value to the work of its members are:

1. Information-sharing;
2. Advocacy and representation, particularly in terms of putting issues on the international agenda;
3. Strengthening the NGO community and voice;
4. Facilitating relationships with international organisations, governments, and other partners; and
5. Enhancing NGO visibility through representation.

of many ICVA members for the Secretariat to be involved in these, meant the ICVA Secretariat found itself, once again, spending much of its time following the UN's programme. Working on a convergence of ICVA's agenda with the UN's agenda will remain a challenge.

Given the level of influence that NGOs had on the UN-led humanitarian reform, there is a fundamental question for ICVA members: should ICVA be a means for NGOs to access and try to influence various UN (and other international) processes or should it aim to be more proactive and try and set the future directions of humanitarian response? For years, ICVA has been able to bring the views of its members to the UN's main humanitarian coordination body – the IASC. There have been a number of processes and products that have come out of the IASC that have involved strong participation from NGOs that are members of ICVA. The majority of actors around the table at the IASC, however, are UN agencies. Given that NGOs carry out the majority of humanitarian work, the opportunity now presents itself for rethinking the role of NGOs on the international scene, particularly when it comes to networks like ICVA.

The creation of the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) provides such an opportunity, as it brings together three families of the humanitarian system – NGOs, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, and UN humanitarian agencies and other inter-governmental organisations – on an equal footing. If NGOs are able to be part of the discussions and debates about how things should be changed in the humanitarian system from the beginning, partnerships will be more effective and can lead to better humanitarian outcomes for the populations with whom we work.

## IASC

ICVA raises the interests of its members directly with other high-level actors in the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC – the main humanitarian coordination body). Members have access to IASC documents via the password protected members-only section of the ICVA website: [www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch)

## UNHCR

ICVA works on behalf of NGOs to provide input to the highest levels of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and its governing body. NGO statements to UNHCR's Executive and Standing Committee meetings are coordinated by ICVA, which also co-hosts UNHCR's Annual Consultations with NGOs (Pre-ExCom).

# GHP: ANOTHER TALK SHOP OR A NEW

When the heads of 25 NGOs, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, and UN agencies and other inter-governmental organisations met in July 2006 to discuss how to enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian response, the main obstacle identified was the inequality in the partnership between these three “families” in the humanitarian system. There was a clear understanding that unless “principles of partnership” were developed and adhered to, there would continue to be difficulties in improving the way in which these three families work together.

Since the early '90s, the UN's main humanitarian coordination body has been the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), created to provide the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) with a tool for coordination of humanitarian response. In reality, the IASC has had limited impact in improving response on the ground. One of its weaknesses is that it does not reflect operational realities. NGOs, which are providing the bulk of actual assistance on the ground, are outnumbered by the more than 10 UN agencies at the table, some of which have only a minimal involvement in humanitarian response.

The July 2006 meeting was an attempt to overcome this imbalance by inviting those NGOs who have a significant operational capacity and/or a specific regional presence. The impetus for the meeting had also partly arisen from the way in which the UN-led humanitarian reform process had been presented. Following the publication of the Humanitarian Response Review (HRR) in 2005, there had been inadequate substantial discussions in the IASC context about how to move the various recommendations forward and which ones should be prioritised. Instead of prioritising the proposals for reform together, NGOs were asked to buy into a process in which they felt no ownership. They were asked to jump on board a moving train when they had no idea in which direction it was heading.

The July 2006 meeting was unique in that it brought so many representatives of the humanitarian community together at the heads of agency level. The heads of the IASC were, for the first time, meeting directly with heads of NGOs, in addition to the NGO consortia that are represented on the IASC (ICVA, InterAction, and the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response).

The meeting allowed for frank discussion, which resulted in clear agreement that a new way of working had to be found. To facilitate this new way forward, the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) was created in order to provide more strategic partnerships. The GHP was designed as an *ad hoc*, action-oriented platform that operates in a flexible manner, and which would work to achieve its goals over three years.

The first aim of the platform was to develop principles of partnership for endorsement at the first meeting of the GHP in July 2007. These principles are meant to form the basis of inter-agency work at the field level. The GHP would also be a forum for the discussion of strategic issues, with the potential to adopt statements of common concern. The work was to be overseen by a Steering Committee, with representatives from the three families.

While the first year of work of the GHP was a little slower than some would have liked, the open and frank discussions that were held at the meeting in July 2007 proved that there is a need for such a forum, at least for now.



# WAY OF WORKING?

For the GHP to avoid becoming another talk shop, it must continue to avoid the traditional UN meeting room rhetoric that suggests more presence and activities than are actually seen on the ground.

As was recently pointed out by a former Executive Director of ICVA and now current ICVA member, Cyril Ritchie, many of the ideas in the GHP and the *Principles of Partnership* mirror the dreams of ICVA in the '60s and '70s. The challenge, this time, will be to make sure that those dreams become a reality so that we do not repeat a similar exercise again in another 40 years.

In order to ensure open and transparent sharing of information related to the GHP, ICVA set up a page on its website, but with the independent web address of [www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org](http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org). ICVA will continue to maintain this web page, with the latest information and documents related to the GHP, until there is a feeling that it should be hosted elsewhere.

## TALK BACK

To subscribe to ICVA's newsletter, *Talk Back*, send an e-mail with the subject "subscribe" to [talkback@icva.ch](mailto:talkback@icva.ch).

## MORE TRANSPARENCY IN RECRUITMENTS

The appointment of senior humanitarian officials in the UN system is often shrouded in mystery (and politics). It is not even clear to the UN's closest partners – NGOs – how or why appointments are made. In 2002, ICVA began a tradition by calling for an open and transparent recruitment process for the UN High Commissioner for Refugees. That call (which was repeated in 2005 for the following High Commissioner's appointment) was also applied to the recruitment process for the post of UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs, also known by the title of Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), with the publication of an article entitled "Selecting the Next UN Humanitarian Chief: The Worst Recruiting Crisis?" in ICVA's newsletter *Talk Back* in December 2006. Given the importance of the ERC's role as Chair of the IASC, the appointment of an experienced humanitarian was seen as key for providing the necessary leadership.

The political reality of States trading senior UN posts without resistance from the UN Secretariat, however, came to bear on the post and the hope of a more open process was quickly dashed. A short time later, the relatively surprising appointment was announced of Sir John Holmes, a British diplomat, with a limited humanitarian background. A Letter to the Editor of the *Financial Times* was written by the ICVA Coordinator, entitled *Humanitarian Disappointment*, which lamented the fact that the former Secretary-General's transparent recruitment procedures for senior staff were not followed. Whether such backroom decision-making will continue to be the norm, or if there will be a greater commitment to accountability in the UN, remains to be seen.

# CLUSTERS CONTINUED

The ICVA Secretariat continued its role of providing information to members to enable them to make their own decisions about their engagement with the cluster approach. It also supported attempts within the IASC to clarify much of the confusion around the cluster approach and to ensure that the clusters adequately involved interested NGOs, through the development of the *Guidance Note on Using the Cluster Approach to Strengthen Humanitarian Response* and, later in the year, through the *Interim Self-Assessment*. At the same time, the ICVA Secretariat also looked at two of the cluster roll-out countries – the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Uganda [see piece entitled *Ugandan IDPs and the Clusters*] – as a means of trying to help ensure that the views of NGOs were being taken into consideration during the implementation of clusters.

At the invitation of OCHA's Humanitarian Reform Support Unit, Secretariat staff travelled to DRC to look at the roll-out of the clusters in March 2006. The visit provided an opportunity to engage in discussions with key humanitarian actors – and particularly NGOs – on the various aspects of the cluster approach. At the time, there were a number of frustrations about what was seen as a headquarters imposed system, which had come with little guidance. The visit provided an opportunity to better explain the clusters, as well as to highlight areas that needed more work in terms of the overall cluster architecture.

Following the application of the cluster approach in the Pakistan earthquake response, ICVA member ActionAid undertook an evaluation of the implementation of clusters in what was the first major new emergency where clusters were being used. In order to help contribute to learning lessons as a broader humanitarian community, the report was launched in Geneva with ICVA. A panel discussion, including ActionAid staff who had worked directly with the clusters in Pakistan, highlighted some of the positives of the approach, as well as areas of weakness where more work needed to be done.

What came out clearly from that evaluation was that it is extremely difficult to attribute whether a humanitarian response is necessarily better (or worse) because of clusters. Given that each emergency involves unique factors affecting response, it becomes impossible to make adequate comparisons. At the same time, there are a number of issues that arise in almost every major emergency that could be highlighted because of the cluster approach, such as the lack of involvement of local NGOs and local structures in the Pakistan response.

The reaction from the UN to the ActionAid report was quite defensive in many ways, with questions being asked about the methodology and the conclusions being drawn. The report was not meant to provide a definitive view of the clusters, but was meant to contribute to the improvement of the cluster approach.

One thing that has become clear is that considerable time was spent at the headquarters level in order to try and clarify the various aspects of the cluster approach. The development of the *Guidance Note*, to which the Secretariat provided considerable input to ensure the concerns and interests of members were adequately reflected, was meant to help provide better explanations of the key terms and processes around the cluster approach. However, during the negotiation of the *Guidance Note*, involving various agencies, the language became quite lengthy, and sometimes not entirely clear, as each agency's interests were included.

When the interim self-assessment was carried out in the last half of the year, it became clear that considerable confusion still existed in the roll-out countries about the definitions, roles, and objectives associated with the cluster approach. The ICVA Secretariat devoted significant time to trying to ensure that the self-assessment provided an honest appraisal of the clusters up until that point. NGO co-facilitators were identified by the ICVA Secretariat for the workshops held in DRC and Somalia, to help ensure NGO views were taken into consideration.

The discussion in the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Working Group of the self-assessment report, however, left little space for debating ways to address the concerns raised. An additional group was created to develop ways to operationalise the *Guidance Note* and to look at some of the concerns, the work of which has continued throughout 2007.

## MEETINGS HOSTED BY ICVA IN 2006

February	ICVA Conference 2006 – <i>NGOs: The Principles and Politics of Humanitarian Action</i>
February	ICVA's 13th General Assembly
April	NGO Meeting with Eric Laroche, Humanitarian Coordinator for Somalia
April	Launch of ActionAid's report <i>The Evolving UN Cluster Approach in the Pakistan Earthquake: An NGO Perspective</i>
May	Geneva NGO Uganda Group informal lunchtime meeting
May	Informal NGO meeting with Humanitarian Reform Support Unit, OCHA
June	Informal meeting between Jan Egeland, Emergency Relief Coordinator, and NGOs, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, UN cluster lead agencies and IOM
July	Meeting on the <i>NGO Impact Initiative</i> with Deputy UN Special Envoy for Tsunami Recovery, Eric Schwartz, and the President/CEO of Plan USA, Sam Worthington
July	Pre-Meeting with Heads of NGOs invited to 12-13 July meeting on <i>Enhancing the Effectiveness of Humanitarian Action, A Dialogue between UN and non-UN Humanitarian Organisations</i>
July	Meeting on the Asylum-Migration Nexus in preparation for UNHCR's Annual Consultations with NGOs (Pre-ExCom)
September	Orientation Session for Pre-ExCom NGO Participants
September	Special Envoy/NGO Impact Initiative Meeting
October	Side-event at UNHCR's ExCom on <i>Examining the Role of ExCom in UNHCR's Work</i>
December	Informal NGO-Donor Government Meeting on Humanitarian Reform
December	NGO Meeting with Toby Lanzer, Humanitarian Coordinator and Resident Coordinator for Central African Republic
December	Meeting on convergence and divergence in NGO views on the clusters and a debriefing on the IASC Principals meeting

This list is not exhaustive, but aims to provide a flavour of the types of meetings that ICVA hosts. It does not include the numerous meetings in which ICVA participated.

# UGANDAN IDPs AND THE CLUSTERS

Uganda is a country that continues to require the highest priority on the agenda of humanitarian agencies. While 2006 saw new hopes for the 1.7 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) returning to a situation of peace and tranquillity, the humanitarian situation remained dire for most of them. Unfortunately, the response of humanitarian agencies did not match the scale of the situation. In a number of the IDP camps, especially those further away from urban areas, the presence of humanitarian agencies has been insufficient. Identified by the UN as one of first three countries for rolling out the cluster approach in 2006, the question is whether in Uganda this new type of coordinating and organising humanitarian response has made a positive impact in terms of covering the IDPs' needs.

In 2006, the ICVA Coordinator undertook two visits to Uganda to look at the humanitarian response and the relationship between the UN system and NGOs. In May 2006, he found that confusion and reluctance to adopt a new approach, which had been poorly explained, were widespread among many humanitarian agencies. In practice, the main implication of the clusters in Uganda was UNHCR's new role with IDPs in the country. Several NGOs saw UNHCR's new role as too little, too late. Other agencies viewed it as an attempt by UNHCR to dominate them.

During his second visit in September, the Coordinator travelled for part of the mission together with the Chair of the UNHCR Executive Committee, Japanese Ambassador Ichiro Fujisaki. Thanks to the new peace negotiations, IDPs had started to return in the districts of Lira and Gulu. UNHCR continued to be ahead of other UN agencies in rolling out the clusters. Whatever can be said about UNHCR, the ICVA Coordinator found that the UN refugee agency took its new responsibility very seriously. It brought in new protection-orientated staff, opened new offices, and started new projects with NGO partners. Thanks to a new head of the OCHA office, efforts were made to correct misunderstandings and clarify confusion about the clusters. However, a number of NGOs, many of which had long-standing experience in northern Uganda, still found it difficult to understand how they could relate to the UN and how they would be able to keep up with the plethora of new coordination meetings.

The question of whether the clusters made a difference in the lives of the displaced in Uganda can, thus, be answered in different ways. Those who believe there has been a positive impact will point to the increased attention for advocacy and protection, largely due to UNHCR's efforts. Those who hold a sceptical point of view refer to the huge bureaucracy that the clusters have brought with them. What all seem to agree on, however, is the need to improve the actual response on the ground. A UNHCR evaluation in 2007, which also made use of the ICVA Coordinator's 2006 reports, found that the humanitarian effort continues to fall short of the minimum standards needing to be met. Coverage and consistency in the response must be addressed as a matter of priority. Otherwise, the clusters may provide little more than the result of creating a bigger dichotomy between meeting room rhetoric and field-level reality.

# BUILDING SAFER ORGANISATIONS

While the problem of sexual exploitation and abuse by humanitarian workers is most closely associated with the 2002 reports from West Africa and Nepal, most organisations now recognise that the risk to beneficiaries from staff is ongoing. Throughout 2006, therefore, the Building Safer Organisations project (BSO) continued to receive requests for assistance from agencies hoping to improve their capacities to handle complaints and investigations.

Accordingly, during the first part of the year, the project compiled and published the training materials it tested in 2005, later distributing as many as 400 copies to ICVA members and former participants in the last quarter alone. The project team also delivered four regional workshops on investigations into sexual abuse and exploitation in humanitarian agencies and began the process of training facilitators from participating organisations to run learning programmes within their agencies. An independent evaluation, conducted in June 2006 by the Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, found extremely high levels of satisfaction with the project's materials and participatory methodology among former participants and sponsoring organisations. The evaluation is available on the ICVA website: [www.icva.ch/bso](http://www.icva.ch/bso)

Another highlight from 2006 was the project's involvement in the December 2006 High Level Meeting on Preventing and Responding to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by UN and Non-UN Personnel, hosted by the United Nations. As a member of the organising committee, the project sponsored the participation of an award winning women's rights campaigner from a Liberian NGO network to attend the conference and launched the BSO Handbook and Guidelines during the meeting's final session. The project was also heavily involved in the negotiation and drafting of a Statement of Commitment endorsed at the meeting by UN agencies and NGOs.

## BSO HANDBOOK

The BSO Training Handbook and Guidelines on complaints and investigation procedures were designed through a process of information sharing, ongoing discussions, and piloting of materials. NGO staff and managers, professional investigators, and child protection experts all participated in this extensive process. Both documents are available from the ICVA website at: [www.icva.ch/bso](http://www.icva.ch/bso)

## BSO CONTACT DETAILS

The latest information on the BSO project is available on the HAP website at: [www.hapinternational.org](http://www.hapinternational.org)

The BSO Secretariat can be contacted by e-mail at: [bso@hapinternational.org](mailto:bso@hapinternational.org)

In November 2006, the ICVA Executive Committee came to an agreement that the BSO project would move to the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership – International (HAP) in early 2007, giving the project an opportunity to grow within HAP's general accountability framework.

# ADVOCACY ON NEGLECTED CRISES

For the past several years, one of the goals of the ICVA network has been to draw attention to crises that are “neglected” by the international community. In 2006, the Secretariat helped do so in two situations, in partnership with UN agencies and in the context of the IASC. The first was the situation in Katanga Province of the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and the second was in the Central African Republic (CAR). The aim was to gain the attention of the international community and NGOs, in particular, and help put a spotlight on the need to better respond to humanitarian needs in these situations.

The Secretariat’s mission to Katanga was undertaken in conjunction with OCHA to look at the cluster roll-out [see piece entitled *Clusters Continued*]. The situation in Katanga, in March 2006, saw internally displaced persons in need of protection and assistance, without a requisite number of humanitarian actors to respond to these needs. A report was broadly circulated to the ICVA membership and briefings were held in Geneva on the situation. A few NGOs did work together to try and better respond to the situation, but funds were not as quickly forthcoming as was needed, with the result that the response was not in line with the needs. In fact, by the time the money was made available, many of the IDPs had started to return. On the positive side, however, the lessons learned from this situation contributed to improving the pooled funding mechanism in the DRC.

The humanitarian situation in CAR was brought to the attention of the IASC by the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator, Toby Lanzer, in July 2006. An inter-agency mission, led by UNICEF, went to CAR in November 2006 and included the ICVA Secretariat, representing the NGO community, as well as a representative of the Swedish government, representing donors. The mission met with various representatives in CAR, as well as traveling to the northwest and visiting a number of persons who had been displaced. The mission reaffirmed much of the analysis of the country team, which highlighted a protection crisis in the northwest, with many people hiding in forests out of fear.

The mission to CAR presented a joint report (available at [www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch)) and proceeded to carry out a number of briefings by various mission members in Brussels, Geneva, New York, Paris, and Washington to raise awareness of the situation to humanitarian actors and to donors. There was a clear commitment to doing a follow-up mission six months later, with a smaller group, which still included ICVA Secretariat and the Swedish government. While the increase in humanitarian actors and funds for CAR cannot be solely attributed to the mission, it undoubtedly played a contributing role.

The model of the CAR mission is one that should be replicated – the inclusive nature of the mission allowed for the views of donors, NGOs, and UN agencies to be incorporated and drew directly from conversations with displaced persons, as well as humanitarian organisations and government officials. Much of the success in the mission, however, was as a result of the strong, partnership-oriented approach of the team leader, Ibrahima Fall of UNICEF.

# APPOINTING QUALIFIED HUMANITARIAN COORDINATORS

One of the pillars of the UN-led humanitarian reform was the strengthening of the function of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HCs). The role of the Humanitarian Coordinator in emergency response is one that is meant to service the broader humanitarian community. While this function has been in place since the mid-nineties, too often candidates have been appointed who did not have the requisite skills and experience. A key element involved in this pillar was to try and make the HC pool (which until last year had only been a tool on paper) and appointment process more open to humanitarian actors outside of the UN. Those who have thorough operational humanitarian experience, which is one of the key HC qualifications, are found in much greater numbers outside of the UN system than within it.

A call was put out to NGOs, the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, and the International Organization for Migration to find suitable candidates that could potentially become HCs. A pool of applicants was selected, with the hope that they would be called upon to act as HCs in a necessary situation, for up to a year. Their organisations would allow them the time off and they would be able to contribute, hopefully, to a better humanitarian response. Prior to deployment, the idea was that they would undergo some familiarisation with the role of an HC, such as working with an existing HC for a period of months. Some of them would also undergo the Resident Coordinator (RC) assessment, to provide the possibility for them to act as an HC and RC, and because there are many aspects of the RC assessment that can also provide indicators for a good HC.

The first non-UN appointment from the HC pool was to Uganda and was from an ICVA member agency. Unfortunately, the appointment was made rather quickly, during the last few days of the previous Emergency Relief Coordinator's term. Due to a number of complicating factors, the post eventually had to be withdrawn.

The consequence of this experience, however, seems to be a reluctance to have separate HCs from RCs. As one NGO representative pointed out at an HC retreat, combining the positions of HCs and RCs (along with other roles, like Designated Official (DO) for UN security and/or Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General (DSRSG) and/or Resident Representative of UNDP) requires a “superman” or “superwoman”. Given that such superheroes are few and far between, it would seem that a rethinking of the system is required so that each of these positions can be adequately carried out. Otherwise, the achievements in the strengthening of the HC function might turn out to be artificial.

# ICVA ASSISTS IN NEW NGO COMMITMENTS

As in the follow-up to the Rwandan genocide and refugee exodus in 1994, the response to the Indian Ocean tsunami was subject to a number of significant evaluations and initiatives to help humanitarian agencies learn lessons for the future. The NGO Impact Initiative, initiated by the UN Special Envoy for Tsunami Recovery, Bill Clinton, was one of these processes that pushed NGOs to adopt measures to improve their performance in a number of key areas.

With a commitment to supporting NGOs' improved performance, ICVA accepted an invitation from a coalition of nine US-based NGOs, brought together by Special Envoy Clinton, to host consultations in Geneva. A meeting was held at ICVA's offices in mid-July, while a second meeting, hosted and chaired by the ICVA Secretariat, took place in October at the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue in Geneva.

ICVA member All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI) hosted a *Strategic Roundtable on the Office of Special Envoy/NGO Impact Initiative (OSE/NII)* following up on the meetings organised by ICVA in July. The event was held in August 2006 in Chennai and focused on drawing feedback from participants on the Initiative's five themes. The roundtable also discussed complementarities with other key international efforts, such as the Tsunami Evaluation Coalition (TEC). A report of the roundtable was published by AIDMI shortly after (see: [www.southasiadisasters.net](http://www.southasiadisasters.net)).

Areas of focus for discussions included: accountability, coordination, local capacity, human rights, and NGO professionalism. Overshadowing all these debates was the issue of a centralised mechanism or structure to certify NGOs. As in the Rwandan refugee crisis, the response to the tsunami saw new NGOs active in a situation in which many of them had little or no experience. A certification system might exclude these newcomers from the humanitarian response.

The consultations on a draft proposal for a new, centralised quality assurance mechanism, which would certify NGOs, as well as monitor their performance, led to a rather watered-down final text. Many of the NGOs participating in the process pointed to existing structures and bodies, such as, for example, the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership – International, which already play such a role. Instead, these NGOs committed to reporting publicly on an annual basis on the progress they have made on the NGO Impact Initiative's recommendations. Their winning argument has been that much of what was originally proposed is already done by them.

Another aspect affecting the value of some of the NGO Impact Initiative's recommendations relates to the specific circumstances of the tsunami. Response to a natural disaster will see recovery efforts starting on day one. Relationships with authorities and local communities are likely to be significantly less dominated by political and security factors, such as access and freedom of movement, compared with the often limited acceptance of humanitarian agencies and strained relations with local powers in war situations.



# TO IMPROVE PERFORMANCE

The recommendations as to what the relationships between internationals and locals should look like should, therefore, should have made a clear caveat related to the difference between humanitarian action in armed conflict and the response to natural disasters. Unfortunately, the report of the initiative does not articulate this essential distinction very well.

Looking at the NGO Impact Initiative one year later, there are some fears that its lengthy report has collected dust on too many shelves. Follow-up on valuable recommendations, such as the need for devoting resources to coordination and influencing donor behaviour, with regards to including support for enhancing local capacities, should not go lost. ICVA, therefore, remains committed to improving humanitarian action through the promotion of these lessons-learned initiatives and ensuring their follow-up. It should not take another major disaster to remember the lessons that should have been learned much earlier.

## NEW ICVA WEBSITE LAUNCHED

In 2006, ICVA was very pleased to launch the new, improved version of the ICVA website: [www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch)

The updated website design has a slicker look and provides access to information in a clearer and more user-friendly format, making it easier for members to find what they need. New features include intuitive navigation bars, easy-to-use tables of contents, and an improved search function. In addition, the website integrates a comprehensive database that allows ICVA to better tailor e-mail distribution lists to its members' needs.

A very positive response to the new look was received from ICVA members, with appreciative feedback on the more professional format, which makes identifying the source of information and accessing documents easier and faster. Overall usage of the site has now increased almost tenfold and users are spending less time navigating within the site. There is also increased usage of the public sections of the website being generated from outside the ICVA network.

ICVA expresses great appreciation for the success of the improved website to its creators, Wyrdwright, Inc., which tailored the design and functions to ICVA's particular needs. In addition to its attentive and detailed design and construction of the site, Wyrdwright provided an extremely generous in-kind donation of CHF 59,595.50 towards the cost of the website overhaul.

For more information on Wyrdwright, please see: [www.wyrdwright.com](http://www.wyrdwright.com)

### WEBSITE PASSWORDS

Each staff member of an ICVA member organisation is entitled to a password to the ICVA website: [www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch). ICVA members simply need to send a message to [webmaster@icva.ch](mailto:webmaster@icva.ch) requesting a username and password.

# TAKING THE TIME TO DISCUSS THE IMPACT

In order to stimulate discussion and to have an honest reflection before going into the 13<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, the ICVA Secretariat organised a one-day conference on *NGOs: The Principles and Politics of Humanitarian Action*. The conference was meant to provoke ICVA members to be self-critical and to engage in assessing how differences and diversity impact on humanitarian work. By bringing together a range of experiences and actors – from governments to NGOs to UN agencies to the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement, the hope was that debate would be stimulated. The ideas generated were fed into the General Assembly.

The Conference was divided into three sub-themes:

- ◆ *Understanding Our Differences – As It Is Now;*
- ◆ *Managing Our Diversity – As It Should Be;* and
- ◆ *Future Challenges: Are We Ready to Meet Them – As It Could Be.*

The keynote address by Angelo Gnaediger, ICRC Director-General, looked at *The Value of Diversity*. He emphasised three points: the diversity of the humanitarian community and the basic implications of this diversity; the guidance that International Humanitarian Law (IHL) provides about humanitarian space; and ways to improve communication between different humanitarian actors. He spoke of collaboration needing to be field-orientated and reality-based.

During the panel discussions, it was made clear that diversity is apparent in the motivations and methodologies of all humanitarian actors. There is, however, a need for greater clarity in what organisations are trying to achieve so that we can better understand why they take different decisions. We also have to address the challenges of working through the differences between national NGOs and international NGOs. The term “capacity building” can be seen as patronising and we should, instead, be looking to harness existing local capacity, which is often ignored. There is also a need for greater dialogue to improve understanding between western NGOs and Islamic NGOs.

There were discussions about how the *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs* can be better put into practice, while involving the voices of beneficiaries for a more coherent response. While we have many standards and tools already in the humanitarian community, what is needed is enforcement of their application. It was, however, suggested that the only way to really make humanitarian actors more accountable was to actually “name and shame” by leaking stories to the media. Another felt that it would be better if NGOs were more transparent and put evaluations out in the public domain, in order to have people trust them more.

In looking to the future, it was made clear that the way forward was to get “our own houses in order,” given the increasing number of actors on the humanitarian scene. At the same time, while some humanitarian organisations might be able to create a “super league” that upholds high professional standards, there also had to be the realisation that international agencies are not the only ones that are the life savers, given that they usually arrive after disasters strike. There is a need for real support by northern and southern NGOs, which goes beyond simply talking about it.

# OF DIVERSITY

Two major challenges put to the conference participants in terms of the future were the polarisation between the rich and the poor (both between, and within, countries) and the increasing impact of technology. The question put to the conference was whether organisations have what it takes to be transformational to react to these challenges.

The debates that took place during the conference helped the ICVA membership think creatively about three central issues in the Strategic Plan: representation and advocacy, the “southern” voice; and membership criteria. Members were able to provide creative suggestions as to how the network would evolve from 2006-2008. They also elected a new Executive Committee to oversee the work of the network.

The challenges posed at the conference and discussed at the General Assembly will need to continue to be addressed by the ICVA membership. The real challenge will be to make sure that our day-to-day work does not overwhelm our ability to address the bigger challenges out there.

## **ICVA CONFERENCE 2006**

### **NGOs: THE PRINCIPLES AND POLITICS OF HUMANITARIAN ACTION**

**Welcome:** Dr. Elizabeth Ferris, ICVA Chair, and Ambassador Blaise Godet, Swiss Permanent Representative

**Keynote Address:** Mr. Angelo Gnaediger, ICRC Director-General

#### **Understanding Our Differences: *As It Is Now***

Facilitator: Ms Lola Gostelow, Consultant

- ◆ Mr. Kenny Gluck, MSF-Holland
- ◆ Mr. Lewis Sida, Consultant, Co-Author of ICVA/SCHR Commentary on NGO/RC Code of Conduct
- ◆ Mr. Abdel-Rahman Ghandour, Author of “Jihad Humanitaire”, formerly Special Assistant to the SRSG on the Great Lakes Region and soon to be with UN IRIN-Middle East
- ◆ Mr. T. Mufizar Mahmud, Forum Bangun Aceh

#### **Managing Our Diversity: *As It Should Be***

Facilitator: Mr. George Devendorf, Mercy Corps

- ◆ Ms Jeanne Samuel, Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Sri Lanka
- ◆ Dr. Hugo Slim, Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue
- ◆ Dr. Hany El-Bana, Islamic Relief
- ◆ Mr. Ton van Zutphen, World Vision International

#### **Future Challenges: How Can We Get Ready to Meet Them?: *As It Could Be***

Facilitator: Mr. Antonio Donini, Tufts University

- ◆ Dr. Mukesh Kapila, WHO
- ◆ Mr. Anders Ladekarl, Danish Red Cross
- ◆ Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, MERCY Malaysia

# NGOs GET A ROLE IN UNHCR'S EXCOM CONCLUSIONS PROCESS

Each year, UNHCR's Executive Committee (EXCOM) adopts a number of Conclusions on International Protection, which are meant to provide guidance on protection issues and fill gaps in the international protection regime. These Conclusions are negotiated between Member States of UNHCR's EXCOM and for years, NGOs had been trying to get their input into the Conclusions by directly lobbying Member States. This function expanded on ICVA's continuing role in facilitating NGO statements to UNHCR's Standing and Executive Committees. Many NGOs use EXCOM Conclusions in their advocacy work, as well as at a very practical level in terms of their refugee work at the national level. By feeding in direct experiences, NGOs have always aimed to ensure that Conclusions raise the standards of protection for refugees, asylum-seekers, and other persons of concern to UNHCR.

Based on a decision of UNHCR's EXCOM in 2004, NGOs were able to provide written consolidated comments on the drafts of the EXCOM Conclusions for the first time in 2005. The drafts were distributed through the ICVA Secretariat, which gathered and consolidated NGO comments to present to Member States. NGOs were also able to present their consolidated views, through ICVA, to a preliminary meeting before the negotiations began on each of the draft Conclusions. Interestingly, there were very few questions and little interaction from Member States on the NGO input during those preliminary meetings.

In 2006, a thematic Conclusion was adopted on Women and Girls at Risk – a topic that had been put forward by a number of NGOs concerned by the protection gaps that exist in the international protection regime. Much of the language of the Conclusion drew upon the practical experiences of NGOs, which were able to provide comments on various versions of the conclusion through a process agreed by the Executive Committee.

One of the challenges in consolidating the views of NGOs was, of course, the fact that some NGOs had differing perspectives on what should or should not be included in the drafts. As often happens, the ICVA Secretariat was put in the difficult position of having to make a judgement call, at short notice, as to which NGO comments to include when there were contradictory inputs. The fact that NGOs must provide a consolidated perspective to UNHCR's governing bodies will always result in a diverse range of views being forced to compromise, to a degree, in order to arrive at a consensus.

There are questions about how States view NGO comments on the draft Conclusions and, thus, how useful a process it is for NGOs to take the time to provide consolidated comments. Several Member States seem to be wary of NGO input and shy away from including it simply because the input comes from NGOs. It may be that lobbying individual governments about particular issues in the Conclusions might be the most effective way of getting changes incorporated. At the same time, continuing to have access to the drafts will be essential for such lobbying to take place.

# FINANCES

## Balance Sheet Statement as at 31 December, with comparative figures (all figures in Swiss francs)

	2004	2005	2006
<b>ASSETS</b>			
Petty Cash	1,776.50	1,016.60	1,253.55
<i>Cash in bank accounts</i>	493,668.82	435,922.52	491,765.46
UBS CHF	107,768.52	300,029.93	490,827.21
UBS CHF - Projects	385,900.30	135,892.59	938.25
<i>Accounts receivable and prepaid expenses</i>	120,762.90	66,785.39	200,536.43
Accounts receivable	113,840.15	8,566.55	52,165.69
Taxes on interest income	186.85	345.74	550.89
Prepaid expenses	6,735.90	32,047.30	0.00
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) via International Rescue Committee	0.00	25,825.80	41,742.25
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	0.00	0.00	10,760.00
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via InterAction	0.00	0.00	71,390.20
Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) via InterAction	0.00	0.00	23,927.40
Guarantee deposit	1,023.05	8,327.60	8,363.60
	<b>617,231.27</b>	<b>512,052.11</b>	<b>701,919.04</b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>			
Accounts payable	38,457.70	37,022.05	18,479.30
IM World Aid (member loan due 31.12.98)	135,125.00	131,125.00	60,600.00
Accruals & Provisions	24,500.00	6,500.00	7,749.00
Foreign Affairs Canada	12,371.85	7,695.20	7,695.20
International Rescue Committee	45,497.95	0.00	0.00
Canadian International Development Agency	288,014.85	161,686.25	0.00
UNHCR	6,420.00	0.00	0.00
Stichting Vluchteling	786.75	0.00	0.00
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	0.00	41,121.40	39,996.40
Swedish International Development Cooperation (SIDA)	0.00	0.00	33,537.92
Oak Foundation	0.00	0.00	163,236.30
Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project	0.00	0.00	22,430.35
Reserve (-deficit) carry over at 31 December	66,057.17	126,902.21	348,194.57
	<b>617,213.27</b>	<b>512,052.11</b>	<b>701,919.04</b>

### AUDIT REPORT

ICVA's full audit report is available upon request from the ICVA Secretariat: [secretariat@icva.ch](mailto:secretariat@icva.ch).

# FINANCES

## Statement of Income and Expenditures 1 January to 31 December, with comparative figures (all figures in Swiss francs)

	2004	2005	2006
<b>SUPPORT TO CORE COSTS</b>			
<i>Income</i>			
Membership fees	263,827.73	240,137.60	302,173.14
Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA) via DRC	103,000.00	103,150.00	105,836.00
Norway - Ministry of Foreign Affairs via Norwegian Refugee Council (NOK 500,000)	45,476.93	59,175.06	93,073.50
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	100,000.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
Netherlands-Ministerie Van Buitenlandse Zaken	0.00	116,279.00	116,279.00
UNHCR, Switzerland (USD 25,000)	34,179.00	30,812.50	29,651.50
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA)	83,000.00	0.00	0.00
Stichting Vluchteling, Netherlands project balance to core	0.00	786.75	-786.75
Restricted funds/reserves balance to core	26,343.00	0.00	0.00
Wyrdwright in-kind donation for website	0.00	0.00	59,595.50
American Red Cross (ARC) tsunami project 2005 contribution	0.00	0.00	22,089.00
Exchange rate gain and bank interest	495.60	207.90	558.40
ICVA's expenses invoiced to projects	7,600.00	23,550.00	194,627.65
<b>Total income</b>	<b>663,922.26</b>	<b>674,098.81</b>	<b>1,023,096.95</b>
<b>SUPPORT TO CORE COSTS</b>			
<i>Expenses</i>			
Core salaries	250,218.85	283,705.40	388,590.73
Consultancy fees	10,510.97	9,022.00	0.00
Social charges	89,461.90	42,036.05	110,238.58
Other personnel charges	130.00	2,468.56	239.70
Website related charges	28,240.15	44,724.40	66,948.60
Executive Committee	9,198.80	13,501.61	15,808.60
Conference/General Assembly	1,770.00	0.00	40,789.95
Office supplies/equipment/maintenance	12,036.30	43,428.69	15,923.25
Travel and representation charges	22,304.30	31,281.82	7,229.69
Publication and translation costs	10,075.50	9,120.26	12,921.85
Office rental and utilities	41,009.30	41,828.15	41,644.15
Postage and telecommunication costs	19,628.14	22,011.30	19,252.25
Audit and legal fees	3,000.00	3,000.00	4,900.00
Bank charges, exchange rate adjustment	2,090.43	1,481.12	580.45
Ad hoc project : Tsunami NGO Coordination Project	0.00	26,383.70	0.00
Ad hoc project : ICVA External Evaluation	0.00	36,603.80	0.00
Ad hoc : Hosting of IASC Working Group Meeting, Nov. 2005	0.00	5,163.00	0.00
Ad hoc : Sphere Project	0.00	0.00	24,422.48
Ad hoc : ICVA Mission	0.00	0.00	4,007.21
Ad hoc : ICVA Conference	0.00	0.00	31,638.44
Miscellaneous	0.00	305.00	0.00
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>499,674.64</b>	<b>616,064.86</b>	<b>785,135.93</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>164,247.62</b>	<b>58,033.95</b>	<b>237,961.02</b>

	2004	2005	2006
<b>IASC Humanitarian Workshop 2004</b>			
<i>Income</i>			
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>			
Foreign Affairs Canada	0.00	12,371.85	7,695.20
<b>Grant received</b>			
Foreign Affairs Canada	28,649.25	0.00	0.00
<b>Total income</b>	<b>28,649.25</b>	<b>12,371.85</b>	<b>7,695.20</b>
<i>Expenses</i>			
<b>Reimbursements</b>			
Foreign Affairs Canada	16,277.40	0.00	0.00
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
Foreign Affairs Canada	0.00	4,676.65	0.00
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>16,277.40</b>	<b>12,371.85</b>	<b>7,695.20</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>12,371.85</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

#### Increasing NGO Engagement with the IASC

<i>Income</i>		
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>		
<b>Grant received</b>		
Swedish International Development Cooperation (SIDA)		121,945.80
		<b>121,945.80</b>
<b>Total income</b>		<b>121,945.80</b>
<i>Expenses</i>		
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>		88,407.88
Swedish International Development Cooperation (SIDA)		33,537.92
<b>Total expenses</b>		<b>121,945.80</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>		<b>0.00</b>

# FINANCES

	2004	2005	2006
<b>Building Safer Organisations Project</b>			
<i>Income</i>			
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) via International Rescue Committee	0.00	45,497.95	-25,825.80
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	0.00	288,014.85	161,686.25
UNHCR	0.00	6,420.00	0.00
<b>Grant received</b>			
<b>Phase I</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) via International Rescue Committee outstanding (2005 USD 20,236)	112,970.00	166,245.45	25,825.80
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	288,014.85	0.00	0.00
UNHCR	6,420.00	0.00	0.00
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) via International Rescue Committee Jan/Feb 2006 USD 25,371			32,543.40
<b>Phase II</b>			
OAK Foundation (USD 169,018)	0.00	0.00	207,773.85
<b>Total income</b>	<b>407,404.85</b>	<b>506,178.25</b>	<b>402,003.50</b>
<i>Expenses</i>	67,472.05	367,506.71	428,774.51
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
<b>Phase I</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) via International Rescue Committee outstanding (March 2006 USD 34,791)	45,497.95	-25,825.80	-41,742.25
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	288,014.85	161,686.25	-10,760.00
<b>Phase II</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) via InterAction USD 57,612	0.00	0.00	-71,390.20
Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) via InterAction USD 19,410	0.00	0.00	-23,927.40
OAK Foundation	0.00	0.00	163,236.30
<b>Spent in 2006 to be reported in 2007</b>	0.00	0.00	-25,518.80
	333,512.80	135,860.45	-10,102.35
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>400,984.85</b>	<b>503,367.16</b>	<b>418,672.16</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>6,420.00</b>	<b>2,811.09</b>	<b>-16,668.66</b>



NGO Code of Conduct Commentary	2004	2005	2006
<i>Income</i>			
<b>Grant received</b>			
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	0.00	60,081.00	41,121.40
Development Cooperation of Ireland	52,622.50	0.00	0.00
<b>Total income</b>	<b>52,622.50</b>	<b>60,081.00</b>	<b>41,121.40</b>
<i>Expenses</i>	70,916.40	18,959.60	1,125.00
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	0.00	41,121.40	39,996.40
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>70,916.40</b>	<b>60,081.00</b>	<b>41,121.40</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>-18,293.90</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

#### Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project

<i>Income</i>			
<b>Grant received</b>			
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC) and US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM)			27,918.85
<b>Total income</b>			<b>27,918.85</b>
<i>Expenses</i>			5,488.50
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project			22,430.35
<b>Total expenses</b>			<b>27,918.85</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>			<b>0.00</b>

#### DEFICIT

<i>Accumulated deficit carry over previous year</i>	-79,896.55	66,057.17	126,902.21
<i>Total excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income for period</i>	145,953.72	60,845.04	221,292.36
<b>Reserve (deficit) carry over at 31 December</b>	<b>66,057.17</b>	<b>126,902.21</b>	<b>348,194.57</b>

# ICVA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2006

## *Executive Committee Members (until February 2006)*

**Chair:** Dr. Elizabeth Ferris, *WCC*  
**Vice-Chair:** Mr. Mamadou Ndiaye, *OFADEC*  
**Treasurer:** Mr. Jappe Erichsen, *NRC*

Mr. Saman Amarasinghe, *NNGOC*  
Mr. Gregory Brown, *IRC*  
Mr. John Damerell, *LWF*  
Mr. Keshav Gautam, *ActionAid*

Mr. Thomas Getman, *WVI*  
Mr. Titon Mitra, *CARE*  
Ms Ann Mary Olsen, *DRC*  
Mr. Sayed Fazlullah Wahidi, *ANCB*

## *Executive Committee Members (Elected by the 13<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, February 2006)*

**Chair:** Mr. Thomas Getman, *WVI*  
**Vice-Chair:** Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, *MERCY Malaysia*  
**Treasurer:** Mr. Jappe Erichsen, *NRC (assisted by Mr. Paul Nesse in 2007)*

Ms Vivi Akakpo, *AACC (co-opted member)*  
Mr. Muzaffer Baca, *IBC*  
Ms Carolyn Makinson, *Women's Commission (co-opted member)*  
Mr. Mamadou Ndiaye, *OFADEC*

Mr. Paul O'Brien, *Concern Worldwide*  
Ms Ann Mary Olsen, *DRC*  
Mr. Sayed Fazlullah Wahidi, *ANCB*  
Mr. Halakhe Waqo, *ActionAid (position filled by Mr. Shah Alam Liton and Ms Annie Street in 2007)*

# ICVA SECRETARIAT 2006

By the end of 2006, the ICVA Secretariat functioned on the basis of a 4.10 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff. The positions at the Secretariat were filled by:

Mr. Ed Schenkenberg van Mierop, Coordinator  
Ms Manisha Thomas, Policy Officer  
Mr. Myke Leahy, Information Officer  
Ms Ester Dross, Finance Officer

Ms Lieske Pott Hofstede, Programme Advisor (*until July 2006*)  
Ms Anne Kluser, Secretary (*until August 2006*)  
Ms Louise Clemo, Secretary (*as of August 2006*)

ICVA also hosted the inter-agency *Building Safer Organisations* project, the full-time Project Coordinator, Ms Katharina Samara-Wickrama, and the project's full-time interns, Ms Coleen Heemskerk (*until August 2006*) and Ms Radha Ivory (*as of August 2006*).

# ICVA MEMBERS 2006

- ◆ Action by Churches Together (ACT), *Switzerland*
- ◆ ActionAid International
- ◆ Afghan NGOs Coordination Bureau (ANCB)
- ◆ Africa Humanitarian Action (AHA), *Ethiopia*
- ◆ Africa and Middle East Refugee Assistance (AMERA), *UK*
- ◆ African Council for Adult and Continuing Education (ARCACE), *Kenya*
- ◆ All Africa Conference of Churches (AACC), *Kenya*
- ◆ All India Disaster Mitigation Institute (AIDMI)
- ◆ AMEL Association (Lebanese Association for Popular Action) (AMEL)
- ◆ Anatolian Development Foundation (ADF), *Turkey*
- ◆ Asian Institute for Rural Development (AIRD), *India*
- ◆ Asociacion Nacional de Centros de Investigacion, Promocion Social y Desarrollo (ANC), *Peru*
- ◆ Association Béninoise de Lutte Contre la Faim et la Misère du Peuple (ASCOFAM), *Benin*
- ◆ Association of Development Agencies in Bangladesh (ADAB)
- ◆ Association of Voluntary Agencies for Rural Development (AVARD), *India*
- ◆ Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)
- ◆ BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights (BADIL)
- ◆ British Refugee Council (BRC)
- ◆ Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR)
- ◆ CARE International
- ◆ Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD)
- ◆ Chinese Relief Association (CRA), *Taiwan*
- ◆ Christian Aid, *UK*
- ◆ Church World Service (CWS), *USA*
- ◆ Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA), *Ethiopia*
- ◆ Community and Family Services International (CFSI), *Philippines*
- ◆ Concern Worldwide, *Ireland*
- ◆ Consejo de Instituciones de Desarrollo (COINDE), *Guatemala*
- ◆ Danish Refugee Council (DRC)
- ◆ Dutch Council for Refugees/VluchtelingenWerk Nederland (DCR)
- ◆ EMO-BARAKA, Union Pour la Promotion du Paysan (EMO-BARAKA), *Burundi*
- ◆ Federacion de Organismos No Gubernamentales de Nicaragua (FONG)
- ◆ Fundacion Augusto Cesar Sandino (FACS), *Nicaragua*
- ◆ Frontiers (Ruwad) Association, *Lebanon*
- ◆ General Union of Voluntary Societies (GUVS), *Jordan*
- ◆ Greek Council of Refugees (GCR)
- ◆ HealthNet TPO, *Netherlands*
- ◆ HelpAge International
- ◆ Human Appeal International (HAI), *United Arab Emirates*
- ◆ Human Rights First (HRF), *USA*
- ◆ Indian Institute of Youth and Development (IIYD)
- ◆ Individuell Människohjälp (Swedish Organisation for Individual Relief) (IM)
- ◆ InterAction (American Council for Voluntary International Action)
- ◆ InterAid International (IAI), *Switzerland*
- ◆ International Blue Crescent Relief and Development Foundation (IBC), *Turkey*
- ◆ International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)
- ◆ International Islamic Relief Organisation (IIRO), *Saudi Arabia*
- ◆ International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT), *Denmark*
- ◆ International Rescue Committee (IRC)
- ◆ International Save the Children Alliance
- ◆ Islamic Relief Agency (ISRA), *Sudan*
- ◆ Italian Consortium of Solidarity (ICS)
- ◆ Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)
- ◆ Lebanese NGO Forum (LNF)
- ◆ Liaison Unit of Non-Governmental Organisations of Seychelles (LUNGOS)
- ◆ Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS), *USA*
- ◆ Lutheran World Federation (LWF)
- ◆ Mauritius Council of Social Service (MACOSS)
- ◆ Médecins du Monde (MDM)
- ◆ MERCY Malaysia
- ◆ Merlin, *UK*
- ◆ Mission Armenia (Arakelutune Hayastan) (MA)
- ◆ National NGO Council of Sri Lanka (NNGOC)
- ◆ Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC)
- ◆ Office Africain pour le Développement et la Coopération (OFADEC), *Senegal*
- ◆ Oxfam GB
- ◆ Plan International
- ◆ Refugee Children and Vulnerable Citizens (RCVC), *Tajikistan*
- ◆ Refugee Education Trust (RET), *Switzerland*
- ◆ Refugees International (RI)
- ◆ Rural Development Foundation of Pakistan (RDFP)
- ◆ Salvation Army International
- ◆ Sarvodaya Shramadana Sangamaya (Sarvodaya), *Sri Lanka*
- ◆ Sierra Leone Association of Non-Governmental Organisations (SLANGO)
- ◆ Stichting Vluchteling (SV), *Netherlands*
- ◆ Télécoms sans Frontières International (TSF)
- ◆ Thailand Burma Border Consortium (TBBC), *Thailand*
- ◆ Union for Support and Development of Afghanistan (VAF), *Germany*
- ◆ Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children, *USA*
- ◆ World Council of Churches (WCC)
- ◆ World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA)
- ◆ World Vision International (WVI)

## PERMANENT OBSERVERS

- ◆ Human Rights Watch (HRW)
- ◆ International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
- ◆ International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
- ◆ Médecins sans Frontières International (MSF)

## NEW MEMBERS IN 2006

- ◆ Frontiers (Ruwad) Association
- ◆ HealthNet TPO
- ◆ International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims
- ◆ Merlin
- ◆ Plan International
- ◆ Women's Commission for Refugee Women and Children

## MEMBERSHIP

Membership in ICVA is open to international NGOs, which conduct activities in two or more countries; international federations; and international or national groupings of NGOs.

A full list of members, detailed procedures for membership, and application forms can be found on the ICVA website ([www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch)) or requested from the ICVA Secretariat: [secretariat@icva.ch](mailto:secretariat@icva.ch).

## **International Council of Voluntary Agencies**

26-28, avenue Giuseppe-Motta  
1202 Geneva  
Switzerland

Tel: +41 (0) 22 950 9600

Fax: +41 (0) 22 950 9609

**[secretariat@icva.ch](mailto:secretariat@icva.ch)**

**[www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch)**