



# 2009 ANNUAL REPORT

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

# 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 a 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

- 2-3 Foreword**  
ICVA's Work and Added Value  
Your Key to Information: ICVA Website Passwords
- 4-5 Putting Humanitarian Principles into Practice**  
ICVA's Structure
- 6-7 Sudan and INGO Forum Support: Responding to the Decision that Stopped NGOs from Operating**  
Tune in: ICVA's E-mail Distribution Lists  
Fostering Humanitarian Dialogue
- 8-9 Protection Standards**  
Selection of Meetings hosted by ICVA in 2009
- 10-11 Improving Humanitarian Reform**  
NGO Participation in the IASC
- 12-13 Better Assessing and Portraying Humanitarian Needs**  
Discussing Food Security Issues
- 14-15 Better Protecting Refugees Living in Cities**  
Active UNHCR and ICVA Partnership
- 16-17 ICVA's Road Map: 2009-2011 Strategic Plan**  
ICVA's Conference and General Assembly 2009  
10 Practical Ways to Use the Principles of Partnership (PoP)
- 18 Principles of Partnership**
- 19-26 Finances**
- 27 ICVA Executive Committee and Secretariat**
- 28-29 ICVA Members 2009**

# FOREWORD

Each year has its ups and downs. 2009 started off very well for ICVA: the General Assembly adopted a new strategic plan and elected a new Executive Committee. In addition, for the first time, member agencies could directly elect the Chair. I was given the trust by the membership to serve as Chair until early 2012, for which I am deeply grateful. The *2009-2011 Strategic Plan* will serve as a road map during the tenure of this Executive Committee. Elsewhere in this Annual Report, you can read how this plan aims to take the next steps in the life of ICVA (see p. 16, *ICVA's Road Map: 2009-2011 Strategic Plan*).

March 2009 was characterised by a significant setback for the humanitarian community. The Government of Sudan arbitrarily decided to stop the activities of 16 organisations carrying out humanitarian work in northern Sudan, once again putting the people of Darfur at risk of further avoidable, and unacceptable, suffering. ICVA engaged in a process with members to find appropriate responses to the many dilemmas presented in the context of this decision (see p. 6, *Sudan and INGO Forum Support*).

Much of 2009 was spent on improving the quality and effectiveness of humanitarian response. There is agreement

that we, as the humanitarian community, should do a better job in assessing and understanding humanitarian needs. Different criteria and views exist on how to measure needs and there are too many cases of populations being “over-assessed.” Instead of arriving at a single assessment methodology for all agencies – which is not only unrealistic, but also undesirable – a framework to compare assessments and understand analyses is long overdue. It is hoped that 2010 will see more steps forward in this process than we saw in 2009 (see p. 12, *Better Assessing and Portraying Humanitarian Needs*).

The Sphere Handbook, one of the most commonly used tools to improve the quality of humanitarian response, saw the kick-off of the revision process in May 2009. Protection will be added as a specific subject to the

## ICVA'S WORK AND ADDED VALUE

As the largest global NGO network for humanitarian advocacy, ICVA is in a unique position to bring the views of its membership to international humanitarian forums. Based on the broad operational expertise of its members, ICVA provides a crucial “reality check” in informing the dialogue and decision-making in coordination and policy-making forums. Through timely and targeted sharing of information and analyses on policy developments, ICVA enables its members to influence the discussions and work of mechanisms, such as the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP), the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees' (UNHCR) Executive Committee. ICVA also supports member organisations to participate directly in these forums.

The ICVA Secretariat, which services the membership and carries out the day-to-day activities of the network, engages in proactive advocacy around current humanitarian issues. Some of the issues on which ICVA focuses include, but are not limited to, protection, reform of the humanitarian system, humanitarian principles, humanitarian space, humanitarian financing, quality and accountability, and humanitarian-military relations.

An ongoing challenge for the humanitarian system is the gap that exists between the policy-making level, on the one hand, and the field level on the other. In an effort to bridge this divide between humanitarian policy and practice, in the period between 2009 and 2011, ICVA plans to develop a number of activities at the regional and country levels, including holding regional workshops and supporting field-based NGO coordination initiatives.

In the coming years, ICVA will also devote specific time and attention to promoting and strengthening the role of local and national NGOs in humanitarian response.

Handbook and all the chapters will undergo major changes based on advanced operational practices and expertise in the sector (see p. 8, *Protection Standards*).

Steps forward were also made in understanding the progress of the clusters, humanitarian financing, and strengthening humanitarian leadership. The NGO experiences with these parts of humanitarian reform were highlighted in a report that a consortium of UK-based ICVA members and the ICVA Secretariat released in October 2009. We, as humanitarian agencies, should be honest with ourselves: while we are making progress in developing our capacity and knowledge, the only real benchmark is the impact our actions have on the lives of populations affected by disasters and armed conflicts (see p. 10, *Improving Humanitarian Reform*).

In Afghanistan, the UN and donor governments continued to follow a political and military agenda, largely in denial of the humanitarian context in the country. The Horn of Africa continued to see a combination of natural disasters, including drought, while governments put their interests first, closing borders or curtailing the rights of civil society organisations to develop their activities. The security for the civilian population and humanitarian agencies in Somalia deteriorated further. The result has been that the majority of international agencies can only work in the country by 'remote control,' leaving the distribution of aid to local organisations and thereby transferring risk to these organisations. In Sri Lanka, following the end of the war in May 2009, the vast majority of the displaced population living in the northern part of the country were interned in closed military-run camps. The government justified this mass internment with the claim that they needed to screen the population for their affiliation with the rebel movement, Tamil Tigers. Humanitarian and human rights organisations were refused to assess independently the conditions and well-being of the interned population.

Unfortunately, these countries are but a few examples of the many situations in which populations were being denied their right to receive protection and assistance in 2009. As humanitarian organisations, we cannot stand by indifferently. Because of its relations with governments and UN agencies, ICVA can help members to raise such situations at the international level. Achieving better humanitarian outcomes is not just a matter of continuously improving our own work, but also of reminding other actors to fulfil their responsibilities. ICVA will continue to be this voice for humanitarian action in 2010. ■

With warm regards,  
Paul O'Brien, Chair, ICVA Executive Committee

## YOUR KEY TO INFORMATION: ICVA WEBSITE PASSWORDS

ICVA's website, [www.icva.ch](http://www.icva.ch), is a useful access point for up-to-date information on humanitarian issues. It provides a repository of documents and tools for humanitarian actors. Its "members only" section contains material that is not available in the public domain. It features policy documents and discussion papers in their early stages, as well as meeting reports and other documentation that is relevant to ICVA's members as important actors in humanitarian response. It thus enables them to follow, and engage in, policy debates as they develop. ICVA's website hosts information and updates on the NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, which can also be found at [www.ngosandhumanitarianreform.org](http://www.ngosandhumanitarianreform.org). ICVA also hosts the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP), [www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org](http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org). Each staff member of an ICVA member organisation is entitled to a password to the ICVA website. They simply need to send a message to [webmaster@icva.ch](mailto:webmaster@icva.ch) requesting a username and password.

# PUTTING HUMANITARIAN PRINCIPLES INTO PRACTICE

Many NGOs, including ICVA's members, highlight the need for the respect of humanitarian principles to distinguish and disassociate themselves from political or military actors that want to get involved in humanitarian response. In 2009, the trend towards integration or comprehensive approaches – the linking between humanitarian and political goals – continued in the UN and other international organisations.

The respect of humanitarian principles can only be realised, however, if NGOs fully understand and apply these principles themselves. The *Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and NGOs in Disaster Relief* (the “Code”) is the main text for NGOs that reflects these principles. At the time of the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the *Code* in 2004, ICVA, along with the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR), tried to develop a commentary around the *Code* as a way to show its usefulness and relevance.

While most NGOs have signed up to the *Code*, it is not always clear how they put the *Code* into practice in their day-to-day work. Given the increasing restrictions facing humanitarian workers – commonly referred to as a shrinking of humanitarian space – the relevance of humanitarian principles contained in the *Code* has come further to the forefront. The onus falls on us as humanitarian workers and organisations to better articulate the principles by which we work and to demonstrate how we apply them. Such transparency in how we work will continue to be essential if we are to be able to gain free and unhindered access to populations in need.

## ICVA'S STRUCTURE

### General Assembly

- ◆ All ICVA members, meeting once every three years. The 14<sup>th</sup> General Assembly was held on 3-4 February 2009
- ◆ Sets the strategic direction of the ICVA network, including adopting a three-year strategic plan (2009-2011 *Strategic Plan* is available at: [www.icva.ch/doc00003328.html](http://www.icva.ch/doc00003328.html))
- ◆ Elects the Executive Committee and the Chair of the Executive Committee
- ◆ Debates relevant policy, advocacy, and operational issues of concern to ICVA within the broader humanitarian context

### Executive Committee

- ◆ Nine members elected by the General Assembly with up to two co-opted for gender and regional balance
- ◆ On behalf of the General Assembly, the Executive Committee (EXCOM) oversees the formulation and implementation of strategies, policy, membership decisions, and ICVA's activities
- ◆ Elects its Vice-Chair and Treasurer, who, together with the Chair of the Executive Committee, are responsible for maintaining ICVA's humanitarian identity
- ◆ Adopts and oversees ICVA's Annual Plans and ensures that they are in line with the Strategic Plan
- ◆ Meets physically twice a year and takes additional decisions electronically and through teleconferences

### ICVA Secretariat

- ◆ Based in Geneva to implement ICVA's Strategic and Annual Plans and related activities on a daily basis
- ◆ Services the membership, including through the analysis and sharing of information in a targeted manner
- ◆ By gathering field-based members' views, the Secretariat aims to provide a “reality check” to policy discussions at the international level
- ◆ Engages proactively in humanitarian advocacy by representing members' views and concerns in various international forums, such as the Global Humanitarian Platform, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, and UNHCR's Executive and Standing Committees
- ◆ Organises meetings on current policy debates or country situations

The efforts to develop the commentary encountered a number of challenges and, in 2009, was finally reworked into a “living document” that looks at the history of the *Code* and its relevance today. The document helped form the basis of draft materials for learning events in the form of workshops designed to bring together both secular and faith-based NGOs to share their experiences of how they understand humanitarian principles, particularly as contained in the *Code*, as well as how they apply those principles in their work. The draft materials were presented to a design workshop in January 2010 and a number of pilot workshops are being undertaken throughout 2010.

The workshops being organised by ICVA became part of the work plan of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee’s Core Group on Humanitarian Space. In addition to the ICVA learning events, the Core Group looked at organising field level workshops, as well as workshops at the headquarters level to examine some of the challenges facing humanitarian actors. In June 2009, the World Food Programme (WFP) hosted a *Roundtable on Perceptions of Humanitarian Assistance* that looked at the changing environment in which humanitarian organisations work; local perceptions of humanitarian organisations and staff; engaging with State and non-State actors; and the challenges to humanitarian space from integrated missions. Given the range of topics covered by the roundtable, it was not expected to find solutions to the various challenges, but to “identify first steps going forward to close gaps in our understanding, to correct unhelpful practices, and to identify useful existing mechanisms and tools.” There was broad agreement on a number of areas, such as the need to better articulate our motives and to better promote humanitarian principles in order to build trust and deliver relief. The perceived “arrogance” of northern humanitarian organisations needs to be addressed through greater transparency and through greater engagement with affected populations and State and non-State actors. At the same time, it was suggested that humanitarian actors need to be clearer about drawing a “bottom line” for engaging (or disengaging) in situations as a way to restore the credibility of humanitarian actors that may be seen as easily “pushed around” by States. In order to tackle the challenge of integrated missions, it was suggested that humanitarian actors should be more engaged in the assessments and planning for integrated missions so as to influence their design.

While the roundtable clearly identified a number of areas of agreements and suggestions on ways ahead, those recommendations and outcomes still need to be taken forward. Through the work of the Core Group on Humanitarian Space and ICVA’s workshops on the *Code*, it is hoped that, collectively, humanitarian organisations can work better at pushing for the humanitarian space required to carry out humanitarian responses. After all, if humanitarian actors cannot work in a free and unhindered manner, it is populations in need that suffer. ■

# SUDAN AND INGO FORUM SUPPORT: RESPONDING TO

Every sovereign government has the right to determine which foreign and national organisations it allows to provide humanitarian assistance on its territory. On the basis of this principle, it has also the right to revoke the licences to operate of organisations already working on its territory. The problem starts when a government, in this case the Government of Sudan, takes such a decision without providing any clear or official explanation for its decision, while the country agreement, which is the legal basis for these organisations to operate in Sudan, provides for a due process. The Sudanese decision on 4 and 5 March 2009, to stop 16 national and international organisations from operating came only hours after the International Criminal Court (ICC) issued an arrest warrant for the President of the country.

For ICVA, the move by the Sudanese government meant that ICVA mobilised its members to find ways to translate the huge amount of concern created in the humanitarian community into appropriate forms of action. In the weeks

following the decision, frequent conference calls were organised among member agencies – expelled agencies and non-expelled ones – to coordinate responses and strategies to address the situation. As usual in such moments of urgency, ICVA also actively engaged with UN agencies and sent a letter to the Emergency Relief Co-ordinator, John Holmes, requesting an *ad hoc* Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) meeting, which eventually took place.

Many dilemmas presented themselves: should the expelled NGOs make severance payments to their Sudanese employees, when they were forced to stop their operations and lay off staff? Payments could imply an admission of guilt in terms of the alleged collaboration with the ICC, which was generally supposed as the reason behind the Sudanese decision. Should these NGOs launch appeal processes while such steps might delay the close down of their operations and keep their remaining staff under further duress? Should other NGOs fill in the gaps in the coverage of humanitarian needs, especially in Darfur, as these gaps were created by the government's order? The entering of new organisations could be perceived as the humanitarian community, in general, not opposing the Sudanese decision. At the same time, not filling in the gaps in the response would mean that the population of Darfur might suffer even more.

## TUNE IN: ICVA'S E-MAIL DISTRIBUTION LISTS

ICVA maintains targeted e-mail distribution lists to keep NGOs updated on their areas of interest and operation. ICVA members can subscribe to the following lists:

- ◆ **Refugee/IDP Issues:** provides information about issues related to refugee and IDP protection and about UNHCR (e.g. its Executive and Standing Committee meetings, UNHCR Executive Committee Conclusions, and UNHCR's Annual Consultations with NGOs (Pre-ExCom)), including engagement in the NGO statements to UNHCR's governing bodies;
- ◆ **Humanitarian Issues:** used for messages regarding, and soliciting members' input on, humanitarian policy, coordination, humanitarian reform issues, the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), and other messages related to humanitarian issues;
- ◆ **Food/Food Security Issues:** provides information regarding the High Level Task Force on the Global Food Security Crisis and meetings about (or that include agenda items on) food security, food prices, and related issues; and
- ◆ **ICVA General:** for details about ICVA's General Assembly, annual Conferences, ICVA's annual and strategic plans, ICVA's Executive Committee, and other ICVA-related matters.

NGOs that are not members of ICVA can also subscribe to the distribution lists on refugee and food security issues to receive a selection of the messages.

If you want to be added to any of these lists, please send an e-mail to [information@icva.ch](mailto:information@icva.ch).

# THE DECISION THAT STOPPED NGOs FROM OPERATING

The entire situation was one of profound confusion and great uncertainty and the need for coordination on these serious questions was more present than ever. ICVA realised that it had a crucial role to play in this regard, although it also knew that keeping all agencies aligned would not be possible. The UN's and donor governments' responses were perceived as too reluctant with regards to developing a common front. The way in which some UN agencies quickly swooped in to fill the gaps was seen by some in the NGO community as perhaps not adequately standing up for the expelled and shut down NGOs.

Following the loss in capacity for the NGO community, ICVA, using its previously established emergency NGO coordination fund, provided the INGO Forum in Khartoum with a staff person to support the Chair of the Forum's Steering Committee (SC) for a few months. A number of members of the Forum had been expelled, leading to a reduction in capacity. The result of the extra support provided by ICVA was that the SC was able to better support the work of Forum members.

One of the important developments since the expulsions has been the focus on partnerships between local/national NGOs and international NGOs. While the government initially talked about "Sudanising" humanitarian response, various discussions helped to show that partnerships can take place in various forms – for example, from working with national staff to working through national/local partners that directly implement programmes. Many INGOs have, over the years, increasingly put Sudanese staff in charge of running various programmes. In addition, many INGOs work directly with government line ministries, which is yet another form of partnership. It also became clear that partnership is a process and cannot just happen overnight.

An important, though perhaps unexpected, outcome of the expulsions was increased dialogue between the government, local/national NGOs, and international NGOs. The entire expulsion situation should have taught us several lessons in the humanitarian community – particularly around partnerships. Whether or not we have taken the time to learn those lessons, however, remains to be seen. ■

## FOSTERING HUMANITARIAN DIALOGUE

ICVA plays a frequent role in convening meetings between NGOs and other humanitarian actors in Geneva, the 'humanitarian capital'. These meetings take different forms, such as thematic meetings with donors and NGOs; briefings with NGOs on specific issues or country situations by individuals; or meetings with UN representatives and NGOs. Meetings with UN Humanitarian Coordinators, who often come to Geneva, provide an opportunity to discuss humanitarian challenges directly with the HCs. With all the meetings that ICVA hosts, the aim is to create an informal space that encourages humanitarian actors to engage in open, frank, and off-the-record discussions.

# PROTECTION STANDARDS

Over the last fifteen years, the humanitarian community has made great efforts in professionalising its work. Standard setting has been a key feature in these efforts. Agreed sector-wide standards help to ensure quality and identify less than good performance. The Sphere Standards have particularly been recognised as a spear-heading initiative.

Most of the standards that have been developed are applicable for what is referred to as the sectoral or assistance areas of humanitarian response: food, healthcare, water and sanitation, and shelter. The more concrete the activity, the more progress can be measured. Yet, humanitarian response is more than these areas of activity. Protection is one particular area of work that has been recognised as a responsibility of humanitarian agencies.

Standards for protection activities undertaken by humanitarian agencies have, however, been a long-debated issue. In the late nineties, the predominant feeling expressed by protection-mandated agencies, such as ICRC, was that it would be impossible to capture the broad and complex area of protection in measurable standards. In search for agreed protection language, the optimal outcome of a series of ICRC-convened workshops in the late 1990s was a common, albeit broad, definition of protection. Ten years later, in 2009, however, ICRC produced a set of professional standards for protection work. ICVA was part of the Advisory Group that helped to formulate these standards, which were launched in November. ICVA members were kept informed of the drafting process and asked for their views and feedback.

The ICRC protection standards aim to set benchmarks for agencies that explicitly state that they are undertaking protection activities. At the same time, it is also hoped that other agencies will make an effort to ensure that their humanitarian work is informed by these standards. While it may seem, for these other agencies, that the threshold for 'doing protection' has been made quite high and/or that the standards are quite abstract (as many of them are not directly measurable), humanitarian agencies should still strive to apply them.

The ICRC standards were preceded by another initiative undertaken by four Australian NGOs that developed standards to mainstream protection in the humanitarian assistance areas of food, healthcare, water and sanitation, and shelter. This effort, while a practical one, does not cover protection in its entirety as specific protection activities, such as monitoring and documenting human rights violations, are not addressed by these standards.

Both the ICRC and Australian standards have significantly contributed to the thinking with regards to whether the humanitarian community is in need of other or additional protection standards. This question has also come up in the context of the revision of the *Sphere Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards and Disaster Response*, which started in 2009. When Sphere was first created, it was decided that the handbook would not include protection standards. This time around, however, with the number of agencies interested in the Sphere handbook being far beyond those who stood at the Sphere cradle in the late nineties, there has been a strong call to include protection.

As in 2003 with the first Sphere handbook revision, the ICVA Coordinator agreed to act as the Sphere revision focal point for protection. While that 2003 revision saw protection being mainstreamed in the handbook, the 2009/2010 revision is producing a new section at the beginning of the handbook that will form, together with the Humanitarian Charter and Common Standards, the “chapeau” for the four sectors. This incorporation of protection into Sphere marks not only a step forward in the humanitarian community’s recognition of protection, but it also highlights that protection goes far beyond the standards and indicators that can be developed for the specific areas of humanitarian assistance. ■

## SELECTION OF MEETINGS HOSTED BY ICVA IN 2009

January	NGO discussion on humanitarian financing and the financial crisis with Meinrad Studer, Senior Advisor for the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation
February	Meeting on Protection standards: ICRC initiative and Sphere Protection Review
February-March	Meetings with UNHCR and NGOs to prepare UNHCR’s Annual Consultations with NGOs
March	Lunch Debriefing with Catherine Bragg, Deputy Emergency Relief Coordinator, on her mission to Zimbabwe
March	Discussion with Antonio Donini and Greg Hansen, researchers from the Feinstein International Center at Tufts University, on their recent studies on humanitarian principles and space in Iraq and Afghanistan, co-hosted with the Permanent Mission of the European Commission
March-May	Series of teleconferences with NGOs related to the expulsions from Sudan
June	Informal meeting with NGOs and Toby Lanzer, Deputy Humanitarian Coordinator (HC)/Resident Coordinator (RC) for Darfur, Sudan
June	Informal discussion between NGOs and donors on Needs Assessment
June	Informal meeting with NGOs and Robert Piper, HC/RC for Nepal
July	Informal meeting with NGOs and Mark Bowden, HC/RC for Somalia
September	Informal meeting with NGOs and Martin Mogwanja, HC for Pakistan
November	Informal meeting with NGOs and Michele Falavigna, HC/RC for Chad
November	NGO discussion on ‘Professionalising the Humanitarian Sector’ with Catherine Russ (RedR)
December	NGO discussion with Jemilah Mahmood, Chief of Humanitarian Response, United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA)
December	Informal Meeting with NGOs and Pratibha Mehta, HC/RC for Yemen

*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, nor the growing number of informal meetings held at the ICVA office.*

# IMPROVING HUMANITARIAN REFORM

The structures and new tools for humanitarian response, such as the clusters or the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) that came with the UN-led reforms in 2005 are here to stay. The main question for ICVA in the last few years has been: how can we make it all work better so that we can have improved outcomes for affected populations?

In 2009, ICVA continued to work with six of its members based in the UK on a project looking at the role of NGOs in the humanitarian reform process. Mapping studies were conducted in five countries – Afghanistan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Ethiopia, Sudan, and Zimbabwe – looking at the state of the humanitarian reform processes. These mapping studies serve as a base line so that progress can be measured throughout the project, which will continue until 2011.

A synthesis report, on which the ICVA Secretariat provided considerable feedback and input, was launched in the autumn of 2009. The five studies pointed to the strengths of the humanitarian reform process to date and to the areas that still require considerable improvement. Many of the findings of the mapping studies came as no surprise – they were similar to the various evaluations that have been done to date of the cluster approach and the financing mechanisms since the beginning of the reform. One of the main areas where work still needs to be done with regards to the humanitarian reform process is in terms of working with national and local NGOs and ensuring that they have better access to the clusters and the financing mechanisms.

Perhaps, rather worryingly, leadership came across as one of the biggest weaknesses of the reform process to date – not only in terms of Humanitarian Coordinators (HCs), but also in terms of cluster leadership. It came out very clearly from the studies, and is reflected in the synthesis report, that in order for the reform process to work, the leadership pillar of reform needs to be given greater attention. Without improvements in that pillar of the reform process, the other pillars (clusters and humanitarian financing) can only make limited progress. In addition, partnership, which was added later in the reform process, also requires strong leadership.

At a one-day conference in October 2009 hosted by the International Rescue Committee UK (one of the project members) on “Strengthening Partnership for Effective Humanitarian Response,” several of the findings in the synthesis report were discussed. It was, again, made clear that leadership is an area that requires more concerted efforts by all parts of the humanitarian community, but particularly the UN, given that HCs and many cluster leads are UN-appointed. In addition, there is still a need for improved inter-cluster coordination to overcome the silo approach of clusters. It was also suggested that for partnerships between international and local/national organisations, barriers to participation in clusters and access to pooled funds need to be removed. Participants also noted that donors and UN headquarters need to provide adequate support to HCs and cluster leads – especially when they need to stick their necks out to defend humanitarian principles and humanitarian action. The issue of accountability to populations was raised as a key area requiring improvement by all, particularly given that it was left out of the humanitarian reform process. An event held in Geneva to launch the report raised a number of similar issues and raised great interest in the findings and work of the project.

## NGO PARTICIPATION IN THE IASC

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) was established by UN General Assembly in 1991 as a mechanism for the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), a senior UN position held by John Holmes at the time of writing, to discharge his mandate and coordinate humanitarian response. This mechanism for humanitarian coordination is largely a UN body with the majority of participating agencies, therefore, being part of the UN. Many of them look at humanitarian response from a longer-term development perspective.

Since 2008, the participation of NGOs has been expanded from three consortia (including ICVA) to nine NGO seats in total as six individual NGOs from the membership of the consortia can also attend. In this context, ICVA continued to bring member organisations to the meetings of the heads of agencies (“the Principals”) and the IASC Working Group (WG). ICVA also facilitated NGO engagement in the IASC’s numerous subsidiary bodies, such as the Needs Assessment Task Force (see 12, *Better Assessing and Portraying Humanitarian Needs*), or the Task Force on Climate Change. One success, following an initial push from NGOs in late 2008, was the creation of an IASC Humanitarian Financing Group by the IASC WG in November 2009.

Calls for expressions of interest to attend IASC meetings are made when ICVA circulates the agenda and background documents to the membership. Expressions of interest in attending are assessed on the basis of demonstrated expertise of the member agency on a topic that is part of the agenda. As the ICVA membership is also based in the developing world, ICVA plays a key role in ensuring that NGOs based in these countries also participate in the IASC. The principle is maintained that at least one representative should come from a developing country. Thanks to a donor, ICVA supports these representatives’ travel to IASC meetings.

The main issue with the IASC is the UN-styled discussions and agendas. Even representatives of large international NGOs, who come from an operational background, often need to get used to the process-oriented discussions. The UN’s perspective of the field reality is not always what is seen on the ground. Feedback that has been provided indicates that member representatives valued the support from the ICVA Secretariat in terms of what they could expect at the meeting and how best they could frame their interventions. Consultations by participating member representatives with colleagues and partners in their country or region prior to the meetings, as well as participation through ICVA, add weight and credibility to their interventions. The networking with other humanitarian partners at such meetings is seen as helpful for future collaboration and advocacy. Based on this progress, the next step should be more pro-active agenda-setting. ICVA will continue to facilitate NGO input and participation, as well as support participants in this direction in 2010.

The project put in place Humanitarian Reform Officers in Afghanistan, DRC, Ethiopia, and Zimbabwe to work with NGOs and others to implement some of the recommendations of the mapping studies and synthesis report. In addition to working in these four countries, ICVA has been working on developing a quick survey that can be used to map progress of humanitarian reform efforts in other countries as well. One of the challenges with this survey methodology is getting NGO staff to take the time to reflect on how humanitarian reform is affecting their daily work. ICVA also needs to take more time to talk individually to NGO colleagues to track their views on the clusters and other aspects of the humanitarian reform: a priority for 2010.

Another priority for the project, which came out of the mapping and synthesis studies, is the need to get the humanitarian reform processes to look more at accountability to affected populations. ICVA and the project have worked with the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR) and the Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International (HAP) to help move that agenda forward, starting with getting the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Working Group to discuss accountability to populations at its meeting in April 2010.

ICVA will continue to push – through the project and through its day-to-day work – for the required improvements that have been highlighted through the project and other evaluations. As a priority, it will mean pushing for greater emphasis on the Humanitarian Coordinator pillar of reform. After all, five years down the road, it is the only pillar that has yet to be evaluated and it would seem time to do so.

*For more information on the NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project, see [www.ngosandhumanitarianreform.org](http://www.ngosandhumanitarianreform.org) ■*

# BETTER ASSESSING AND PORTRAYING HUMANITARIAN

One of the perpetual challenges in humanitarian response is having a clear picture of needs. Most humanitarian organisations will conduct their own needs assessments before carrying out programmes. However, the result of the various assessments can be “over assessment” of populations who may even end up not receiving any aid at all. In an effort to tackle this challenge, attempts were made during 2009 to try and come up with harmonised and better coordinated needs assessments. A needs assessment group eventually became a task force of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in July 2009. Among the activities laid out in the Needs Assessment Task Force (NATF)’s work plan, which continues into 2010, are developing operational guidance to improve the coordination of needs assessments, strengthening needs assessment capacities, and enhancing information management of these assessments. A project undertaken by three ICVA members – HelpAge International, Merlin, and the Norwegian Refugee Council – called Assessment Capacities (ACAPs) undertook to support the work of the Task Force by developing a group of trained experts that could undertake timely, independent assessments and provide support to the humanitarian community in emergencies. In addition, a rather controversial undertaking that was pushed by OCHA and several donors – the “humanitarian dashboard” – was also made part of the work of the NATF.

While needs in the first 72 hours of a disaster are basically the same survival needs, after that time period assessing needs becomes much more complicated, as well as political, because the assessments are then about values. For example, how does an agency value participation of populations when assessing needs? Does an agency take a livelihoods approach in relation to survival? Each agency will assess needs based on their approach to humanitarian response and their areas of expertise. In addition, assessing needs in a disaster or an armed conflict are not the same.

One of the points that has long been pushed by NGOs and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Movement – particularly in the context of the Global Humanitarian Platform (GHP) – is that we should do better at sharing our assessments of what the needs are, instead of trying to create an agreement on how we should all assess needs. Given the range of actors in the humanitarian community, agreeing on common needs assessments is a challenging, if not impossible, task – yet for much of 2009, there were pushes by some (particularly donors) to come up with “common” needs assessments. Not only is it impossible to expect all humanitarian organisations to have the same needs assessments, but it is also undesirable, as it risks compromising the independence of organisations. Some organisations will, un-

## DISCUSSING FOOD SECURITY ISSUES

The food price spike in 2008 had a significant impact on humanitarian response, given the number of interconnected needs related to food security, for example in the areas of nutrition, water and sanitation, and health. A well-coordinated and international approach was required to find solutions to such a complex set of needs. In 2009, ICVA continued to facilitate the information-sharing on policy debates around food security, including around high-level discussions, such as the Madrid High Level Meeting on “Food Security for All”; the World Bank’s Civil Society Round Table on Food and the Financial Crisis; the High-Level Expert Forum in Rome entitled “How to Feed the World in 2050”; and discussions with the UN System Coordinator for the High Level Task Force on Global Food Security. Among the challenges emerging in particular from the World Summit on Food Security in Rome in November was to ensure participation of NGOs in the World Bank’s Global Food Security Programme, as well as in the Committee on Food Security. This committee was created in the seventies as an inter-governmental forum and was reformed in 2009 to make it a wider group of participants meeting on issues of food security. In addition, those NGOs wishing to engage in the global policy discussions on food security have increasingly been doing so directly.

*To join ICVA’s Food Security mailing list, if you are an NGO, please see 6, Tune in: ICVA’s E-mail Distribution List.*

# NEEDS

doubtedly, be able to come together and agree on common needs assessment formats and clusters are also working on common approaches. However, in the end, organisations will have to take operational decisions and, more often than not, they will base those decisions on their own needs assessments. After much discussion in the NATF and in the IASC, it seems that there is finally the recognition that needs assessments should be shared and better coordinated instead of seeking the elusive “common” needs assessments for all.

Perhaps more worryingly in 2009, the push to have a humanitarian dashboard took up considerable time and debate. The idea of the dashboard was to put information about a humanitarian situation on one page that would have pictorial representations with dials, similar to those on a car’s dashboard. While the one page would have underlying layers with more information, the risk of a one page document is that decision-makers would not look at the supporting information. By reducing humanitarian needs and response to quantitative data, as the original dashboard was doing, the protection side of humanitarian response was getting lost. In addition, despite many suggestions made by NGOs and UN agencies to improve the dashboard, it took until 2010 for those concerns to be taken on board. Fortunately, many of the suggestions are finally being taken on board in the renamed “SHARE” (Strategic Humanitarian Assessment and Response Exercise).

While decision-makers have limited time to absorb all the necessary information around a humanitarian response, reducing humanitarian needs to mere numbers risks further de-humanising humanitarian response. In addition, the ‘severity’ rating included in the dashboard risks having different crises or countries being compared to each other on the basis of an assigned number. The push by donors to have an easy-to-use document is understandable, from one perspective. However, such information must be portrayed in a way that does not betray the truth and complexity of humanitarian needs or the response. Humanitarian response is not an easy task – there are numerous sectors of response that must come together to meet the needs of those affected by disasters or armed conflicts. Trying to over simplify the impact of disasters and conflicts on the lives of people to a series of numbers and dials is a risky undertaking. As humanitarian actors, we have a responsibility to those with whom, and for whom, we work – and that includes providing accurate portrayals of the situation in terms of both protection *and* assistance needs. People’s needs and the response to their needs cannot simply be reduced to a series of numbers and figures. Fortunately, the revised dashboard – SHARE – is starting to take into consideration the broader aspects of humanitarian response beyond mere numbers. ■

# BETTER PROTECTING REFUGEES LIVING IN CITIES

With the focus in the past years on the humanitarian reform process, refugee protection sometimes seems to take a back seat when it comes to discussions on humanitarian policy at the international level. Fortunately, 2009 proved to be a year where finally some long-awaited progress was made in addressing some of the challenges related to responding to the needs of refugees and asylum-seekers in urban areas.

Shortly after UNHCR issued its urban refugee policy in 1997, there were various criticisms levelled against the policy – including that it did not take into account the rights of refugees. Following an evaluation of the policy done by UNHCR, UNHCR’s (then) Evaluation and Policy Analysis Unit (EPAU) published a document in 2003 on “Protection, solutions and assistance for refugees in urban areas: guiding principles and good practice,” which EPAU suggested should replace the 1997 policy. When that replacement did not happen, a number of NGOs called for a revision of UNHCR’s policy in 2004.

For years, NGOs had been trying to influence UNHCR to issue a revised urban refugee policy: not only because of the need to ensure that refugees and asylum-seekers have their rights respected, but also because there are increasing numbers of urban refugees, which poses a number of challenges for humanitarian response. From 2005 onwards, there were numerous iterations of the policy and several rounds of comments and suggestions from NGOs. At the protection retreat between UNHCR and several NGOs in 2008, the fact that the revision process had been ongoing for a number of years was raised. At the time, a number of concrete suggestions and ways forward were put to UNHCR. Unfortunately, the time line and consultation process proposed at that time took much longer than planned. Finally, in 2009, UNHCR released a revised policy in time for the UNHCR Executive Committee meeting. This revised policy made much needed changes to the previously inadequate policy. Importantly, the revised policy ensured that refugee rights were an integral part of it.

The 2009 High Commissioner’s (HC) Dialogue in December on “Challenges for Persons of Concern in Urban Settings” provided an opportunity to look beyond refugees and asylum-seekers. The HC’s Dialogues each year provide an atmosphere that is more conducive to discussion and an exchange of ideas than UNHCR’s governing bodies’ meetings. With a number of NGOs able to attend the Dialogue, in addition to experts and, for the 2009 Dialogue, several mayors of cities with substantial refugee populations, there was an opportunity to really tackle some of the issues of concern.

Prior to the Dialogue, ICVA organised a pre-meeting with NGOs (including those attending the Dialogue and others) to exchange ideas of what were priorities for NGOs to bring to the meeting. One of the concerns raised by NGOs, which was then brought to the Dialogue, was the need to now look at a policy that applies to internally displaced persons (IDPs). One of the positive aspects of the urban refugee policy, highlighted by NGOs in the pre-meeting, was that it looked at the “changing role” of UNHCR in urban settings and provided elements of partnership, but that it would likely require some different skill sets for UNHCR staff. One of the concerns raised by NGOs, with regards to the session at the Dialogue on identifying persons of concern, was that in many cases, people do not want to be identified as they feel it puts them at further risk. The challenge posed by this lack of identifica-

tion, however, is that donors tend to fund programmes on the basis of numbers: if people do not want to be identified, they will not be counted, leading to inadequate funding by donors. It was suggested that NGOs needed to really push donors and UNHCR to de-link registration and numbers from assistance. While registration is *one* tool for protection and assistance, it should not always be seen as the only one. NGOs also raised the need to put an emphasis on the need to work on advocacy around the rights of persons of concern to UNHCR and to particularly look at ways to combat xenophobia.

The Dialogue, as with previous Dialogues, allowed States, UNHCR, experts, and NGOs to come together to discuss the various challenges associated with providing assistance and protection to persons of concern to UNHCR in urban settings. The ICVA-organised NGO pre-meeting allowed for some common messages to be formed and brought to the Dialogue. There were several practical suggestions put forward during the Dialogue, many of which UNHCR committed to take forward. The High Commissioner, in his closing remarks, noted that UNHCR could not undertake the development of a policy on IDPs on its own, but suggested that he and the Representative of the Secretary-General on the Human Rights of IDPs, Walter Kälin, undertake advocacy within the broader humanitarian community to define a similar policy for IDPs.

While there is a more appropriate urban refugee policy now in place, it has been suggested that it needs to be looked at in a couple of years to see how useful it is and how it is being put into practice. The (planned and ongoing) evaluations that UNHCR is conducting in a number of cities will be one way to look at how the policy is being used. In addition, UNHCR's work with NGO partners and UNHCR's mainstreaming of the policy will be helpful ways to ensure that refugees and asylum-seekers are better protected and assisted. The operational guidance that is to accompany the policy is still much needed and hopefully will be developed in consultation with NGOs. If there are changes that are identified to be made in the current policy, hopefully, they will be made in a timelier manner than the 12 years it took to revise the previous policy. ■

## ACTIVE UNHCR AND ICVA PARTNERSHIP

One of ICVA's functions is to facilitate NGO relations with UNHCR. ICVA has the formal role of coordinating NGO input into UNHCR's governing bodies, including its Executive and Standing Committees. At the same time, ICVA focuses on a range of other aspects of UNHCR's work and mandate, including, for example, through the High Commissioner's Dialogue on Protection Challenges. ICVA also continues to co-host and assist in organising UNHCR's Annual NGO Consultations. In 2009, around 300 representatives from 179 national and international NGOs signed up for the Consultations to discuss issues and challenges facing refugees and others of concern persons of concern of UNHCR. A report from the Annual Consultations (see [www.icva.ch/doc00003809.html](http://www.icva.ch/doc00003809.html)) was presented to UNHCR's annual Executive Committee (ExCom) meeting in October 2009, with specific recommendations.

Beyond these regular meetings and activities, ICVA maintains a close relationship with UNHCR's Inter-Agency Unit throughout the year, which is helpful in understanding each other better and anticipating potential concerns or issues. ICVA and UNHCR have also been closely working together in the context of the NGO/UNHCR/WFP/UNICEF dialogue on humanitarian financing and partnerships, which started in the second half of 2009 (see [www.icva.ch/doc00002257.html](http://www.icva.ch/doc00002257.html) for the minutes from these meetings).

# ICVA's ROAD MAP: 2009-2011 STRATEGIC PLAN

## ICVA's CONFERENCE AND GENERAL ASSEMBLY 2009

Each year, ICVA's Conference offers an opportunity for reflection and debate for humanitarian practitioners and others having an interest in improving humanitarian action. In 2009, the Conference preceded ICVA's General Assembly and an effort was made to ensure that the dialogue at the Conference would inform the Assembly deliberations.

"Changing the Humanitarian Community," which was the theme of the 2009 Conference, is an issue that should capture the imagination of all working in humanitarian action, as we should always look at making progress to improve the lives of those with whom we are working. While previous ICVA Conferences looked at better addressing specific aspects of humanitarian response, the 2009 Conference sought to take these aspects together and initiate debate on actually implementing change instead of just talking about the actions that could improve our work. In this respect, the Conference was inspired by a presentation from Professor Martha Maznevski who explained, from her experience in the corporate sector, the conditions for making a change programme succeed. She added that, compared to other sectors, a specific feature of the humanitarian community is that we do not seem to be easily satisfied by what we have achieved so far.

It is this point that also helped ICVA to think about making the next step. The theme of change coincided with the topic of the General Assembly, which discussed collaboration between ICVA members, not just in Geneva, but also at regional and national levels. Strengthened collaboration will contribute to achieving better humanitarian outcomes. The General Assembly, as noted elsewhere, adopted the *2009-2011 Strategic Plan*, which makes collaboration a central feature for ICVA in the coming years. Future ICVA Conferences will continue to take stock of our progress and make an attempt to move the humanitarian community forward by looking at new challenges and finding answers collectively that will help us to improve our actions.

Every organisation needs a vision and strategy: what it wants to achieve and how it will go about doing so. For a membership organisation such as ICVA, setting a strategy is no small task as it needs to be broad enough to address the expectations and desires of a diverse membership, yet focused enough to chart a meaningful course.

ICVA sets its priorities on the basis of three-year strategic plans. These plans are developed by the Secretariat with guidance and input from the Executive Committee and member agencies and are approved by the General Assembly. The basis for the *2009-2011 Strategic Plan*,

endorsed by the ICVA membership in early February 2009, was laid out in a project carried out together with the Humanitarian Futures Programme to look at collaboration in the humanitarian community and beyond. In preparing the Plan, efforts were also made to analyse the functions that ICVA has as a network. When setting new directions and developing new initiatives for the network, there are functions that are at the core of ICVA's mission to be kept in mind: providing information services to help members take informed decisions relating to humanitarian practice and policy.

With this Strategic Plan, ICVA intends to take the next step as a network. The Plan starts from the perspective that ICVA's credibility rests with its humanitarian policy and advocacy orientation. Based on the operational experience of members and through ICVA, NGOs can be more pro-active in setting, rather than following, a policy agenda. This agenda should now be set by the views of national and local NGOs. For too long these NGOs have been treated as second class players in the humanitarian community, whereas they are often the first responders after a disaster. Together with other NGO networks, ICVA supports NGOs based in developing countries as the transfer of knowledge and participation of these NGOs in international meetings will strengthen their capacities.

The Plan also recognises that collaboration among member agencies is critical to a network such as ICVA. This collaboration should not only take place in Geneva. Member organisations have expressed the hope of working together more closely, as ICVA members, at the regional and country levels. This regional and national collaboration will connect ICVA members into a truly global network. By having members meet and work together in regions and countries, it is expected that the range of services generated with ICVA membership will broaden. Leadership in the humanitarian community and preparing for the future are related priorities which are also covered by the Plan.

If an organisation is recognised for its brand name that meets the expectations of the stakeholders, it should not deviate too much from delivering its high quality products. ICVA should stay in the business of humanitarian coordination, policy, and advocacy. At the same time, ICVA must ensure that its products remain relevant and are perceived by the membership as adding value. It is exactly this ambition that ICVA has set itself and that will serve as the main motivation in implementing its strategic priorities. ■

## 10 PRACTICAL WAYS TO USE THE PRINCIPLES OF PARTNERSHIP (PoP)

1. Make explicit reference to, and use, the PoP in all partnership agreements/memorandums of understanding (MoUs) with the UN, other NGOs, and the Red Cross/Red Crescent (RC/RC) Movement and evaluate how all parties to the agreements/MoUs adhered to the PoP.
2. Report in your annual reports on how you are putting the PoP into practice.
3. Ensure the PoP are part of the terms of reference/modus operandi of all coordination meetings/clusters.
4. In developing project proposals, refer to how the PoP will be used in the project's implementation.
5. In job postings, refer to the PoP and ask about candidates' views on partnership.
6. Ensure that partnership skills are an essential qualification considered when recruiting and appraising staff.
7. Use the PoP to advocate for improved performance from those in other humanitarian agencies and from the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC).
8. Ensure that Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAPs) and Consolidated Appeals Processes (CAPs) are developed in line with the PoP and potentially refer to how the PoP will form part of the coordination efforts in the country.
9. When talking to governments and local authorities, ensure that they know you will apply the PoP in your work.
10. When talking to media, refer to partnerships and how you are carrying them out with regard to the PoP.

*The Principles of Partnership are available at: [www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org](http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org)*

*ICVA Secretariat  
May 2008*

# Principles of Partnership

## A Statement of Commitment

*Endorsed by the Global Humanitarian Platform, 12 July 2007*

The Global Humanitarian Platform, created in July 2006, brings together UN and non-UN humanitarian organizations on an equal footing.

- Striving to enhance the effectiveness of humanitarian action, based on an ethical obligation and accountability to the populations we serve,
- Acknowledging diversity as an asset of the humanitarian community and recognizing the interdependence among humanitarian organizations,
- Committed to building and nurturing an effective partnership,

... the organizations participating in the **Global Humanitarian Platform** agree to base their partnership on the following principles:

- **Equality**

Equality requires mutual respect between members of the partnership irrespective of size and power. The participants must respect each other's mandates, obligations and independence and recognize each other's constraints and commitments. Mutual respect must not preclude organizations from engaging in constructive dissent.

- **Transparency**

Transparency is achieved through dialogue (on equal footing), with an emphasis on early consultations and early sharing of information. Communications and transparency, including financial transparency, increase the level of trust among organizations.

- **Result-oriented approach**

Effective humanitarian action must be reality-based and action-oriented. This requires result-oriented coordination based on effective capabilities and concrete operational capacities.

- **Responsibility**

Humanitarian organizations have an ethical obligation to each other to accomplish their tasks responsibly, with integrity and in a relevant and appropriate way. They must make sure they commit to activities only when they have the means, competencies, skills, and capacity to deliver on their commitments. Decisive and robust prevention of abuses committed by humanitarians must also be a constant effort.

- **Complementarity**

The diversity of the humanitarian community is an asset if we build on our comparative advantages and complement each other's contributions. Local capacity is one of the main assets to enhance and on which to build. Whenever possible, humanitarian organizations should strive to make it an integral part in emergency response. Language and cultural barriers must be overcome.

[www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org](http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org)

Several organisations generously provided (unofficial) translations of the PoP, which were posted by ICVA on the GHP website: [www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org/pop.html](http://www.globalhumanitarianplatform.org/pop.html). The PoP now exist in the following languages, as well as the original English:

- ◆ Arabic
- ◆ Bangla
- ◆ Burmese
- ◆ Creole
- ◆ Filipino

- ◆ French
- ◆ German
- ◆ Indonesian
- ◆ Italian
- ◆ Mandarin

- ◆ Nepali
- ◆ Portuguese
- ◆ Spanish
- ◆ Russian

# FINANCES

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

	2007	2008	2009
<b>ASSETS</b>			
<i>Petty Cash</i>	1,211.40	1,130.30	1,840.52
<i>Cash in bank accounts</i>	476,346.15	517,126.90	721,155.24
UBS CHF	441,630.54	482,463.09	686,754.63
UBS CHF - Projects	34,715.61	34,663.81	34,400.61
<i>Accounts receivable and prepaid expenses</i>	145,306.78	133,735.46	32,663.11
Accounts receivable	129,395.00	130,999.43	31,707.18
Taxes on interest income	769.43	500.03	955.93
Prepaid expenses	15,142.35	2,236.00	0.00
<i>Guarantee deposit</i>	8,890.15	8,867.05	8,911.40
	<b>631,754.48</b>	<b>660,859.71</b>	<b>764,570.27</b>
<b>LIABILITIES</b>			
<i>Accounts payable and Provisions</i>	72,212.81	40,532.58	17,704.39
Accounts payable	6,833.20	23,027.70	10,704.39
IM World Aid (member loan due 31.12.98)	26,600.00	0.00	0.00
Accounts Payable IM World Aid	30,000.00	0.00	0.00
Accruals & Provisions	8,779.61	17,504.88	7,000.00
<i>Earmarked projects</i>	102,703.02	139,685.03	289,473.18
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Commentary Code of Conduct (CoC)	36,910.89	36,337.07	20,028.43
Sida - Strengthening NGO Voices in Global Humanitarian Coordination	44,924.78	33,537.78	218,533.93
Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project	20,867.35	2,707.77	1,040.13
CWS/ACT - NGO Liaison	0.00	60,489.78	49,870.69
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) - ICVA/HFP project	0.00	258.52	0.00
German Federal Ministry of Foreign Affairs (German MFA) - ICVA/HFP project	0.00	6,354.11	0.00
<i>Reserve (-deficit) carry over at 31.12</i>	456,838.65	480,642.10	457,392.70
	<b>631,754.48</b>	<b>660,859.71</b>	<b>764,570.27</b>

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)

	2007	2008	2009
<b>SUPPORT TO CORE COSTS</b>			
<i>Income</i>			
Membership fees	325,374.11	376,295.93	322,398.97
DANIDA	109,395.00	100,359.00	100,189.50
Norway - Ministry of Foreign Affairs	108,159.50	98,708.05	100,000.00
Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC)	100,000.00	100,000.00	105,000.00
Netherlands - Ministerie Van Buitenlandse Zaken	116,279.00	110,000.00	0.00
UNHCR, Switzerland	30,049.14	27,570.00	26,529.90
Exchange rate gain and bank interest	646.55	888.35	1,347.10
ICVA's Expenses Invoiced to Projects	81,668.40	7,513.75	110,280.45
Brookings Institute	0.00	1,691.63	0.00
Other income	0.00	0.00	1,599.08
<b>Total income</b>	<b>871,571.70</b>	<b>823,026.71</b>	<b>767,345.00</b>
<b>SUPPORT TO CORE COSTS</b>			
<i>Expenses</i>			
Core salaries	452,172.97	465,608.05	476,292.61
Training courses	34,586.08	228.20	11,363.10
Social charges	95,085.52	86,672.10	89,233.25
Other personnel charges	-1,803.80	81.85	555.00
Website related charges	9,281.68	17,074.36	11,562.62
Executive Committee	18,686.78	10,304.33	16,722.51
General Assembly	0.00	0.00	38,828.27
Office supplies/equipment/maintenance	15,799.17	10,191.29	11,749.44
Travel and representation charges	18,077.19	46,977.33	25,159.96
Publication and translation costs	10,118.07	6,949.76	4,241.90
Office rental and utilities	42,099.30	43,225.75	42,406.85
Postage and telecommunication costs	17,436.70	21,986.75	21,944.68
Audit and legal fees	13,311.70	6,000.00	8,300.00
Bank charges, exchange rate adjustment	1,196.42	1,440.96	1,829.71
Ad hoc: Sphere Project	12,983.16	5,477.36	3,620.52
Ad hoc: ICVA Conference	22,100.55	17,792.37	16,476.26
Ad hoc: NGOs and Humanitarian Reform	0.00	562.09	0.00
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>761,131.49</b>	<b>740,572.55</b>	<b>780,286.68</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses</b>	<b>110,440.21</b>	<b>82,454.16</b>	
<b>Excess of expenses over income</b>			<b>-12,941.68</b>
<b>SUPPORT TO CORE COSTS</b>			
<i>Expenses</i>			
Ad hoc: ICVA Mission	0.00	2,233.65	0.00
Ad hoc: Writing ICVA's History	0.00	11,520.00	10,307.72
Ad hoc: NGO Liaison Officer	0.00	44,897.06	0.00
	<b>0.00</b>	<b>58,650.71</b>	<b>10,307.72</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses</b>	<b>110,440.21</b>	<b>23,803.45</b>	
<b>Excess of expenses over income</b>			<b>-23,249.40</b>

	2007	2008	2009
<b>Strengthening NGO Voices in Global Humanitarian Coordination (formerly entitled Increasing NGO Engagement with the IASC)</b>			
<i>Income</i>			
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>			
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	33,537.92	44,924.78	33,537.78
<b>Grant received</b>			
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	99,487.79	0.00	351,656.28
<b>Total income</b>	<b>133,025.71</b>	<b>44,924.78</b>	<b>385,194.06</b>
<i>Expenses</i>			
Travel	24,826.38	2,027.03	28,038.90
GHP July meetings	0.00	7,520.43	0.00
Montreux Donors' Retreat	0.00	0.00	2,287.12
GHP regional workshops	0.00	1,744.88	0.00
Supplies	34.55	66.71	255.19
Workshop ICVA administration	0.00	27.95	0.00
Ditchley Conference	0.00	0.00	6,401.21
International Humanitarian Conference 2009 (MERCY Malaysia)	0.00	0.00	9,941.94
Supporting NGO coordination	0.00	0.00	21,957.99
Monitoring and evaluation	0.00	0.00	1,000.00
Contribution ICVA administration	63,240.00	0.00	63,240.00
	88,100.93	11,387.00	133,122.35
<b>Reimbursements</b>			
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	0.00	0.00	33,537.78
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency	44,924.78	33,537.78	218,533.93
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>133,025.71</b>	<b>44,924.78</b>	<b>385,194.06</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

### Building Safer Organisations Project

#### Income

#### Fund balance previous year

##### Phase I

US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM)

    via IRC outstanding

-41,742.25      0.00      0.00

Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)

-10,760.00      0.00      0.00

##### Phase II

US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM)

    via InterAction (57,612 USD)

-71,390.20      0.00      0.00

Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)

    via InterAction (19,410 USD)

-23,927.40      0.00      0.00

OAK Foundation

163,236.30      0.00      0.00

Spent in 2006 to be reported in 2007

-25,518.80      0.00      0.00

-10,102.35      0.00      0.00

# FINANCES

	2007	2008	2009
<i>Grant received</i>			
<b>Phase I</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via IRC (2005 - 20,236 USD)	41,742.25	0.00	0.00
<b>Phase II</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via InterAction (57,612 USD)	71,390.20	0.00	0.00
Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) via InterAction (19,410 USD)	23,927.40	0.00	0.00
AusAid Donation	146,880.00	0.00	0.00
Office of US Foreign Disaster Assistance via InterAction	25,329.94	0.00	0.00
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via InterAction	129,058.95	0.00	0.00
	<hr/> 438,328.74	0.00	0.00
<b>Total income</b>	<b>428,226.39</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
 <i>Expenses</i>			
Personnel	56,850.50	0.00	0.00
Travel	18,191.50	0.00	0.00
Workshop expenses	49,409.33	0.00	0.00
Handbook supplies	3,270.54	0.00	0.00
Bank charges and interest	49.85	0.00	0.00
Handbook consultancy	6,291.65	0.00	0.00
Handbook ICVA administration, communication, office	16,830.00	0.00	0.00
Publication, Translation	8,331.20	0.00	0.00
	<hr/> 159,224.57	0.00	0.00
<i>Transfer project to Humanitarian Accountability Partnership International</i>			
Balance AusAid donation	143,038.00	0.00	0.00
Balance OAK Foundation donation	127,759.95	0.00	0.00
	<hr/> 270,797.95	0.00	0.00
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
<b>Phase I</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via IRC	0.00	0.00	0.00
Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA)	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Phase II</b>			
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via InterAction	0.00	0.00	0.00
US Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) via IRC	0.00	0.00	0.00
Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) via InterAction	0.00	0.00	0.00
OAK Foundation	0.00	0.00	0.00
Spent in 2006 to be reported in 2007	0.00	0.00	0.00
	<hr/> 0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>430,022.52</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>-1,796.13</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

NGO Code of Conduct Commentary	2007	2008	2009
<i>Income</i>			
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>			
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	39,996.40	36,910.89	36,337.07
<b>Grant received</b>			
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	0.00	0.00	0.00
Development Cooperation of Ireland	0.00	0.00	0.00
	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Total income</b>	<b>39,996.40</b>	<b>36,910.89</b>	<b>36,337.07</b>
<i>Expenses</i>			
Consultancy	0.00	0.00	12,750.00
Supplies	0.00	0.00	56.64
Editing Commentary	3,085.51	573.82	3,502.00
	3,085.51	573.82	16,308.64
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs	36,910.89	36,337.07	20,028.43
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>39,996.40</b>	<b>36,910.89</b>	<b>36,337.07</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

#### Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project

<i>Income</i>			
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>			
Refugee Protection Training	22,430.35	20,867.35	2,707.77
<b>Total income</b>	<b>22,430.35</b>	<b>20,867.35</b>	<b>2,707.77</b>
<i>Expenses</i>			
Administration Cost	960.00	662.33	498.20
Postage	117.00	3.80	4.70
Training	486.00	17,493.45	1,164.74
	1,563.00	18,159.58	1,667.64
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>			
Reach Out Refugee Protection Training Project	20,867.35	2,707.77	1,040.13
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>22,430.35</b>	<b>20,867.35</b>	<b>2,707.77</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

# FINANCES

	2008	2009
<b>NNGOs and IDP Protection</b>		
<i>Income</i>		
<b>Grant received</b>		
Brookings Institute	16,021.13	0.00
	<u>16,021.13</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<b>Total income</b>	<b>16,021.13</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<i>Expenses</i>		
Travel	14,268.26	0.00
Other costs	61.24	0.00
Balance to core	1,691.63	0.00
	<u>16,021.13</u>	<u>0.00</u>
Reimbursements	0.00	0.00
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>		
Brookings Institute	0.00	0.00
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>16,021.13</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

	2008	2009
<b>ICVA-HFP The Future of Humanitarian Collaboration project</b>		
<i>Income</i>		
CIDA funding	0.00	258.52
German MFA funding	0.00	6,354.11
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>6,612.63</b>
<b>Grant received</b>		
CIDA funding	26,208.20	0.00
German MFA funding received	44,154.60	0.00
Sida funding	0.00	28,143.40
	<u>70,362.80</u>	<u>28,143.40</u>
<b>Total income</b>	<b>70,362.80</b>	<b>34,756.03</b>
<i>Expenses</i>		
<b>CIDA</b>		
Activity 1 - Desk top analysis	14,698.85	0.00
Activity 2 - Baseline information	8,128.20	0.00
Management committee meetings	230.03	0.00
King's College administration	2,892.60	0.00

	2008	2009
<b>German MFA</b>		
Activity 4 - Focus groups	17,686.84	0.00
Activity 6 - Broader collaboration	8,436.57	0.00
Management committee meetings	965.48	0.00
Advisory group meetings	1,638.48	0.00
ICVA staff cost	1,360.00	0.00
HFP Senior Research Associate	2,520.41	0.00
HFP Administrative staff	2,989.44	0.00
King's College administration	2,203.27	0.00
<b>Sida &amp; CIDA</b>		
Activity 8 - Simulation exercises	0.00	22,784.68
Management committee meetings	0.00	94.54
King's College administration	0.00	5,506.70
Postage final report to German MFA	0.00	16.00
	<u>63,750.17</u>	<u>28,401.92</u>
<b>Reimbursements</b>		
German MFA funding	0.00	6,354.11
	<u>0.00</u>	<u>6,354.11</u>
<b><i>Funds available at the end of the year</i></b>		
CIDA funding	258.52	0.00
German MFA funding	6,354.11	0.00
Sida funding	0.00	0.00
<b><i>Total expenses</i></b>	<b>70,362.80</b>	<b>34,756.03</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b><u>0.00</u></b>	<b><u>0.00</u></b>

	2008	2009
<b>NGO Liaison</b>		
<b><i>Income</i></b>		
<b>Fund balance previous year</b>	0.00	60,489.78
<b>Grant received</b>		
Church World Services Pakistan (CWS)/Action by Churches Together (ACT)	60,489.78	0.00
	<u>60,489.78</u>	<u>0.00</u>
<b><i>Total income</i></b>	<b>60,489.78</b>	<b>60,489.78</b>
<b><i>Expenses</i></b>		
NGO Liaison Myanmar	0.00	10,619.09
	<u>0.00</u>	<u>10,619.09</u>
Reimbursements	0.00	0.00
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>		
Church World Services Pakistan (CWS)/Action by Churches Together (ACT)	60,489.78	49,870.69
<b><i>Total expenses</i></b>	<b>60,489.78</b>	<b>60,489.78</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b><u>0.00</u></b>	<b><u>0.00</u></b>

# FINANCES

NGOs and Humanitarian Reform Project	2009
<i>Income</i>	
Fund balance previous year	0.00
<b>Grant received</b>	
Department for International Development (DFID) via ActionAid International	43,718.35
<b>Total income</b>	<b>43,718.35</b>
<i>Expenses</i>	
Travel costs	432.90
ICVA core costs	43,285.45
	<hr/>
<b>Funds available at the end of the year</b>	
DFID via ActionAid International	0.00
<b>Total expenses</b>	<b>43,718.35</b>
<b>Excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income</b>	<b><u>0.00</u></b>

	2007	2008	2009
<i>Accumulated carry over previous year</i>	348,194.57 <sup>1)</sup>	456,838.65 <sup>3)</sup>	480,642.10
<i>Total excess of income over expenses or - expenses over income for period</i>	<u>108,644.08<sup>2)</sup></u>	<u>23,803.45</u>	<u>-23,249.40<sup>4)</sup></u>
<b>Reserve (deficit) carry over at 31.12</b>	<u>456,838.65</u>	<u>480,642.10</u>	<u>457,392.70</u>

- 1) The accumulated carry over of CHF 348,194.57 from previous years will be used as a reserve for the 2009 General Assembly and Conference, for three months' emergency operating costs for the ICVA Secretariat, and for a fund to start up NGO coordination at the field level, when requested.
- 2) The total excess income over expenses of CHF 108,644.08 in 2007 will be carried over to 2008 for activities not completed in 2007.
- 3) The accumulated carry over of CHF 456,838.65 from previous years will go towards the 2009 General Assembly and Conference, for three months' emergency operating costs for the ICVA Secretariat, and for a staff development fund.
- 4) This amount is covered by an allocation from the general reserve.

# ICVA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

## *Executive Committee Members (until February 2009)*

**Chair:** Mr. Thomas Getman, *WVI*  
**Vice-Chair:** Dr. Jemilah Mahmood, *MERCY Malaysia*  
**Treasurer:** Mr. Jappe Erichsen, *NRC*

Ms Vivi Akakpo, *AACC*  
Mr. Muzaffer Baca, *IBC*  
Ms Carolyn Makinson, *Women's Commission*  
Mr. Mohammad Nasib, *ANCB*

Mr. Mamadou Ndiaye, *OFADEC*  
Mr. Paul O'Brien, *Concern Worldwide*  
Ms Ann Mary Olsen, *DRC*

## *Executive Committee Members (elected by the 14<sup>th</sup> General Assembly, February 2009)*

**Chair:** Mr. Paul O'Brien, *Concern Worldwide*  
**Vice-Chair:** Ms Carolyn Makinson, *Women's Commission (Women's Refugee Commission as of September 2009)*  
**Treasurer:** Mr. Paul Nesse, *NRC*

Ms Marian Casey-Maslen, *ACT International (ACT Alliance as of January 2010)*  
Dr. Jemilah Mahmood (*until July 2009*), Dr. Ahmad Faizal Perdaus (*from August 2009*), *MERCY Malaysia*  
Dr. Steven Muncy, *CFSI*  
Ms Kathrine Starup, *DRC*  
Dr. Misikir Tilahun, *AHA*  
Ms Judy Wakahiu (*until October 2009*), Ms Lucy Kiama (*from February 2010*), *RCK*

# ICVA SECRETARIAT 2009

By the end of 2009, the ICVA Secretariat functioned on the basis of five full-time staff. The positions at the Secretariat were filled by:

Mr. Ed Schenkenberg van Mierop, Coordinator  
Ms Manisha Thomas, Policy Officer  
Mr. Rüdiger Schöch, Information Officer (*until October 2009*), Associate Policy Officer (*from November 2009*)  
Ms Bethan Montague-Brown, Associate Policy Officer (*until October 2009*)  
Mr. Harman Bhamra, Information Officer (*from November 2009*)  
Ms Marianne Gémin, Finance and Administration Officer

# ICVA MEMBERS 2009

- ◆ Action by Churches Together (ACT International; ACT Alliance as of January 2010), *Switzerland*
- ◆ ActionAid International, *South Africa*
- ◆ Afghan NGOs Coordination Bureau (ANCB)
- ◆ Africa Humanitarian Action (AHA), *Ethiopia*
- ◆ Africa and Middle East Refugee Assistance (AMERA), *UK*
- ◆ 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*
- ◆ Asylum Access, *USA*
- ◆ Australian Council for International Development (ACFID)
- ◆ BADIL Resource Center for Palestinian Residency and Refugee Rights (BADIL)
- ◆ Canadian Council for Refugees (CCR)
- ◆ CARE International
- ◆ Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD), *UK*
- ◆ Church World Service (CWS), *USA*
- ◆ Christian Relief and Development Association (CRDA), *Ethiopia*
- ◆ Coastal Association for Social Transformation (COAST) Trust, *Bangladesh*
- ◆ Community and Family Services International (CFSI), *Philippines*
- ◆ Concern Worldwide, *Ireland*
- ◆ Danish Refugee Council (DRC)
- ◆ Dutch Council for Refugees/VluchtelingenWerk Nederland (DCR)
- ◆ FAHAMU – Network for Social Justice, *Kenya*
- ◆ Frontiers (Ruwad) Association, *Lebanon*
- ◆ Fundacion Augusto Cesar Sandino (FACS), *Nicaragua*
- ◆ General Union of Voluntary Societies (GUVS), *Jordan*
- ◆ Handicap International (HI), *France*
- ◆ Human Appeal International (HAI), *United Arab Emirates*
- ◆ HealthNet TPO, *Netherlands*
- ◆ HelpAge International, *UK*
- ◆ Human Rights First (HRF), *USA*
- ◆ Individuell Människohjälp (Swedish Organisation for Individual Relief) (IM)
- ◆ InterAction (American Council for Voluntary International Action)
- ◆ InterAid International (IAI), *Switzerland*
- ◆ Interchurch Organisation for Development Co-operation (ICCO), *Netherlands*
- ◆ International Blue Crescent Relief and Development Foundation (IBC), *Turkey*

## NEW MEMBERS IN 2009

- ◆ Asylum Access, *USA*
- ◆ FAHAMU – Networks for Social Justice, *Kenya*
- ◆ Handicap International (HI), *France*

## MEMBERSHIP

Membership in ICVA is open to non-governmental organisations with human rights/humanitarian programmes that are consistent with the purposes of ICVA as described in ICVA's Statutes and Mission Statement. The following categories of organisations qualify for membership:

- ◆ international NGOs;
- ◆ consortia and networks of NGOs; and
- ◆ national NGOs that have demonstrated a commitment to translating their work to the international level; have country, regional, or other expertise on which ICVA may draw; and/or are based in countries that have no national consortium, network, or group of NGOs.

Details on membership, as well as membership application forms, are available on the "Member Agencies" page of the ICVA website: [www.icva.ch/members.html](http://www.icva.ch/members.html).

For the current list of ICVA members please see:  
[www.icva.ch/membership.html](http://www.icva.ch/membership.html)

- ◆ International Catholic Migration Commission (ICMC)
- ◆ International Medical Corps (IMC), *USA*
- ◆ International Rehabilitation Council for Torture Victims (IRCT), *Denmark*
- ◆ International Rescue Committee (IRC)
- ◆ International Save the Children Alliance
- ◆ Islamic Relief Agency (ISRA), *Sudan*
- ◆ Jesuit Refugee Service (JRS)
- ◆ Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Service (LIRS), *USA*
- ◆ Lutheran World Federation (LWF)
- ◆ Marie Stopes International (MSI), *UK*
- ◆ Mauritius Council of Social Service (MACOSS)
- ◆ Médecins du Monde (MDM)
- ◆ Mercy Corps, *USA*
- ◆ Malaysian Medical Relief Society (MERCY Malaysia)
- ◆ Merlin, *UK*
- ◆ 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 Consortium of Kenya (RCK)
- ◆ Refugee Council of Australia (RCOA)
- ◆ Refugee Council USA (RCUSA)
- ◆ Refugee Education Trust (RET), *Switzerland*
- ◆ Refugees International (RI)
- ◆ Salvation Army International
- ◆ Sustainable Environment and Ecological Development Society (SEEDS), *India*
- ◆ 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 (Women's Refugee Commission as of September 2009), *USA*
- ◆ World Council of Churches (WCC)
- ◆ World Society for the Protection of Animals (WSPA)
- ◆ World Vision International (WVI)

#### **PERMANENT OBSERVERS**

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

#### **AFFILIATE MEMBER**

- ◆ Refugees Studies Centre (RSC), *UK*

## **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)**