



EU – ACBAR Donor Conference

European Union Delegation, Kabul

Monday 28th February 2017

Contents

- 1. Welcome note from European Union – Maurizio Cian 1
- 2. ACBAR Presentation – Fiona Gall 1
- 3. European Union - Michael Steffens 2
- 4. British Embassy - Rosalind Meek 3
- 5. French Embassy – Pascal Hanse 5
- 6. USAID - Niaz Gul Afghanyar 6
- 7. Norwegian Embassy - Sabir Nasiry 6
- 8. Italian Embassy - Zarlisht Barek 7
- 9. German Embassy - Franziska Albrecht 7
- 10. Questions and Answers 8
- 11. Final thoughts 14
- 12. Annexes: 15

1. Welcome note from European Union – Maurizio Cian

Mr. Maurizio Cian, Head of Development Co-operation welcomed all participants and thanked ACBAR for help in organizing this second donor-civil society conference. He noted that the idea was to get NGOs and CSOs together to meet donors and collect ideas from both sides. Then he handed over the conference to Mr. Michael Steffens, Task Manager Human Rights, Civil Society and Gender for the EU and Mrs. Fiona Gall, Director of ACBAR.

2. ACBAR Presentation – Fiona Gall

ACBAR thanked the EU colleagues for hosting this meeting for donors and ACBAR's members. A similar donor meeting had been held at the EU in November 2015. At that previous meeting ACBAR had invited 4 other NGO coordination bodies to share concerns of NGOs and CSOs in Afghanistan with donors. This time ACBAR had only invited its members to the meeting to give them the opportunity to discuss with several donors at one time.

Context – Since the Brussels conference there is increased pressure for donors to move funds “on budget”. As Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) and Civil Society Organisations (CSOs) we realize that it is important for the Government to promote and lead development in Afghanistan, but we consider that NGOs/CSOs have an important role not only to support Government as service providers but also to follow our own independent priorities. With less funding there is increased competition for resources. NGOs/CSOs are also facing impediments as the Government wants to decrease corruption by increasing regulations and procedures so there are delays in reporting, payment of taxes and permission to start projects. We are concerned that this creates less space for new initiatives and creative development. As NGOs and CSOs we also need to re-define our role and our contribution in the present context.

Comparative advantage of NGOs/CSOs - ACBAR has 137 national and international members working in all

34 provinces of Afghanistan in different sectors (education, health, community development, livelihoods, capacity building) and with different groups (youth, women, children, people with disabilities, vulnerable groups). We work with rural and urban communities using participatory and rights based approaches, responding to humanitarian needs, disasters and environmental needs and covering a wide range of interests and expertise.

Challenges - As mentioned there is a concern that funding and support for civil society is shrinking and donors are less accessible. Capacity is often limited capacity particularly in national NGOs/CSOs due to short-term funding, poor communication, turnover of staff and lack of specialization. NGOs/CSOs increasingly have to follow fund trends rather than their own strategies and defend themselves against an image of corruption portrayed in local media and by the Government.

Suggestions for Government - Civil society and NGOs need to have increased representation in policy meetings with Government and feed back to the wider NGO/CSO community. We must ensure space for civil society actors to share experience and learn from each other rather than simply compete and share best practice and learning with Government. We must also refuse to contribute to corruption through increased transparency – examples are ACBAR's code of conduct for its members and community audits of NGO/CSP projects.

Suggestions for Donors - We suggest increased donors promote support a variety of partnerships and coalitions between Afghan NGOs/CSOs and International NGOs. This allows space for new initiatives and new partners, while reducing management requirements for donors. Some donors already use these models but not all. ACBAR also recommends longer, multi-year project periods (3-5 years) which provide core funds for NGO/CSOs to develop their structures. International NGOs have an added advantage in that they can link up more easily to bi-lateral funding and international foundations for sponsorship. It would be good to assist national NGOs/CSOs to make these linkages. Finally there is still a need to simplify donor processes and provide feedback on proposals and lessons learned to all stakeholders.

Practical problems in proposals for Donors – I would like to highlight the problems particularly faced by national NGO/CSOs in competing for donor funding. Firstly understanding the language of Requests for Proposals (RFPs) is still a concern for many – it is not just a matter of the barrier of the English language but also the complexity of the language and concepts used. Language and logic should be as simple and clear as possible. Secondly, as far as possible there should be a standardized format for RFPs between donors. There is often very little time to given for applicants to design and write proposals and the fact that each donor has their own format makes it even more difficult. Thirdly there is a lack of feedback on proposals when they fail - donors should take the time to explain what mistakes were made, such as the very good explanation provided by the EU at the previous conference we held here. Finally despite many trainings provided by ACBAR and others on proposal writing, many national NGOs/CSOs still find logframes difficult to understand and to complete, so if we can find an alternative way of explaining the work this would be useful.

3. European Union - Michael Steffens

At the moment the EU does not have funding opportunities this year for NGOs/CSOs but for in principle the EU covers the sectors of Health, Agriculture, Security and Migration and does also have funding opportunities in these areas. EU recently had training on a Rights Based Approach and we have various initiatives which will come out of that which could lead to more funding for Civil Society next year. Our funding levels under the CSO-LA instrument may also increase significantly. We have frequent discussions with CSOs and networks and we often hear their concerns that donor funds are going to Government budget support and modalities like the ARTF Trust Fund, so should we use those modalities to channel more money to CSOs? We do have funding for CSOs under the SEHAT program for the Health sector, which could be a model to be followed in modalities like the ARTF. However, the World Bank is usually focusing on its cooperation with the Government, which is an

important element of development cooperation as well. So the onus is on us bi-lateral donors to take this forward and make sure there is funding for CSOs. Neither Human Rights nor Civil Society are priorities for EU area under the multi-annual indicative planning. We use thematic instruments from the EU like the civil society and local authorities' thematic instruments where we have a call every 2 years.

We went through consultations with Civil Society for our Road Map process two years ago. The feedback was that it was hard for EU to reach out to smaller NGOs/ CSOs in rural areas who have difficulty in applying. In response EU decided to implement a sub-granting scheme for Accountability in the Health and Education sectors with the partner Oxfam Novib, they will provide 16 sub-grants to small organizations for up to 60,000 Euros. They will provide capacity building to these partners so they can manage these funds and then go up the next step of the ladder to manage larger amounts. This will be the modality that we will follow. Next year we will have a call to establish another sub-granting scheme to focus on Accountability so we can see how well the Government is spending the budget

We also have another instrument for Human Rights, called European Democracy Human Rights (EDHR) which will focus on women, children and human rights defenders. For 2017 we have one million Euros to be dedicated to the women rights (either human rights or economic rights) and the call for proposal will be out in March. We do a lot of frontloading there so we don't need to sign the contract at the end of the year but we have time to discuss the framework. Part of this program will also help the EU Delegation to mainstream rights in all our sectors - migration, health, agriculture and security. Ideally this will be for an organisation that is good on human rights and has connections to the research sector.

Eligibility Criteria – To touch on this issue, I am happy to share the presentation from last time for your information. There are a number of criteria in the guidelines which NGOs/CSOs need to meet. It is sad when an organization applies and doesn't meet the minimum budget requirement or when it exceeds the maximum amount. NGOs cannot ask for 100% of EU contribution, there is always co-financing which must be provided. Now EU prefers that local NGOs/CSOs are in the lead of a partnership for applications to gain experience and EU gives a higher EU contribution if local NGOs are in the lead. It has been a successful approach over the past 2 years.

The other criterion is the partnership, if we say we want a minimum of 3 partners, then you cannot apply with only 2 – you need to have 3 or 4 organizations working together. Make sure to go through the guidelines and use the checklist to make sure you have completed all requirements.

4. British Embassy - Rosalind Meek

I have been working on TAWANMANDI for the past year; this was originally co-funded by the Norwegians, the Swiss, the Swedish and the Danish. It started in 2011 under British Council management with a funding Council that had a steering role over the program. The program was transferred from British Council to DFID management one year ago and there were 18 Legacy implementing partners left, of which one is ACBAR. TAWANMANDI was setup to support Afghan Civil Society and it was the first of its kind. It was aimed to build the capacity of Afghan civil society organizations to win funding directly from donors, also to learn from experience of their programmatic activities and to support a high percentage of their administrative costs to be able to implement effectively. We have learnt a lot about this programme over the past 6 years, it is finishing soon and there are many reasons why. So what we are doing now is to learn as much as we can if whether our first objective was achieved - a credible and sustainable Afghan Civil Society base. That is very hard to measure.

We do know we have funded 107 Afghan civil society organizations in 31 provinces across the country so next we would like to map whether those CSOs still exist, we don't actually know. We know in Kabul we do have a prosperous civil society base, but does it extend further than Kabul? One way to approach the idea of account-

ability, which was the biggest challenge we faced, is to see what mechanisms there are in the country that are Afghan-led mechanisms for accountability. We are very interested in the Afghan Institute for the Afghan Civil Society (AICS) certification scheme, we don't directly support that but we think it is a good way for civil society to self-monitor, and for them to find out whether they are achieving what they need to achieve through the certification schemes. There might be some challenges around that but our due diligence assessment process is probably much more difficult to pass than something which is Afghan-led and referring to local Government laws and policies.

DFID had an annual review recently and our approach is to reduce what we used to do. We have been doing surveys of our remaining partners to see if they are able to access funding streams from other sources. The results have been quite positive. There are less funding opportunities available for the civil society than there used to be but partners do seem to be winning proposals. In the future DFID would like to see that the CSOs we have worked show an increased ability to advocate, collaborate and to work across thematic areas so that there is a cohesive message coming from civil society to the Government. And the UK would like as a donor to support and advocate for the civil society directly through our diplomatic engagement with the Government.

For the British Embassy/DFID it is important that in Afghanistan that we operate as one Government – we work closely with political section colleagues. DFID recently conducted a civil society policy review which is looking our approach to civil society across the globe and in the UK. We try to share this information with our partners on our gov.uk website. One of the benefits of having TAWANMANDI in house is having a direct relationship with civil society and being able to meet them regularly which is a positive result. We have 2 big global schemes:

- Firstly - UK-Aid Match which is a global scheme centrally managed from London. It is focused on achievement of global goals for sustainability and development through the financing unit of civil society projects and used to engage UK public with CSOs and it has been just launched. Apparently in the 1st round of this grant we will see nutrition among children under 5 and it will help feed in to nutrition results here and we are going to support 2 million additional women and girls access to family planning between 2012 -2020. There is also a new commitment of our Secretary of State to stamp out modern slavery world-wide.
- Secondly - UK-Aid Direct has just been launched which closed on 31 of January but it is a huge scheme with 18 priority countries of which Afghanistan is one. We do know that a number of bids were received from Afghanistan, but in terms of priorities for that, we are looking for good proposals rather to set the priorities in each country.
- Finally the British Embassy Kabul has a call for proposal currently running, you can find information about these grants through our website and Facebook on the British Embassy Government website. There are three schemes - the first one has already closed - Social Inclusion and Encountering Extremism, the second is Strengthening the Role of Women which is open till 22nd of March and the third is Credible Media and Good Governance which is open till 14th of March . These are small-scale and looking for innovation in those areas.

Regarding Clarity on Call for Proposals - There is a clear structure and template to complete on the website. It is an open call for proposals, for unsolicited bids so please consider if you are interested. We will always take your questions and comments.

After TAWANMANDI we are looking at what we should do as our future approach with civil society bi-laterally. From DFID's point of view, we will not create another bespoke civil society program like TAWANMANDI. We do think it has achieved a great deal, but may things have changed in six years, for example the security environment has changed dramatically. Was our approach for the baseline of CSOs the right one? Did we over-estimate what we could achieve in terms of creating CSOs which could be fully independent? So we have to think what our baseline should be now. So instead we would like to embed civil society components into all our programs – for example in our humanitarian programs there is a lot of CSO involvement, including ACBAR.

There are still gaps in security sector reform and extractive transparency. So we want to work out where gaps are; but we hope to continue our engagement with CSOs which we have developed under our TAWANMANDI program as well as to talk to international CSOs. I agree with the EU that it is important to work in consortia and along thematic lines. We would love to see more Afghan-led consortia and we know a lot of capacity still needs to be built in Afghan civil society so if we can encourage international and Afghan-led consortia that would be great. Our engagement strategy will focus on advocating the important role of civil society with the Government. After the Brussels conference we feel that there has not been much traction and together with our UN and donor counterparts and with BAAG we would like to continue these conversations.

5. French Embassy – Pascal Hanse

It is nice to be here and see some familiar faces. Our cooperation with NGOs/CSOs in Afghanistan is mainly through bi-lateral projects on a long term basis. We do not therefore go through calls for proposals much – only for a small amount of funds.

We have a few important commitments in health – like the French Hospital (FMIC) and I see our colleagues from Chaine de l’Espoire are here. This is a big bi-lateral commitment and we don’t have many other funds for other partners. Besides these bi-lateral projects we have 3 other possibilities:

- We have a two yearly call for proposals for nutrition which is still going on – we cover areas where there are nutrition needs.
- Our cooperation agency has a desk for NGOs and there you can find funding for bigger projects for 2-3 years but the NGO has to provide 50% of your own funds (co-funding). This may be difficult for some NGOs to find the matching funds. These projects are in health, infrastructure and for rural development.
- The most interesting for you today may be the Social Fund for Development – this aim is to help Afghan civil society to develop its capacities and policies y – so I agree with my British colleague this should follow national priorities and strategies.

We will be in process to launch the second call with the contribution of ACBAR at beginning of April. We want to support smaller NGOs who we already know and who have given good results, and the second aim is to help young NGOs develop and improve their capacity, so mainly focused on small projects. The main criteria is that the proposals might be well presented and written by well-trained proposal writers but for us this is not enough - we want to feel in the proposal that project is genuine and really rooted in the community you want to assist.

Last time we had 35 proposals and many of them were paste copies – so we are searching for genuine proposals. You have to prove in your proposal that you really have worked with the community you want to assist. We still have many projects that are continuations of other projects with the same standards and objectives. So we want to see a development in sustainability and autonomy and I know this is not easy.

Security – the criteria that is important in recent projects – is the possibility to visit your projects. So the projects we finance have to be accessible for us to visit and our Government has required this criteria. This may be a problem in 30% of the country today but politically it is important that we can visit the project at any time (Embassy staff). So the second round for this proposal will be launched beginning of April with the support of ACBAR.

Q – Will this not affect our humanitarian principles of neutrality if Donors are coming to visit with armed teams?

A - This is for the Social Fund projects only – we do not do this for our humanitarian and nutrition projects.

6. USAID - Niaz Gul Afghanyar

USAID's Office of Democracy and Governance (ODG) has been supporting the civil society and media in Afghanistan since 2003 and provided technical assistance, capacity building, and small grants support to hundreds of civil-society and independent media organizations across the country. USAID Civil Society and Media team through current program called "Afghan Civic Engagement Program (ACEP)" work closely with media and civil society organizations (CSOs) to enable Afghan citizens to engage more effectively advocate for their legitimate interests and hold their Government accountable, as well as ensure that quality, independent information is available to inform their decisions and advocacy efforts. USAID under ACEP program, which is a five-year \$70m program, works with CSOs at provincial, regional and national level as well as provide technical assistance, capacity building and grants to local CSOs and NGOs nationwide in Afghanistan.

The goal of ACEP program is to promote civil society and media engagement that enables Afghan citizen to influence policy, monitor Government accountability, and serve as advocates for political reform. The program aims to achieve this goal through five program areas: (1) Regular CSO Engagement with Government to increase CSOs' ability to advocate for policy priorities; (2) Increased CSO and Media Thematic Expertise in Democracy and Governance; (3) Expanded Civic Engagement and education across the country; (4) Improved Access to Independent News and Public Affairs Information, and (5) Increased CSO Organizational Capacity as well as established the Afghanistan Institute for Civil Society (AICS), which raises the credibility of the civil society sector in Afghanistan. The Institute encourages the growth of a vibrant, credible, and effective civil society, promoting pluralism and participatory, inclusive development in Afghanistan.

7. Norwegian Embassy - Sabir Nasiry

We contribute more or less 700 million Norwegian kroner per year to Afghanistan. We have three sectors - rural development, education and governance – we work with NGOs, some of them are here today.

We divide support for civil society into two categories – one which is advocacy which was mainly done through Tawanmandi – secondly some humanitarian support and service delivery which is more long term. For this we have long standing partners that we trust, and I will be open with you, we are not concerned so much about monitoring because we know many of you are doing a very good job out there and some NGOs have been here 30 – 40 years so they have established good systems. We know that these partners work with grass roots and community.

Our grants system is very centralized, we don't do anything here at the Embassy level, the decisions are made back in Norway, so we have little flexibility here for moving funds around. However there are some possibilities for funding that come up from time to time and those possibilities are advertised centrally so those with a good knowledge of the Norwegian system can access these funds.

8. Italian Embassy - Zarlisht Barek

We have been in Afghanistan since 2001– with different projects. We are working with the Government, civil society and international organisations. We are working in the following sectors: Justice and Governance, Micro Finance and Private Sector Development, Agriculture and Rural Development, Gender Equality, Health,

Infrastructure, Culture and Education, Migration and Humanitarian aid. The bulk of our investments is in the infrastructure sector. We are currently working mainly in the provinces of Herat, Bamiyan, Ghor, Badakshan and Kabul but we are looking forward to expanding our activities in other provinces that haven't been covered by development aid. We are currently funding the Government through bilateral programmes, Italian NGOs registered in Afghanistan, UN Agencies (UN Women, UNFPA, UNOPS, UNHCR, WHO, UNDP, UNESCO and UNICEF) and the World Bank.

9. German Embassy - Franziska Albrecht

Germany Development Cooperation in Afghanistan is administered by two Government bodies by Ministry of Development Cooperation and by the Foreign Ministry. Most of our money goes into the trust funds or to large development partners like GIZ and KFW or large international NGOs with whom we have worked for a long time – so these are large, long term projects. Similar to France and Norway, we don't have a lot of funding opportunities for local NGOs. We do have every year a fund for a few projects in the field of human rights – women, children access to education, access to legal aid – so we are always interested in proposals in that area. I cannot promise that the proposal will be accepted - our fiscal year starts in January and ends in December and Human Rights have to finish by December so for this year have already decided on our funding. So please share your ideas this year for next year.

Other than that the Embassy also has micro-project funds for local NGOs and grants of 25,000 Euros. It cannot be humanitarian aid as we already donate to UNHCR, IOM and WFP. These micro-projects have to be short-term but sustainable – they are a few months long but have a longer term impact: for example repairing a roof of a school which will last for 5-10 years. Local NGOs with experience in their field – we do not do institutional funding – just project based such as health, education or environmental protection. The project has to have a visible impact on local communities. Micro-project funds can be submitted all year but if you come to us in Nov and our fiscal year ends in Dec – we will probably say please come back in January. So now it is still Feb so we hope we can implement a few more micro-projects and we are always interested in hearing your ideas.

EU - Apologies from Swedish and Danish Embassies – who could not come – but we will put together a funding table with links to the relevant websites to send to you.

EU – we also have some global calls through our Brussels office and you can access our EU website to see if they cover Afghanistan – such as the recent one for education. So we will try to accumulate this information for you together with ACBAR.

10. Questions and Answers

NGO: First - is there any chance that international community can focus more on relations with NGOs and civil society and NGOs rather than increasing bi-lateral funding with Government? Second - monitoring is an issue in Afghanistan – 40% of territory is in opposition hands and access is difficult in other areas. Direct donor monitoring such as French Embassy proposes can make it difficult for us - we cannot have a convoy of armed vehicles to see our project – we need to be low profile.

NGO: With donor support NGOs/CSOs should work with Government, not replace Government, but assure good governance and reduction in corruption. For instance in provincial levels there are some improvements with support from donors, I appreciate the work presented by our USAID colleague – so support for monitoring

and evaluation of Government by civil society in order to ensure better governance and to reduce corruption.

A: France - Bilateral agreements should not be an obstacle to relations between donors and civil society organisations. Our country has been signing these treaties of cooperation prior to this present Government of President Ghani. The idea is not to exclude NGOs but to have a framework which is agreed by both nations and this does not exclude France contributing to other instruments. If there is no agreement there is no money so we have a political obligation to explain our contributions - we are responsible to our parliament to show our bi-lateral and multi-lateral contributions to different partners – Afghan Government, EU and UN. So I do not see any contradiction between support for the political agreement with the Afghan Government and the important place and role of NGOs.

Q: Our concern is the matter of how the present Afghan Government perceives these bi-lateral agreements and the role of NGOs.

A: EU - So maybe the issue is how visible are state – civil society relations and how much donors put this on the agenda with the Afghan Government. We are increasing on-budget support and we see many areas where Government is not able to implement, so why are we not also discussing with the Government to increase CS implementation on their side. I don't think Government sees CS as the enemy – but they might not have them first on their call sheet when they think about implementation. So we need to have a regular forum for CSOs to agree what they issues they can discuss, donors to provide a platform, and then to have regular dialogue with Afghan Government – maybe four times a year on certain thematic issues such as enabling environment. How is the Government making it easier for CSOs to operate in the country in terms of the NGO Law and reporting back to Government. We are currently thinking about that, the reason is that we had a programme with British and Irish Agencies Afghanistan Group (BAAG) to lead up to a CS paper for the Brussels conference. We had a number of network organisations that worked on this message and 10 CS representatives would also be selected. At London conference we had difficulty with so many CS participants so for Brussels we limited the number of people and preferred to concentrate on the message. It was frustrating – CS individuals wanted to go to Brussels rather than convey a message. The criticism is also that there are always the same faces that go. So we want to provide CS – State dialogue on a regular basis. We know that the Civils Society Joint Working Group (CSJWG) has been created to try to do this. Donors should push for this to be done more regularly. We should also have this forum regularly so you can vent your frustration with us donors so we can see where the impediments lie and so that we can alter our modalities so they can be more conducive to your needs.

DFID – We are aware of this issue and we are trying to work within the Government to find key supporters for Civil Society. Dr Abdullah, the CEO, is a key proponent for Civil Society. We need to find the key people in Government. We had an Ambassadors lunch to discuss this very issue in November. We need to focus on the Brussels conference outcomes, coordinate on this and to see what we can do with the commitments made at Brussels and monitor their implementation. We need to use UNAMA's civil society working group more which donors do not attend regularly. So we do have coordination mechanisms already, we just need to use them better. We need better coordination and less competition between CSOs that we work with.

DFID Governance Advisor – On this issue of state-civil society roles and relationships and the role of the CDCs, I would be very interested to hear the view of people how that will actually play out. From my perspective Citizen's Charter and CDCs is all about civil action and holding the Government accountable. I do see the danger of co-option that you talk about and the dangers of how CDCs are accountable and to whom - but I would urge you not to throw out baby with bathwater. A lot of the elements in Citizen's Charter are related to civil society action in this country. You are worried about this co-option issue, but in terms of conflict in states you are getting central funds going right down to local level with CDCs having bank accounts and the role of the facilitating partners, who are also part of civil society, is to create that infrastructure.

NGO: I agree that the Citizens Charter is making the Government accountable and is turning things upside

down and it is a good link between rural communities and central Government. But we are still gap-filling to reach the neediest. Our organisation's biggest concern is that we have lost development funding – so we are replacing this with humanitarian funding – but the development needs are still there. So we have protracted beneficiaries with rising population of IDPs and refugees coming back. Can they be integrated into existing communities when the services are not there, for example schools and clinics? These are the challenges – security, corruption. How do we deal with funding disappearing from development and going into humanitarian needs? There is no difference between the two - just how you chose the beneficiary and for how long. We are trying to select beneficiaries by donor direction (IDPs, undocumented, refugees) but when we do assessments we see all of them have the same needs outside the city centres. So how do we address that?

EU: Is there much research is available on this?

NGO: There is a lot of data and information coming though integration working group and refugee chapters every month so there is current information.

EU - Can we go now to some of the questions on Monitoring and Evaluation, the certification scheme and the overall accountability of NGOs?

DFID – On M&E we all want to visit our projects but in the British Embassy we accept that we cannot often do that because we are restricted by the security environment. So we can only talk to our partners at a few locations. One way that helps us to fund partners is to make sure that they have the capacity and governance structures in place so that our money is channelled appropriately. So certification becomes really important to us. Before we enter into any agreement we will conduct a due diligence of your organisation – your different funding streams and your robustness in relation to donor funding. It is not a pass or fail but we set out recommendations for improvements – if we see a lot of gaps it may affect our ability to fund grants and we will wait for you to fix those issues first. We like the AICS certification approach as it is Afghan led.

So we see AICS is successful - we are finding that lots of organisations say that the recommendations they get on their certification gives them lot to learn and reflect on gaps; who they need to train and what structures they need in place to account for donor funding. Experiences from Tawanmandi highlighted the importance of our accountability to tax payers in the UK and they need to know where money is going and in this particular environment where there is a problem with corruption we need to be confident that we know where our money is going. So we feel this scheme is Afghan appropriate, that organisations learn about themselves and be more successful in finding funding in the future.

Germany – in terms of M&E, we like all our CS and Afghan Government partners but we don't necessarily trust you! This is why we have these rules and here in Afghanistan we are more flexible because normally we should visit the project several times but we don't do that here because of the context but still we have to find some mechanism of monitoring. It's the same for small NGOs, big international NGOs, big international organizations – we are accountable to our tax payers and the German Government to say where the money went. We have experimented with different monitoring instruments: some work, others don't. It is important that the organisation itself has the capacity to do some internal monitoring. I am working on two projects at the moment and one which was a large international organisation could not spend all the money in the project (80,000 Euros), so this was not corruption but lack of planning which is a shame as this will go back to Ministry of Finance in Germany and be lost for development projects here.

USAID – we have this accountability issue as well. USAID as a donor agency is monitored by SIGAR and the Office of General Inspection. So we have a five tier M&E approach to provide information to Congress and SIGAR and to OIG. First is US Government monitoring. Secondly is partners' reporting: weekly, monthly and annually. The third tier is Afghan Government monitoring entities that can monitor some large projects. Then we have beneficiaries and CSOs who can give feedback on projects. The fifth tier is third party monitoring by different organisations hired to monitor our projects with local staff. AICS is also created for certification of Afghan NGOs

and to help local NGOs have proper systems in place like finance, operations and HR.

NGO – we all appreciate we have to monitor ourselves and be monitored. It was just the modality of coming to visit with armoured vehicles – this creates a risk for us and our beneficiaries.

NGO – in terms of trust, NGOs have to build up their monitoring systems; what is currently the donor prevention to risk and prevention to financial risk knowing that the country is unstable and where we are working in opposition held areas? So if you don't trust the monitoring system then how do we reach beneficiaries in the areas which are insecure?

EU – the answer to this is maybe as donors have to have flexibility in our funding. So if you have to change provinces because of security issues we have to be able to accommodate that in our contracts. Up to 3 changes were made in 3-4 years in some of our partners. Budget support is easier to manage when we have this sort of heavy burden in grant management. We have outsourced as a solution – with larger grants to a contractor which will manage sub-contracts. So the issue of M&E is not how to do it, but that we do not want to spend too much money on it. External contractors will do M&E and this should support your project management and our management in order to achieve better quality. If we achieve better quality then it is easier to argue for budget to be allocated to projects. So I think the AICS certification scheme is a good initiative – we need to sit down on the donor side to see how it is running and see if we can have a joint-donor approach to certification.

DFID – One caveat is that we need to avoid that it becomes a requirement.

NGO – I have the experience of registering with different donors. Last year we applied for CHF – it took us 2 months or so. Then we registered with AICS. These processes take a lot of time, so it would be good to merge them to avoid the waste of time.

EU - We are doing this with our sub-granting scheme, AICS is a partner to this sub-granting scheme and they will prepare a simplified process for small organisations that are eligible for grants but when Oxfam has an open call for proposal it will be open to everybody. We should encourage certification and we should have a standard approach and make it work for civil society and listen to any concerns. Again we need a platform to discuss this.

NGO – Our accountability towards beneficiaries is not different from donor accountability to their Governments. Bilateral agreements are an opportunity to have more advocacy and pressure on the Afghan Government on behalf of humanitarian actors. The country is suffering and 40% is under the opposition – almost all places are volatile and sometime inaccessible – we as actors we have access with difficult. We expect the donors to advocate with Government to facilitate our work. We work with different line Ministries and we face challenges – we want donors to help us and support us through their bi-lateral relations with the Afghan Government and to put pressure on them as we are here for humanitarian reasons.

NGO – Regarding co-funding, this is expensive and difficult for local NGOs. It is difficult to find 50% co-funding so we propose that donors reflect on this. How can local NGOs be excluded from this requirement? Secondly, information can be very difficult to find on Embassy websites, such as the Germany Embassy website. Thirdly, for on-budget funding, I would like to add that when NGOs are bidding for Government contracts, then NGOs cannot always combat the corruption because we are now working with Government. If you raise concerns about corruption, then you cannot participate in the bidding. Also some of those Afghans in the RFP teams are also freelancing as proposal writers. Also WB talks about lump sum in health but Government does not understand this, the Ministries go for lengthy procedures and micro-management, there is no flexibility for partners. The World Bank says you can do anything with your lump sum for the beneficiaries but Government does not permit this. So when donors put their money on budget we are not against it but it should be managed in a transparent way, it should not affect us negatively and all rules and procedures should be implemented.

NGO – If there is a negative image with the Government and the public - perhaps there is a need for capacity building of NGOs how to handle and utilize media in order to project a positive image of organisations and the success stories of the interventions. And in M&E we cannot go 40% of country but we do not hear about peace building initiatives and we accept that the country will be in conflict for a long time so we are trying to deliver services. Civil Society also has a role to play in peace building and we have had that in the past but I hear less about that now.

NGO – I am from a disability organisation – we see the funding and RFPs covering different thematic areas but not for disability so it is a challenge to go for the proposal because the language is difficult – many disability organisations are closing down. We would like donors to help in our sector as the number of people with injuries and disabilities is increasing and the funds decreasing, so we face a lot of challenges.

NGO - We are an experienced women's organisation and we have worked strategically in Afghanistan, we have stayed in the same provinces at least for 10 years working in the community. This is our success but now considering all the challenges I am afraid that we may have to stop our activities due to funding challenges and give the place to new people to start from zero just because they have better access to donors. So regarding transparency and accountability my first question is whether the donor organisations are monitoring their own staff? For example, unfortunately for Tawanmandi we had faced this issue in the Eastern region, our concept and proposal was selected but the regional staff asked for 10% commission from our budget – so this was why our proposal was rejected. This happens with many other donors. Secondly, if we are asked for innovations so why do donors duplicate activities. For example USAID's Promote project is always publicised by the First Lady and promoted as the biggest programme for women in Afghanistan. But do the women's organisations have real access to these funds. We were members of APEC for two rounds, we had good capacity to build others in our zone, but right now all we do is facilitate bringing women from the provinces to the Promote project. We should implement ourselves. The women's Leadership programme is implemented by a USAID contractor (TetraTec) with a huge administrative cost so why can we women's organisations not implement these with a much lower cost? Why do we have big USAID contractors that run these small projects delivering training to women? Also Mushariqat project – this is a duplication of what women's organisations have done for the last 15 years. It is bringing women together to ask them what their challenges are in their provinces and making advocacy groups – so this is what have we been doing so far in our women's networks and organisations. We have been doing this already so why spend more money on zone levels to bring up the same things again. We are asked for financial sustainability and for volunteerism. We are not allowed to make offices at local levels – our trainers should go to the houses of the local community. So why is PROMOTE paying \$5 for a leadership programme for the women to come. It is not for transport costs, as the session is in the same institute, so what is the \$5 daily cost for? So this is the first time I have had an opportunity to ask donors directly these problems.

EU – there were a lot of tough messages here. I have worked closely with Promote and Mushariqat and there was no intention to drive out AWN and other women's organisations. I am concerned that we see the same faces on the panels in the conferences. I have asked some of the women's organisations how much time do you spend in your organisation and with your local and provincial counterparts and how much time do you spend outside the country? So how can you represent your people if you are always outside the country – so this why we have Mushariqat. So I am on the opposite side of this.

USAID – I am not able to answer as I am not the Promote programme manager. With regards to media, we wanted to improve capacity of media to cover the activities of CSOs. We have multi-media centres in different regions to promote this. About PROMOTE and working with CSOs, so far the donor agencies were focusing on building capacity as in IPAC 1 and 2 programmes, now the intention is to focus on advocacy and Mushariqat is a PROMOTE component to look at advocacy. When we have funding to CSOs, we award a large programme – Promote is about 200 million USD – so local CSOs cannot compete. So the prime partners like TetraTec, Counterpart, DAI – they work with local partners and they issue their own RFPs. So CSOs and international NGOs can apply for these grants. In terms of working with new or old CSOs, the focus is to build capacity of emerging CSO

leaders, so after 10 years, CSOs have to apply for these grants and compete. Under ACEP, I have had a number of meetings with Counterpart – one of my concerns is that when they advertise calls for proposals they only have 4 or 5 applications while we have 2,000 registered NGOs across the country. We have to see if there are problems with the criteria, so we need to work with our prime partners to see what needs to be reviewed and adapted.

Norway – for clarification on Tawanmandi I can say that the person who asked for money was not a staff member of the donor but was a contracted project staff. We had a lot of meetings to try and fix the problems in Tawanmandi. It was very difficult to substantiate these claims. We would get a claim of corruption and we would say let's investigate it, and when we asked for evidence the person would stop communicating and step back. Let's put this in the context of Afghanistan – we have to confess there is a lot of duplication going on – the donors always have good intentions. In Tawanmandi we wanted to put together a fund which would be independent. Unfortunately it did not work and all of us have to take some blame. We have to work as a whole and define ourselves. I agree with things said here today - disability is a priority, humanitarian issues and the need for development. Let's see how can we work together.

DFID – part of the issue for donors is not being able to get out to meet communities - so we need you to tell us – so there is a need for whistle-blowing.

NGO – donors also should be more transparent. How do they award contracts? They should treat NGOs equally and make sure competition is open. There are NGOs created with Government links that receive donor funding. So if I am rejected I must know the reason and what mistakes were made.

EU – there is coordination among donors – about 60 groups on the political and cooperation side. We would like to centre coordination around Human Development Councils once they are up and running. Issues like disability and children's rights could be better looked at so you need to push us on this. We have in principle a Human Rights and Gender coordination group where we can raise disability and we also discuss children's rights there. Some other issues are embedded in other forums. Migration is covered with almost too much coordination. On the funding side – we should question in new people coming into our teams – basically our procedures help us to balance this. When I have a CFP I will mix up the team looking at the concept note in the first stage and different people looking at the full proposal in the second stage, to avoid possible corruption. If you have any complaints, please come and see us. I have had some complaints in the past, but when you ask for facts sometimes these allegations do not have substance. If you have something concrete please come forward.

With the discussions on civil society - state relations. We as donors are not in a very good position to advocate with the Government. We have had discussions when we did the road map but we need to have your views on the key issues that need to be tackled – delays in MoUs, NGO laws and bureaucratic impediments.

NGO - There was an initiative by ACBAR to compile all the bureaucratic difficulties and we can start with that.

USAID – we have got ICNL/Counterpart working with Ministry of Economy on the NGO Law. There is a working group for this. Also Counterpart organized Framework for Cooperation conference and invited around 300 CSOs from around the country. We are also working with the Civils Society Joint Working Group which signed a memorandum with the office of the President – so we need to develop this platform.

EU – We are starting to look back at our Civil Society roadmap from 2 years ago and now we would like to consult you again and see what needs to be done moving ahead. Please tell us how we could do this in a meaningful and structured manner so that 90% of organisations feel somehow represented in the dialogue as well as including regional CSOs. We will send you the Civil Society road map and hold discussions with you in workshops and seek solutions together with the other donors.

NGO – I have a solution for on-budget funding; the money that the Government does not spend, you should ask for it to be given back, and then give it to the NGOs!

NGOs – best practice for NGOs most of us INGOs depend on HQs to get proposals but best practice to give us result on time, sometimes we wait a long time and the context has changed. We need to have a clear timeframe, then we know and can submit the proposal to another donor.

NGO - A practical suggestion – co-funding should be explained with clear instructions. As an example, German Government funding required 30% co-funds, but for Afghanistan it is only 10%. However when we applied, we only then learnt that this co-funding was not permitted from other institutional donors – only private funds. If the instructions had been clearer then it would have been easier.

11. Final thoughts

Q: What are donors taking away with them at the end of this meeting?

Norway - Frustration probably but we need to clarify things among ourselves and appreciate the problems. I will work on the WB – we are doing an external review of the ARTF so we should look at flexibility so we will see what we can do that.

EU - I will take away that we just have to have more contact with CSOs in this type of forum and with other donors on how we can support CSOs in terms of funding and with the Government on how to create a proper enabling environment. I hope things we discuss here will lead to more funding for Civil Society next year and I think the colleagues here responsible for budget support also are supportive of Civil Society. With more budget support, donors have greater access to the Government, so we can advocate for Civil Society as well. We had a workshop on gender budgeting with Gove and took on board several women's organisations. So please reach out to us.

DFID- we are aware of the shrinking availability of funding, we have good structures in place and we need to make use of them, we need to coordinate Civil Society around thematic areas to drive forward the initiatives from the Brussels conference.

USAID – this was very helpful for me, so I would suggest we invite other USAID partners that work with civil society next time so that they can benefit from these discussions and include other Civil Society networks, not just ACBAR members.

Italy /France – it was useful and interesting. There are many meetings so we need to be focused and committed. We are dealing with high level of requirements – politically and financially – so we are under pressure but we are to help you so we will go on doing this.

Germany – we will share the information with our development colleagues and I will request our head office to try and some practical information like a factsheet on our website.

Thank you to donors on behalf of ACBAR members

ACBAR - We want to continue to promote dialogue among our members and with other CS actors, the Government and donors. We will send round a report of the meeting with a factsheet on donor funding possibilities.

12. Annexes:

European Union fact sheet

DFID fact sheet

USAID fact sheet

Norwegian Embassy fact sheet

French Embassy fact sheet

Italian Embassy fact sheet

German Embassy Fact Sheet

European Union

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department: EU Delegation to Afghanistan
- Website: https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan_en
- Key contacts: Sajjad Rahim, Project Manager Human Rights, Civil Society and Gender, Sajjad-Ahmad.RAHIM@eeas.europa.eu
- Michael Steffens, Task Manager Human Rights, Civil Society and Gender, Michael.Steffens@eeas.europa.eu

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality **No**
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **No**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality **No**

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

EIDHR Thematic Instrument: Focus on women rights; leadership development and research

Focus on women, children and human rights defenders. The funding for 2017 will most likely be used on human rights defenders' support. Contracting is currently in discussion.

CSO-Local Authority Thematic instrument: Focus on local authorities

Funding every two years - there was a call in 2016 for CS and 2017 will be dedicated to local authorities. EU is looking at including a CS element in 2017 funding, by having a CSO working on capacity building of the local authorities to respond to population needs and improve service delivery.

Accountability in health and education sector: Sub-granting scheme run by Oxfam Novib

Oxfam Novib will provide up to 16 sub grants to small organization (up to 60 000 euros) as well as capacity building to ensure these organizations are able to manage the fund.

Perspectives for 2018

EU sectors (health, agriculture, security, migration) will not present call for proposals including civil society in 2017, however there could be possibilities in 2018.

Another sub granting scheme focusing on accountability will be established under the CSO-LA instrument in 2018.

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain
 - Your minimum and maximum amount EUR 850 000 to EUR 900 000
 - Your minimum and maximum period (in months, years) 36-48 months
 - Main timeline (main deadlines for allocation etc.) 31/12/2017
 - If you require co-funding? Yes

- If you require consortium or partnership? Yes.
- Any other criteria you would see fit : Preference of local lead partners (higher EU contribution)

5. Funding modalities

- usually 3 year period under a call for proposal;
- minimum and maximum remains undecided for the moment; around EUR 900.000 maximum with the upcoming call for proposals under EIDHR;
- up to a maximum budget of EUR 2 million for local authorities (working with CSOs to provide a capacity-building element)

6. Relevant websites

- EU Delegation to Afghanistan: https://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/afghanistan/area/jobs-funds_en
- Tendering database: <https://webgate.ec.europa.eu/europeaid/online-services/index.cfm?ADSS-Chck=1489053817432&do=publi.welcome&userlanguage=en> (the advanced search function allows screening for eligible countries and open calls for proposals; this database includes also global call for proposals)
- On-going calls for proposals: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/37623_en
- Upcoming call for proposals: https://ec.europa.eu/europeaid/node/37624_en

DFID

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department: UK Embassy / DFID
- Website
https://www.facebook.com/ukinafghanistan/?hc_ref=SEARCH&fref=nf
<https://ukaiddirect.org/>
<https://www.gov.uk/Government/world/organisations/british-embassy-kabul>
- Key contacts
Rosalind Meek: r-meek@dfid.gsx.gov.uk
Karen O'Riordan: K-ORiordan@dfid.gsx.gov.uk

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

Tawanmandi – final phase

6 year program, reaching its final stage (dozen of partners left). Core contribution to build capacity to Afghan CSOs, reached 107 Afghan CSOs across the country.

UK Aid Match – Global Scheme (closed)

Managed at central level (London), focused on Sustainable Goals for Developments (SDGs): malnutrition for under 5, access to family planning, modern slavery

UK Aid Direct – Global Scheme (closed)

Managed at central level (London), Afghanistan is included in the priority list countries. Will be selecting proposal based on their quality and national priorities

British Embassy Kabul – Foreign Office (closed)

3 funds: "Social Cohesion and Counter Extremism", "Strengthening the Role of Women" and "Credible media and governance", Small scales grants looking at innovation, open to everyone.

Integrating CS funding in other programs

DFID Humanitarian Programs include CS funding. DFID also sees gaps in the security sector reform extractives transparency and possibly elections where CS could be involved.

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain

Please see different modalities on our website.

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department:

United States Agency for International Development (USAID), Office of Democracy and Governance (ODG), Civil Society and Media (CSM) Team

- Website: <https://www.usaid.gov/afghanistan>
- ACEP Website: <http://www.counterpart-afg.org/>
- Key contacts: Niaz Gul Afghanyar

Project Management Specialist

USAID's Office of Democracy and Governance (ODG)

E-mail: NAfghanyar@usaid.gov

Office Ext. +93(0)700 11 3034

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

Afghan Civic Engagement Program (ACEP) is 5 years program awarded to Counterpart International in December 2013 and will end in December 2018. The award was made to Counterpart International Inc. in partnership with the Internews Network, the Aga Khan Foundation (AKF), the International Center for Not-for-Profit Law (ICNL), and a host of Afghan civil society organizations (CSOs). The goal of ACEP program is to promote civil society and media engagement that enables Afghan citizen to influence policy, monitor Government accountability, and serve as advocates for political reform.

Request for Applications (RFAs): ACEP provides sub-grants to local civil society organizations (CSOs) and NGOs through competitive process by issuing request for applications (RFAs) where all CSOs will have equal opportunity to apply and compete for resources. Counterpart International, USAID prime implementing partner for this program, issues RFAs regularly for various types of grants to the Afghan CSOs and NGOs and encourage them to apply for these small grants through open and fair competition process. The RFAs are posted on ACBAR website <http://www.acbar.org/REF/> as well as on Counterpart/ACEP website: <http://www.counterpart-afg.org/> and Facebook page: <https://www.facebook.com/Counterpart.Afghanistan/> so that all CSOs/NGOs will have access to these RFAs to apply for ACEP grants and follow the guidance and instructions provided in the RFAs.

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain

ACEP provides various types of grants to local CSOs and NGOs including Youth Activism Grants, Women Peace and Security Grants, Men Supporting Women's Rights/Activism Grants, Government Monitoring Grants, Sub-National Civic Engagement and Outreach Grants, Regional Civic Engagement Grants and grants for Kabul based National Partners. The information about the amount of these grants, period, timeline, cost-sharing and other related criteria are provided in the relevant RFAs.

Norwegian Embassy

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department: Norwegian Embassy
- Website <https://www.norway.no/en/afghanistan>
- Key contacts emb.kabul@mfa.no

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs Yes
 - National NGOs / CSOs No
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs No
 - National NGOs / CSOs Yes
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

Humanitarian and Anti-Corruption

Service delivery

With long term partners that work with CS at grass root level

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain
 - Your minimum and maximum amount
 - Your minimum and maximum period (in months, years)
 - Main timeline (main deadlines for allocation etc.)
 - If you require co-funding
 - If you require consortium or partnership
 - Any other criteria you would see fit:

French Embassy

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department: French Embassy
- Website: <https://af.ambafrance.org/>
- Key contacts: julie.brouillet@diplomatie.gouv.fr

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

NGO desk at the French Development Agency - AFD (Agence Française de Développement)

50 % co-funding, 2-3 funding, unsolicited bidding (currently funding health, infrastructure and rural development)

Social Fund for Development via the program ICSSCP "Innovative civil society and stakeholder coalition projects"

This fund is focused on Afghan civil society actor's capacity building, by strengthening their structure and policies. The second round of the program will be launched end of April 2017.

The program aims to fund small projects that are deeply rooted in local community preferably through a consortium of small and effective or new local CSOs/NGOs, or a partnership between an international NGO and a local one.

Nutrition (still to be confirmed)

2 yearly calls for proposal (December- January and April-May)

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain
 - Your minimum and maximum amount: amount varying for each program/fund
 - Your minimum and maximum period (in months, years): period varying for each program/fund
 - Main timeline (main deadlines for allocation etc.) the second round of the program

ISCCSP will be launched by end of April 2017

- If you require co-funding: 50 % co funding is required for the AFD funded projects.

- If you require consortium or partnership: the projects for the program ISCCSP which use consortium or partnership will be preferred.

- Any other criteria you would see fit: Social Fund for development Projects need to show a financial sustainability approach and the location of the project should be accessible to French Embassy staff (national and foreigners, including security teams) for monitoring purposes.

Italian Embassy

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department: **Italian Agency for Development Cooperation**
- Website: www.aicskabul.org
- Key contacts: segreteria.kabul@aicskabul.org; Ph: +93 (0)797 47 47 45/6

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs Yes
 - National NGOs / CSOs Yes
 - NGOs from a specific nationality No
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs Yes
 - National NGOs / CSOs Yes
 - NGOs from a specific nationality No

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

Sector: Justice and Governance, Micro Finance and Private Sector Development, Agriculture and Rural Development, Gender Equality, Health, Infrastructure, Culture and Education, Migration and Humanitarian aid.

Location: Bagdhis, Herat, Baghlan, Bamyán, Nanghahar, Kabul, Ghor, Badakshan

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain
 - Your minimum and maximum amount - NA
 - Your minimum and maximum period (in months, years) NA
 - Main timeline (main deadlines for allocation etc.) **September**
 - If you require co-funding - No
 - If you require consortium or partnership - No
 - Any other criteria you would see fit

IADC may open Calls for Proposals for local CSOs to provide specific services (e.g. training, grant management, etc) in the framework of projects directly managed by IADC. Local CSOs have to be registered in Afghanistan in order to apply to IADC calls for proposals.

German Embassy

1. Donor information

- Donor's name and department: German Embassy
- Website: www.kabul.diplo.de
- Key contacts:

Head of Economic Cooperation Counsellor Uwe Gehlen:

wz-1@kabu.auswaertiges-amt.de,

Deputy Head of Economic Cooperation First Secretary Ulrike Meier:

wz-2@kabu.auswaertiges-amt.de

Humanitarian Aid First secretary Frank Hichert:

wz-10@kabu.auswaertiges-amt.de,

2. Funding Recipient

- In 2017, your institution will directly fund
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes / no**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes / no**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)
- In 2017 your institution will indirectly fund or create sub grants for
 - International NGOs/ CSOs **Yes / no**
 - National NGOs / CSOs **Yes / no**
 - NGOs from a specific nationality (Please detail)

3. Funding target: beneficiaries / themes

- What sector, type of programs will you fund in 2017:

Concentration on larger project: main German funds are channeled through trust fund, large development implementers (i.e: GIZ) and long term International NGO partners

Human Rights Projects (women, children, access to education and legal aid)

Small scale projects, Afghan CSOs, accept unsolicited proposal

Micro Projects ran by German Embassy

Not humanitarian aid, have to be short term (implementation within the year of funding) but sustainable, over in a few months but with long term impact on local communities. Targeting local NGOs that have expertise in the field of health, education, environment protection. No institutional funding, only project costs

4. Funding modalities

- What type of grants/ funds will you provide? Please explain
 - Your minimum and maximum amount: For Micro Project equivalent of 25 000 Euro max.
 - Your minimum and maximum period (in months, years)
 - Main timeline (main deadlines for allocation etc.) Fiscal year starts in January and finishes in December, and Human Rights Projects have to end by December 2017. For 2017, the embassy has already gone through the funding. For the Micro Projects, application should be submitted as early as possible (before November)
 - If you require co-funding
 - If you require consortium or partnership

Any other criteria you would see fit



 ACBAR

 @ACBAR_AFG

 <http://www.acbar.org>