

Scoping the Viability of a Humanitarian WASH Fund

June 20, 2022

Abbreviations

Central Emergency Response Fund	CERF
Cluster Advocacy and Support Team	CAST
Country-Based Pooled Funds	CBPFs
Disaster Relief Emergency Fund	DREF
Field Support Team	FST
Education Cannot Wait	ECW
Emergency Relief Coordinator	ERC
Global Financing Facility	GFF
Global Health Visions	GHV
Global WASH Cluster	GWC
Humanitarian-Development Nexus	HDN
International Committee of the Red Cross	ICRC
International financial institution	IFI
International nongovernmental organization	INGO
Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development	OECD
Sanitation and Hygiene Fund	SHF
Scaling Up Nutrition	SUN
Sustainable Development Goal	SDG
United Nations	UN
United Nations Children's Fund	UNICEF
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees	UNHCR
United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	UNOCHA
United States dollars	USD
Water Sanitation and Hygiene	WASH
World Health Organization	WHO

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	5
Introduction	6
Literature Review	7
Key Findings	8
Key Parameters to Establish a Humanitarian WASH Fund	13
Conclusion	15
Annex I: Global financing facilities desk research	17
Annex II: Interviewees	32

I. Executive Summary

At a time when the world is grappling with multiple, often converging, humanitarian emergencies—the COVID-19 pandemic, increasing impacts of climate change—the actors of the WASH Roadmap identified the need for the WASH community to come together for decisive action. It's imperative for this community to safeguard progress made and to ensure that communities have the resources needed to survive and thrive during and after these global challenges have been faced, particularly in impoverished communities that are often overlooked among many competing priorities and limited resources. Recognizing capacity, preparedness, and funding are insufficient to meet the priorities and needs of humanitarian challenges, Roadmap actors set out to explore the potential parameters and viability of a fund for humanitarian WASH.

In 2020, Global WASH Cluster partners agreed to address the sector's challenges collectively, through the implementation of the 2020 – 2025 Humanitarian Roadmap. This Roadmap is a set of initiatives aiming to “put into practice new and innovative approaches to save lives, reach public and environmental health outcomes, and build synergies among acute and complex emergencies, humanitarian crises, and long-term development.”¹

Global Health Visions (GHV) partnered with Roadmap actors to support **initiative 4.2: Sector development and strengthening: explore the possibility of a global fund for WASH Humanitarian Sector**. GHV has examined existing global financing facilities and scoped the feasibility, viability, and appetite among key parameters to establish a humanitarian WASH pooled funding mechanism.

The landscaping revealed a number of key benefits to pooled funding mechanisms and key trends that merit further exploration (e.g., evidence supporting the benefits and outcomes of anticipatory versus reactive funding, the potential for pooled funds to support Grand Bargain commitments and advance the localization agenda, etc.).

But overall, there was a fairly low appetite for establishing a new humanitarian WASH fund. While a number of challenges and concerns are detailed in the report, the feedback that was most prominent centered on the following concerns around developing such a fund:

- It would splinter an already fragmented (humanitarian) space; the humanitarian system would not benefit from further segmentation.
- There are too many funds existing already, several of which address humanitarian WASH. Donors largely feel their commitments are covered through existing, trusted funds (a new one would be unproven and potentially duplicative).
- Pooled funding mechanisms bypass and undermine country systems and capacity strengthening.

¹GWC, Delivering Humanitarian WASH at Scale, Anywhere and Any Time, 2020. Available here.

It is the recommendation of Global Health Visions, in agreement with the co-leads of initiative 4.2, to conclude the exploration of a humanitarian WASH fund and to explore alternate avenues to expand and diversify funding and to support research agendas appealing to donors.

I. Introduction

The implementation of the WASH Roadmap relies on innovative approaches and new partnerships to materialize this ambitious vision: “By 2025, the WASH sector will have the capacity and resources to deliver in emergencies at scale, anywhere and at any time.”²

Three key strategies the Roadmap outlines are (1) increasing capacity while ensuring that methods, geography, and timing are accurate); (2) creating and sustaining strong and strategic coordination and partnerships between humanitarian WASH actors and leadership; and (3) ensuring that sufficient financing exists but is also innovative, flexible, and reliable.

Initiative 4.2 seeks to explore if and how a funding facility could join funding from humanitarian and development donors in areas including: 1) first-phase emergency responses 2) multi-year preparedness and resilience 3) overall sector development and capacity building 4) coordination of emergencies.

In this report, GHV seeks to 1) map and analyze other global funds to learn what is relevant for a potential humanitarian WASH fund or other financing facility and 2) define key parameters needed to establish a fund, and assess the feasibility and viability of establishing a humanitarian WASH fund.

A. Methodology and Limitations

The methodology is based on the requirements set out in the initiative 4.2 terms of reference and was refined through consultation with 4.2 initiative leads UNICEF and UNHCR, in close partnership with other Roadmap actors.

The methodologies utilized include:

- **Desk review:** GHV conducted in-depth research on a broad range of financing facilities across sectors, ultimately narrowing down and focusing on eight different financing facilities to identify key parameters, common practices, and considerations for a pooled fund as well as to distill valuable lessons. The desk research on these eight mechanisms included mission, governance structure/operations, key donors, allocation of funds, etc. Annex I provides a table with detailed information on each.

² Delivering Humanitarian WASH at Scale, Anywhere and Any Time, Roadmap for 2020 – 2025 Report. Available [here](#).

- **Multi-partner consultation and surveys:** A virtual multi-partner consultation was held in March 2022 to inform Roadmap participants of the efforts underway for initiative 4.2 and to solicit input.
- **In-depth interviews:** In-depth interviews were carried out with 24 key informant stakeholders including donors, international nongovernmental organizations, and national actors utilizing tailored interview guides developed by GHV and reviewed by initiative 4.2 co-leads.

II. Literature Review

Background on pooled funds:

A. Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs):³ CBPFs are established by the UN Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) in response to a new emergency or declining/underfunded humanitarian situation, enabling governments and private donors to pool their donations into unearmarked funds for humanitarian efforts in a single country. The funds are allocated in alignment with the global humanitarian response plan.⁴ UNOCHA manages 18 CBPFs including those for Pakistan, Afghanistan, Sudan, and Yemen. In 2019, the 18 active CBPFs received \$956 million USD. The top donors included the UK, Germany, Sweden, and the Netherlands (the full list is available [here](#)). Recently, the Start Fund began piloting CBPFs in Bangladesh and Nepal.

CBPFs focus on being swiftly responsive and, as such, are typically directed less toward longer-term efforts such as preparedness, recovery, and infrastructure or other development activities.⁵

- **Key advantages:** The major benefit of humanitarian pooled funds, which would be applicable to a WASH humanitarian fund, is the ability to access flexible funding relatively swiftly and where appropriate, to allocate directly to NGOs and other organizations.⁶ Reports and interviewees suggest that this type of fund enables a more responsive and harmonized approach when compared to bilateral funding for humanitarian assistance.⁷

³ About Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs): Invest in humanity. Available [here](#).

⁴ Ibid

⁵ Stoddard, A., Poole, L., Taylor, G., Willitts-King, B. (2017) *Efficiency and inefficiency in humanitarian financing*. London: Humanitarian Outcomes

⁶ Lattimer, C. and Swithern, S. (2017) *Global humanitarian assistance report 2017*. Bristol: Development Initiatives.

⁷ Carter, B. (2018) *Country-Based Pooled Funds for humanitarian financing*. Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

- **Key limitations:** Limitations⁸ include the unique environment within each country: If processes are convoluted, decision-making is slow, or implementation costs are high, all of these aspects limit the effectiveness of the CBPF. Another limitation is the role of nation-based nongovernmental organizations (NGOs). They are often constrained in their ability to successfully manage long-term, multi-year funding compared to global NGOs.

B. Global anticipation and response funds with soft allocation:⁹ This type of fund entails a rapid response based on “soft” parameters for disbursement. In some instances, these are pooled funds. While initially directed toward rapid emergency response, some funds are evolving toward anticipatory forecasting and action. Three examples include the crisis anticipation window¹⁰ at the Start Fund, the Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF)¹¹ at the International Federation of the Red Cross (IFRC), and the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF).¹²

CERF allocations: In 2021, weather events, conflicts, disease outbreaks, impacts of COVID-19, gender-based violence (GBV), and people with disabilities all received notable allocations.

- **Key advantages:**¹³ Rapid response funding has several advantages given that it tends to be dispersed more swiftly than in an ad hoc approach. Pooled funds can spread out risk across multiple geographies and partners, which allows for responses to emerging and historically underfunded disasters. When responding to underfunded disasters, this type of pooled fund is often seen as a bridge from a rapid response to the anticipation of longer-term financing provided by other donors. Another advantage of rapid response is that it can divert some negative impact from impending disasters because of its quick response (e.g., in a drought).
- **Key limitations:** This type of funding relies on proactive and available funding, which can be difficult to secure from donors. Because of this limitation, there’s a limited number of organizations that provide this type of funding (e.g., CERF, DREF, the Start Fund), and many governments do not rely on this method as part of an integrated strategy.

⁸ Stoddard, A. (2017) *International humanitarian financing: review and comparative assessment of instruments*, updated edn. London: Humanitarian Outcomes

⁹ Willitts-King, Barnaby; Weingärtner, Lena; Pichon, Florence; Spencer, Alexandra (2020): Risk-informed approaches to humanitarian funding: Using risk finance tools to strengthen resilience, ODI Report, Overseas Development Institute (ODI), London

¹⁰ Start Network Crisis Anticipation Window Learning Framework. Available [here](#).

¹¹ Disaster Relief Emergency Fund. Available [here](#).

¹² The Start Fund Learning Framework: Crisis Anticipation Window.

¹³ Stoddard, A. (2017) *International humanitarian financing: review and comparative assessment of instruments*, updated edn. London: Humanitarian Outcomes

III. Key Findings

A. Trends

A number of key trends emerged through informant interviews, revealing important considerations around pooled funding.

- I. **Anticipation and risk financing:** There is a growing body of evidence indicating that action prior to the onset of an emergency or “predictable shock” is considerably swifter, more cost-effective, and even potentially more dignified when compared to traditional humanitarian responses. Further, we are increasingly able to forecast with confidence both the occurrence and the resulting impacts of certain shocks.¹⁴ Ultimately, in light of the ever-increasing complexity and frequency of humanitarian crises, this approach aims to counter the sluggish response to often-predictable shocks.¹⁵

As noted in the *Introduction* section, there are numerous funds integrating anticipatory pooled funding into their funding windows. Several examples are provided below and additional details are provided in Annex I.

- a. **OCHA-facilitated anticipatory action portfolio:** CERF provides funding for OCHA-facilitated anticipatory action pilots, which complements its Rapid Response (RR) and Underfunded Emergencies (UFE) windows.

In 2020, OCHA facilitated the development of five collective anticipatory action pilots: Bangladesh (monsoon floods), Ethiopia (drought), Malawi (dry spells/floods), Somalia (drought), and Chad (preliminary work). In 2021, the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) selected six more pilots: Burkina Faso, Madagascar, Nepal, Niger, the Philippines, and South Sudan. Through the pilot programs, as the anticipatory funding approach is still nascent, OCHA is evaluating if 1) collective anticipatory humanitarian action at scale works, and whether the anticipatory approach leads to a 2) faster, 3) more efficient (cheaper), and 4) more dignified response.¹⁶

- b. **The Start Network:** In addition to underfunded small and medium crises, and funding for “spike” or an escalation within a chronic humanitarian emergency, Start also provided forecast and early action funding for impending crises, aiming to take a responsive approach rather than a reactive one. Start’s rapid response window enables Start funds to be dispersed within 24 hours, taking a “no regrets”

¹⁴ UNOCHA: Anticipatory Action. Available [here](#).

¹⁵ Start Network: Timely Funding for Predictable Crises. Available [here](#).

¹⁶ Ibid

approach (i.e., funds are returned if the crisis is averted). Start is working closely with a range of academics, analysts, and experts to inform anticipatory action, such as in the Forecast-Based Warning, Analysis, and Response Network (FOREWARN).

While there's growing evidence around the clear benefits of anticipation and risk financing, there are challenges that must be carefully considered in assessing the viability of forming a fund with an anticipatory funding approach. First, this type of funding requires a diverse and highly technical set of experts (e.g., reading weather systems, disease epidemiology, etc.). With conflict forecasting, forecasting variables is particularly tricky as the situation evolves swiftly and variables change. Further, assessing and interpreting data and then swiftly translating it into project activities requires a heavy lift and ample capacity. Finally, this landscaping revealed that donors remain largely resistant to anticipatory funding, instead maintaining a preference for a "wait and see" approach at this stage.

- II. Localization agenda:** As a key component of the Grand Bargain, the localization workstream aims to ensure that 25% of global humanitarian funding is directed to local and national responders (by 2020). Further, the Grand Bargain commitments on localization include making better use of funding tools that expand and enhance assistance by local and national responders, including UN-led CBPFs, IFRC, DREF. etc.¹⁷ Among the current relevant pooled funds, the Country-Based Pooled Funds, which to some extent bridge the development-humanitarian nexus, have the clearest mandate and flexibility to direct funds to local and national actors.¹⁸ A recent review on "*Enhancing the Potential of Pooled Funds for Localisation*" identified several key recommendations for pooled funds, which merit consideration if establishing a new fund, including:¹⁹
- The need to address the inequities and inconsistencies in how pooled funds and partners contribute to the overhead costs of local and national actors.
 - The need for pooled funds and their donors to recognize the greater investment required for capacity strengthening. This ensures that local and national actors are positioned to be the "*best placed*" actors to receive funds.

Interviewees indicated that, increasingly, final decisions are being made as locally as possible. Project selection is done by people within the country, where they know the

¹⁷ Desk Review on Enhancing the Potential of Pooled Funds for Localisation Final Report. September 2020. Available [here](#).

¹⁸ Desk Review on Enhancing the Potential of Pooled Funds for Localisation Final Report. September 2020. Available [here](#).

¹⁹ Ibid

local context nuance. For some pooled funding mechanisms, advancing the localization agenda is central to the mandate. For example, the Start Network aims to “*catalyze a locally-led humanitarian system by enabling a diverse ‘network of networks’ that ensures equity in power and decision-making, access to resources, and voice and visibility for its local members.*” Start is approaching this aim through a number of pathways including: incubating a network of locally-led, self-governing national and regional hubs; decentralizing and distributing governance and decision-making to hubs; and using local decision-making to select projects based on contextual knowledge.²⁰

A number of interviewees underscored the challenges and complexities in integrating the localization agenda into a pooled fund. For example, for some headquarters-based funds, without assurance procedures for agencies operating in the field, there are limitations. Other challenges are elaborated on below.

B. Benefits of a Pooled Fund

There was broad consensus among interviewees that pooled funds generally have the following key attributes or benefits:

- **Nimble and rapid response:** Pooled funds typically have the ability to swiftly respond to immediate needs or gaps not met by traditional funding pathways. There is clear consensus that preparedness is the single greatest advantage of existing funds responding to humanitarian emergencies.
- **Supports Grand Bargain commitments:** As noted above under the *Trends* section, pooled funds enable more flexible funding and can support elements of the localization agenda, both central to Grand Bargain commitments. According to some interviewees, pooled funds are better able to support local actors and decision-making.
- **Flexibility for implementation:** Pooled funding often gives implementing organizations more leeway than earmarked projects.
- **Magnified impact:** Where there are clear objectives and funding is sustainable, what can be achieved goes beyond what single donors can do alone.
- **Builds diversity:** When collaboration is strong, pooled funds can bring diversity of perspectives and expertise.

²⁰ The Start Network: Locally led action. Available [here](#).

- **Enhances coordination:** Pooled funds can provide a coordinating role (e.g., consolidating asks, coming together at key moments, etc.). As one interviewee articulated, *“coordination and alignment go beyond the value of a dollar amount.”*

In considering the potential for a humanitarian WASH fund, a few interviewees identified a number of potential benefits, including:

- **Rallying around a common agenda:** Such a fund could provide the UN and global collaborative system a framework to organize around shared agenda. Further, a fund could advance an advocacy agenda, raising awareness among donors in a crowded space (i.e., humanitarian/emergencies), which might be particularly valuable for humanitarian WASH advocacy, which has historically been disjointed.
- **Addressing the nexus:** A pooled fund could deliberately address the nexus of development and humanitarian WASH and dismantle silos and funding cycles which are persistent barriers to smooth transitions between.

C. Challenges and Concerns Regarding a New Pooled Fund

The challenges or concerns raised by interviewees, fell broadly into two buckets: 1) concerns with pooled funds generally and 2) specific concerns about a humanitarian WASH fund.

Broadly, concerns and challenges identified regarding pooled funds most frequently included:

- **Insufficient accountability, transparency and reporting:** Lack of transparent reporting is a key barrier for donors. As one articulated, *“we don’t really know where the money is going.”* For donors, one of the principal limitations of pooled funds and greatest hesitancy to engage in another fund, is the inability to direct funds. For fund administrators and implementors, it is cumbersome to adhere to different reporting requirements of different donors. While it may not be viable to have many different sets of reporting structures, the trade-off with a uniform approach is reduced transparency and visibility.
- **Complexity of coordination and bureaucracy:** The vast majority of interviewees consistently emphasized the concern that pooled funds can largely be moving money around, not growing it. The administrative burden and bureaucracy of coordinating a pooled fund is seen to detract significantly from the value (e.g., meetings, replenishment, bilateral donor relationships etc.) and in the view of many, the benefit does not outweigh the cost. Further, the optics of administrative overhead (i.e., human and financial resources directed towards administering a fund), versus reaching a consumer raise concerns. Depending on the size and ambitions of a fund, this administrative overhead can be immense. Numerous interviewees emphasized that the transaction costs for pooled funds are significant and rising.

- **Undermining country capacity and systems:** Several interviewees underscored that the surplus of pooled funds are in fact undermining capacity at the country level, by bypassing country systems. This is seen by some as detrimental as the pooled funds essentially disincentivize the building of country capacity at every level.

The primary challenges or concerns raised specific to the development of a humanitarian WASH fund include:

- **Redundancy:** Some donors feel that their long-standing contributions to humanitarian WASH are covered under well-established donations to existing funds (e.g., CERF, DREF, Start, etc.). And some do not support parceling out sectors further.
- **Lack of necessity or value:** Some donors and implementors do not see a gap or need for a specific humanitarian WASH fund. While others who *do* see a need to grow humanitarian WASH funding did not see a pooled fund as the means to achieve this. Interviewees noted that establishing a pooled fund will not necessarily diversify donors or expand funds but will certainly increase administrative burden. As one interviewee underscored, *“what we need is more money in the sector, not a new way to organize it.”*
- **Difficulty of equitable selection:** A number of interviewees raised concerns that protracted crisis could dominate such a fund (e.g., Yemen), and it would be difficult, political, and potentially divisive to determine which countries or emergencies are prioritized.
- **Quality dimensions present unique obstacles:** The quality dimension is a leading issue in humanitarian WASH. As interviewees noted, it *“gets hard and expensive very quickly.”* There are concerns around parceling humanitarian sectors generally, but more emphatic concerns around a highly technical sector with quality control as a central issue (versus the education sector, for example).
- **Requires broad endorsement from the humanitarian sector to succeed:** The nexus space and resilience space are highly political. As such, developing such a fund would require a strong endorsement from the broader humanitarian sector or risk fostering competition.

IV. Key Parameters to Establish a Humanitarian WASH Fund

There are many parameters to consider in weighing the viability and feasibility of establishing a new humanitarian WASH fund. In Annex I, GHV has detailed the approaches of eight funds toward these parameters, in order to illustrate their complexities. While not exhaustive, key parameters for consideration include:

- **Mission/mandate:** There are a number of existing pooled funds that already include humanitarian WASH (e.g., DREF, CERF, Start, etc.). It would be critical to develop a

differentiated mission and identity, distinct from existing funds, to avoid both duplication and confusion.

- **Founding partners:** Determining who the founding partner will be is a crucial decision point. To make the fund viable, there will likely need to be sizable “heavy hitter” partners at the level of the World Bank, WHO, UN, or the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation.
- **Host organization:** The selection of a host organization is a critical decision point. There is broad consensus that a new fund would likely not be a standalone fund (e.g., Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance). Many of the funds assessed in this landscaping are hosted within the UN system, while others are hosted by an INGO or IFI (e.g., the Global Financing Facility is hosted by the World Bank). There are benefits and limits to each setup.
- **Governance:** Governance typically involves responsibility for fundraising, coordinating/approving programs and disbursements, strategic/policy development, oversight on monitoring and evaluation, legal and financial management, etc. Most funds have a Board of Directors or Trustees providing oversight, and some are member-driven (e.g., Start Network).
- **Operations:** Often a Secretariat or staff manages day-to-day operations. Interviewees at existing funds underscored that those operations can be administratively complex and require ample human resources, and that transaction costs are elevating.
- **Donors and business model:** Most funds are heavily funded by governments. Other donors typically include multilateral development banks, INGOs, the private sector, and foundations. Interviewees underscored that without securing a very large primary donor, the viability of a new fund would be limited. It is critical to shape a sound business model, which includes persuading sovereign donors to invest in the fund, developing a balanced risk portfolio, etc.
- **Fiduciary principles:** The bar for setting robust fiduciary principles, ranging from accounting to environmental impact to social impact, is increasingly rising, according to key informants.
- **Type of funding window(s):** In alignment with the fund’s mandate, the fund would need to determine the most appropriate and impactful funding windows (e.g., rapid onset emergencies, underfunded emergencies, multi-year resilience, forecast/anticipatory funding, etc.).

- **Allocation:** There is a need to determine both the method of allocation (e.g., grants, loans, national hubs, etc.) as well as the principles of allocation. Interviewees agree that while extremely challenging to eliminate, minimizing bias and ensuring equity and transparency are key. As one interviewee articulated, *“allocation should be transparent and purely performance-based.”* There’s also the determination of a **country eligibility model** (e.g., fragility considerations, GNP, WB fragility index, etc.).
- **Technical mechanism for review:** A humanitarian WASH fund will require the establishment of a technical mechanism for review to potentially forecast as well as to determine the best placed organization to lead the response. This is likely to include, at a minimum, expert technical guidance and in-country intelligence. For humanitarian WASH, the number and complexity of emergencies or “shocks” will likely require access to many different technical areas of expertise (e.g., weather, climate, epidemiology, protection, etc.).
- **Reporting protocols:** One of the most significant potential challenges of pooled funds is the complexity of reporting to numerous donors with varied requirements. Some funds have taken a uniform reporting approach to minimize complexity and the burden of different donor requirements (e.g., Education Cannot Wait), while others have a dedicated team for donor engagement and reporting.
- **Disbursement mechanism for commodities:** The disbursement mechanism for key commodities is a critical logistic consideration. Key questions include: How can these commodities be forecasted, stockpiled, and activated very quickly? Can sufficient supply be generated? Which tools and commodities fall within scope?

V. Conclusion

Among the key informants consulted, there was an overall low appetite for developing a new humanitarian WASH fund. In some cases, very strong concerns were raised about the benefits, viability, and impact of such a fund. It is the recommendation of Global Health Visions, in agreement with the co-leads of initiative 4.2, to conclude the exploration of a humanitarian WASH fund and to explore alternate avenues to expand and diversify funding and to support research agendas appealing to donors.

Potential alternative avenues to explore may include:

- **Links to other relevant Roadmap initiatives**
 - Align the development of the research agenda under initiative 1.5 with evidence gaps identified by donors and agencies consulted for this landscaping (e.g., need

for more evidence on outcomes resulting from anticipatory versus reactive funding, need for WASH resilience and WASH climate resilience research).

- Align with and feed into initiative 4.3 in the development of an advocacy strategy to broaden and diversify donors.
- **Explore other novel pathways to expand humanitarian WASH financing**
 - private sector matching for bilateral funding
 - linking with other sectors (e.g., climate change funds)
 - seek investors with interest in social impact

Annex I: Global financing facilities desk research

Financing facilities researched:

1. Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)
2. Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF)
3. Education Cannot Wait (ECW)
4. Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (Gavi)
5. Global Financing Facility (GFF)
6. The Sanitation and Hygiene Fund (SFH)
7. Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN) Pooled Fund
8. START Network

Key information included for each entity:

- Background
- Governance structure/operations
- Key donors
- Allocation of funds
- Other notable information

1. Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF)

Founded:	Established by the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) in 2006
By whom:	Day-to-day operations are carried out by the CERF Secretariat, which ensures that fund allocations are timely and appropriately disbursed and that reporting is transparent and fosters accountability.
Governance:	The CERF advisory group lends expertise and policy guidance to the Secretary-General on the use and impact of CERF. The Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator (USG/ERC) manages CERF's day-to-day operations on the Secretary-General's behalf. ¹
Mission/overview:	Provides seed funds to jump-start critical relief operations and fund life-saving programs not covered by other donors.
Funding allocation:	Donors contribute to CERF prior to urgent needs arising and CERF then pools the funds into a singular fund. Humanitarian needs (including water and sanitation, shelter, food, and medicine) are identified by aid works at the country level. UN agencies and partners prioritize relief activities and then formalize a request for CERF funding via the top UN

	<p>official in the respective country. Based on expert guidance and intelligence from aid workers in-country, the Emergency Relief Coordination (ERC)² distributes funds to relief organizations.</p> <p>CERF has two funding windows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CERF’s Rapid Response Window funds³ are made available to UN agencies and partners at the onset of an emergency and typically must be spent within six months. This window allows country teams to kick-start time-crucial relief efforts immediately in a coordinated response. The provision of funds is a country-driven process. The reasons for allocating Rapid Response funds include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sudden-onset emergencies 2. A rapid or significant deterioration of an existing humanitarian situation 3. Time-critical interventions • CERF’s window for Underfunded Emergencies helps scale up and sustain protracted relief operations to avoid critical gaps when no other funding is available.⁴ Twice a year, the ERC⁵ allocates grants to selected countries from the underfunded emergencies window. The ERC relies on selection criteria, including the level of funding, humanitarian needs, risk, and vulnerability; UN agencies’ recommendations; consultations with UN agencies and other stakeholders; and a review of documents such as Humanitarian Needs Overviews. The reasons for allocating Underfunded Emergencies are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To ensure a rapid response to sudden-onset emergencies or to rapidly deteriorating conditions in an existing emergency. 2. To support humanitarian response activities within an underfunded emergency. <p>Additionally, CERF is currently piloting funding for Anticipatory Action, which complements the two other funding windows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2020, OCHA facilitated the development of five anticipatory action pilots: Bangladesh; Ethiopia; Malawi; Somalia; and Chad. • In 2021, the ERC selected six more pilots: Burkina Faso; Madagascar; Nepal; Niger; the Philippines; and South Sudan.
Donors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • UN Member States and observers, regional governments, corporate donors, foundations, and individuals. • Contributions by donor can be found here.
Allocation summary:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USD \$638.5 million in 2021

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$5.5 billion total since inception
--	---

2. Disaster Relief Emergency Fund (DREF)⁶

Founded:	Established in 1985
By whom:	International Federation of Red Cross (IFRC)
Mission:	The mission of the IFRC is to inspire, encourage, facilitate, and promote at all times all forms of humanitarian activities by National Societies.
Governance:	IFRC (International Federation of Red Cross)
Donors:	There are not many details given about the names of donors toward DREF specifically. However, funds donated through IFRC cross over to fund DREF. The IFRC also holds an Annual Fundraising Cycle for DREF specifically.
Funding allocation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rapid funding comes from a central pot toward small- to medium-sized disasters that often go unnoticed. • Central pot of funding, in which funds are released, go immediately to in-country INGOs and local organizations. • Allocation goal: to reach an allocation of Swiss Franc (CHF) 100M to each National Societies (NS) annually (by 2025). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ National Societies are locally led organizations that are a part of Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies present in almost every country. NS consist heavily of country-based volunteers/staff.⁷ • There are two mechanisms for funding allocations. Both are demand-driven and open to the NS members (192) who submit applications (including an action plan), which demonstrates local priorities/needs. The two mechanisms are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Loans: startup funds for IFRC/NS to respond to large-scale disasters, to be later reimbursed by donor contributions via an emergency appeal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ IFRC Emergency Appeals⁸ are launched for big, complex disasters for long-term support. These allow for donations to go directly to specific emergencies. ○ Grants: for small to medium disasters, no emergency appeal is required, or additional financial support is not needed.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports over 100 small to medium disasters each year. • Forecast-based Action (FbA) by DREF is another funding mechanism that allows NS to take proactive action in anticipation of the occurrence of disasters. The FbA uses meteorological forecasts and risk analysis to attempt to get ahead of any occurring disaster. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Total budget: CHF 600M. ○ Early Action Protocols (EAPs)⁹ (formal plans) produced by NS, for a five-year duration.
WASH	<p>WASH is one of the key areas of focus under the <i>Health and Care</i> pillar of the fund. DREF focuses on emergency WASH, development WASH, and public health WASH. The WASH approach includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Infrastructure: building infrastructure (e.g., toilets, water pumps) and building and repairing sewer systems, water storage, and water treatment facilities. • Hygiene promotion, behavior change, and community support for management of WASH facilities.
Resources:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DREF website • WASH focus areas can be found here

3. Education Cannot Wait (ECW)¹⁰

Founded:	2016
By whom:	ECW was launched during the World Humanitarian Summit by international humanitarian and development aid actors, together with donors and the private sector.
Mission/overview:	ECW aims to elevate education as a key priority in humanitarian emergency response. To better collaborate/coordinate in emergencies via flexible funding, less bureaucracy, national ownership, and a holistic approach for both immediate and long-term needs toward education.
Governance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hosted by UNICEF (manages financial, HR, and admin rules/regulations). • Independent governance structure: High-level Steering Group (provides strategic guidance to fund operations) – hosted at the ministerial level.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Chair: UN Special Envoy for Global Edu – Rt. Hon Gordon Brown ○ Other partner organizations: UN Agency Heads, multi-lateral agencies, CEOs of CSOs/foundations, private sector – all are part of the Fund’s Executive Committee ● Day-to-day activities are managed by – Secretariat under the direction of Director Yasmine Sherif.
<p>Donors:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Total: 21 donors ● Heavily funded by governments/several NGOs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ UK: USD \$16.1M ○ Germany: USD \$136.8M ○ Denmark, Norway, USA: USD \$80-90M each ○ Canada, EU, Lego Foundation, Netherlands, and Sweden: USD \$30-60M each ○ Under USD \$15M: 11 additional grantees – six governments, five NGOs – totaling USD \$57M
<p>Funding allocation</p>	<p>Funding is allocated via three outlets:¹¹</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First Emergency Response: supports education programs immediately with sudden disaster or crisis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rapid funding with inter-agency coordination proposal (including internal planning/RM strategies – Flash Appeals/Humanitarian Response Plans) ▪ Time limit: 12 months maximum ▪ Coordination at country-level via ECW coordination body ▪ No unsolicited proposals are accepted 2. Multi-year Resilience: long-term needs via multi-year joint programs for crisis humanitarian/development actors to work together in delivering five priority areas (listed below*) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collaborative approach for protracted crisis countries – joint analysis, multi-year planning, joint-programming; Integrates immediate, medium, and long-term aspects. ▪ Strategic Plan, 2018-2021 aims for 25 priority countries, grantees selected by ECW Task Force at the country level. <p><i>*Five Priority Areas:¹²</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>“Access: Ensure that crisis-affected children are provided with continuous quality learning</i>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>“Equity and Gender Equality: Leave no one behind and ensure access is provided to the most vulnerable children, including girls and children with disabilities</i> ▪ <i>“Continuity: Ensure children stay in school until they complete their education</i> ▪ <i>“Protection: Make sure that schools and learning centers offer a safe, protective, and healing environment to crisis-affected children</i> ▪ <i>“Quality: Improve learning outcomes by focusing on curriculum, teachers’ capacities, and learning materials”</i> <p>3. Acceleration Facility: research/data collection for advancing best practices/promoting innovation, learning outcomes, gender-targeted education interventions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Support broader efforts that contribute to education preparedness, crisis planning/response ii. Strategy is ongoing iii. Calls for proposals will be announced on their website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seed funding/program implementation is via selected partners only. • Funding covers humanitarian aid to development assistance within an escalation of crisis, continuing through all stages from post-crisis and sustainable development with all three outlets. • Grants in numbers: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2017: 42 grants (Totaling: \$173.5M) 2. 2018: 70 grants (Totaling: \$329.2M) 3. 2019: 139 grants (Totaling: \$712.6M) 4. 2020: 167 grants (Totaling: \$1,717M)
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website • 2018-2021 Strategic Plan • High-level Steering Committee Terms of Reference

4. Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization (Gavi)

Founded:	2000
By whom (Founding partners):	WHO, UNICEF, World Bank (WB), Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation (BMGF)

<p>Mission/overview:</p>	<p>To save lives and safeguard health by increasing equitable and sustainable use of vaccines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Selective/specific purpose: vaccinates almost half the world’s children against deadly and debilitating infectious diseases. • Ultimate goal: countries to transition out of Gavi support program once sustainable, robust systems/decision-making is in place in the country.
<p>Governance:¹³</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Day-to-day operations: Gavi Secretariat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ CEO across six departments (responsibilities below*) ○ Deputy CEO, six managing directors (one per department) ○ Responsibilities include: fundraising, coordinating/approving programs and disbursements, strategic/policy development, M&E, legal and financial management, and support for Gavi Board and committees • Gavi Board: provides strategic direction, policy-making, and operates as the supreme governing body <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 28 members, chaired by Jose Manuel Barroso <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consists of partner organizations, experts in private sector ▪ Permanent Seats: reserved for founding partners ▪ Others: serve on a limited-time basis ▪ 18 “representative” seats consisting of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nine seats of the 18 are purposely chosen to be independent/unaffiliated individuals (no professional affiliation to Gavi’s work to bring balance/scrutiny), • The Gavi CEO has one seat. ▪ Each entity is allowed one alternative member.
<p>Donors:¹⁴</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Donors are primarily governments • 90 donors total
<p>Funding allocation:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant cycle:¹⁵ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eligible countries can apply if they need assistance within the following: support for health system strengthening (HSS), vaccines, cold chain equipment, or targeted country assistance (TCA). ○ There are three opportunities a year for countries to request for new/enhanced support to be added

	<p>to their current portfolio (requests are reviewed by Independent Review Committee).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Matching Fund:¹⁶ multiplies private sector partner funding by doubling their investment; founded in 2011 – by BMGF/DFID (pledged \$111M in total between 2011-2015) and resulted in an additional USD \$210M in funding.
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website • 2021-2025 strategy • COVAX – Gavi is integral in leading the global vaccination process against COVID-19 via procurement and equal distribution across all countries

5. Global Financing Facility (GFF)

Founded:	July 2015
By whom (operations):	Financing for Development Conference by the UN, WB
Mission/overview:	GFF supports 36 low and lower-middle income countries with catalytic financing and technical assistance to develop and implement prioritized national health plans to scale up access to affordable, quality care for women, children, and adolescents.
Governance:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hosted by the World Bank • Investor’s Group:¹⁷ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consists of governments, CSOs, private sector, UN Agencies, Gavi, Global Fund ○ 35 members across youth/private sector/CSO constituencies ○ Meet multiple times per year • GFF Trust Fund:¹⁸ operationally connected to International Development Association (IDA)/International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sets strategic funding approach and priorities, including the annual GFF Secretariat work plan and budget ○ Maximizes IDA/IBRD funds and domestic funding ○ Funding from domestic government resources (GFF countries), IDA/IBRD, external funding, private sector • GFF Secretariat:¹⁹ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Leads day-to-day operations (has larger staff setup) ○ Leads GFF multi-donor Trust Fund

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provides technical assistance, analytical work for GFF countries/programs/projects ○ Leads global engagement ○ Supports M&E
Donors: ²⁰	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Significant government donors: Burkina Faso; Canada; Cote d’Ivoire; Denmark; Germany; Japan; Netherlands; Norway; Qatar; and the United Kingdom. ● Private sector: BMGF; Susan T. Buffet Foundation; EC; Laedral Global Health; MSD for Mothers; and Rockefeller Foundation. ● Other entities have aligned their priorities with specific GFF country investment case priorities – WHO, other UN agencies, Gavi, the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria, etc.
Funding allocation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● GFF Trust Fund: (connected to IDA/IBRD) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Is funded by a mixture of GFF country domestic government resources, IDA/IBRD, external funding, and private sector. ● The GFF allocates small amounts of funding to catalyze on other mechanisms to create and leverage greater pools of funding (including IDA, IBRD, external resource mobilization, private sector) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The GFF utilizes the concept of “smart financing” – hoping that by giving a modest amount of funding to an eligible country, then the country will utilize their own domestic funds to add into the implementation, hoping to create sustainability within that geography. Many of the GFF-eligible countries already receive IDA/IBRD funds, which can be coupled with GFF funds for greater financing. ● Currently 36 GFF countries²¹ of 67 on IDA/IBRD World Bank (WB) list. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Each country that receives GFF funding is considered an investment case²² (details the change a country wants to see around RMNCH). ● Funding disbursement goes through the WB platform.
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Website ● Fact Sheet ● Concept Note (Sept 25, 2014) ● Operationalizing the GFF model (2019)

6. The Sanitation and Hygiene Fund (SFH)

Founded:	Launched in November 2020 by UN Deputy Secretary General, Ms. Amina J. Mohammed.
Mission/overview: ²³	<p>To achieve universal access to sanitation, hygiene, and menstrual health for all. SFH focuses on the “SH” of WASH. It centers on country priorities and addresses complex issues impeding the sanitation economy. SFH aims to scale up investments for sanitation services and drive billions of dollars into the sanitation sector. SFH seeks to disperse USD \$2B over the next 5 years.²⁴</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SFH supports countries through the process of identifying, navigating, and benefiting from innovative financing opportunities by aligning countries that need investment with funders. • Works with countries to develop or update a national investment case and financing strategy. • Focuses on off-grid rural or semi-urban infrastructure, not large-scale hygiene/sanitation infrastructure (e.g., sewer systems). • Four strategic objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expanding household sanitation ○ Menstrual health and hygiene for all ○ Ensuring sanitation/hygiene in schools and health facilities ○ Supporting innovative sanitation solutions
By whom:	Sits within the UN; managed by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS)
Governance: ²⁵	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SFH Board consists of members across different sectors (including UN Leadership) on a voluntary/honorary basis. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Board approves strategy, allocations to eligible countries; provides areas for growth, greater impact, and strategic advice. • UNOPS provides HR, legal, in-country representation and insight; Fund is managed per UNOPS systems and processes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Audits per UNOPS and regulated by Executive Board.²⁶ • Small staff (leadership consists of two staff).
Donors:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public-private partnership – working with governments to do business differently, while private sector companies provide financing. • Utilize multilateral development banks (MDBs) to leverage their concessional lending windows with the SHF grant

	financing, having MDBs provide technical and financial support. ²⁷
Funding allocation:	<No information>
Resources:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website • SFH Strategy 2022-2025

7. Scaling Up Nutrition Movement (SUN) Pooled Fund

Founded:	The SUN Movement Pooled Fund was established in 2017.
By whom:	Hosted by UNOPS by providing operational and administrative support.
Mission/overview:	The SUN Movement Pooled Fund serves to accelerate actions and sustainable change in countries. The fund is a grant program to allocate funding to Civil Society Networks (CSNs) in SUN countries to support their efforts to end malnutrition. The SUN Movement Pooled Fund came about from the earlier Multi-Partner Trust Fund (MPTF), established in 2012 to scale up nutrition. ²⁸
Governance:	Hosted by UNOPS by providing operational and administrative support.
Donors:	CIDA, IrishAid, Swiss Government
Funding allocation:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grants are administered by UNOPS. • The fund is used as a last resort, catalytic source of grant funding to SUN Civil Society Alliance activities. Allocation is made at the recommendation of SUN CSN members, who sit at the national and sub-national levels. • By 2020, the pooled fund had allocated roughly USD \$18.5M from a beginning of USD \$3M in 2017. • The pooled fund supports multi-stakeholder and the multi-sectoral platforms in SUN countries through two funding windows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Window 1: focuses on strengthening participation among non-state actors across multi-stakeholder platforms (i.e., the SUN CSAs). ○ Window 2: focuses on accelerating a coordinated nutrition delivery message by SUN CSN members across the 45 SUN countries.²⁹

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fund is unique in that its financial allocation provides funding for in-country advocacy, peer-to-peer learning between stakeholders across different SUN countries to enhance capacity and sustainability. Its funding also builds synergies to inspire others to get involved in nutrition-specific activities in their communities. It has been deemed successful in ensuring that the nutrition agenda is addressed by decision-makers and implementers across multiple levels.³⁰
Resources:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Website

8. START Network

Founded:	2010/2012 – Name changed from START Fund to START Network with more international reach.
By whom: ³¹	<p>Originally a Consortium of British Humanitarian Agencies (CBHA); concept was born from: humanitarian leaders from 15 aid agencies via informal conversations; awarded GBP 8M from DFID (for emergency response fund/capacity building to prepare for future disasters).</p> <p>START Fund – originally funded by the Governments of Britain, Ireland, and Netherlands (2014).</p>
Mission/overview:	<p>To drive and accelerate transformation of the global aid system; to forge a new humanitarian system that will save more lives.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key characteristics of network: innovative, proactive, fast-funding at the local-country level (those closest to the front line). The first multi-donor pooled fund managed solely by NGOs. 55 international/national NGO members, 7K partners, 200 countries/territories worldwide.
Governance: ³²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hosted by Save the Children UK; minimal other staff hosted by other member organizations around the world. Staff sits across Start Network charity and Start Programmes Team. Board of Trustees: takes its direction from and is accountable to the membership body (Assembly). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chair: Sanjayan Srikanthan Oversees subcommittees/team performance, strategic direction, approves annual business plan/budget and new programs.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Assembly: Made of membership (one representative place per member) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Primary role is advisor, but also sets strategic direction, and acts as a sounding board for the evolution of organization. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Key responsibilities: approving new membership, approving new Board members, and assessing Board performance. ● Membership is derived from a diverse representation of organizations, both large and small.
Donors: ³³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Major donor: Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) ● Donors: Netherlands, DFID, IKEA Foundation, IrishAid, EU <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Funding toward humanitarian-focused work: GIZ, Jersey Overseas Aid, Rockefeller Foundation, Belgium, Estonia, Humanitarian Innovation Fund (HIF) ● Start Fund: Netherlands, Germany, Jersey and IKEA Foundations (GBP 77,023,294 distributed) ● Benefit for donors: access to multiple NGOs/implementation partners through one point of entry and multiple funds
Funding Allocation:	<p>Multiple types of “funds,” including:³⁴</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Start Fund:³⁵ The Start Fund focuses on three types of humanitarian response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Underfunded small, medium crises ○ A “spike” or escalation emerging within a chronic humanitarian emergency ○ Forecast and early action for impending crisis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alerts are made to the “fund” from a member or group of members, then the cycle begins with information sharing and decision-making. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Final decision is always made by in-country members/team where “project” would be implemented (emphasis on localization). ▪ Rapid response to disasters and support interventions – can distribute funds in 72 hours from the first “alert” – very quick response mechanism. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Begin implementation within seven days and project completed within 45 days ○ Numbers: 492 alerts; 327 responded, 68 countries

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ GBP 77,023,294 distributed ● National Start Fund: Start is piloting a national model with Start Fund Bangladesh³⁶ and Start Fund Nepal. This approach aims to move the Network toward a more decentralized model of national and regional hubs. The goal is to transition more funding and support to national and local responders. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hubs manage their own funds, local/national NGOs have access; putting support/funding in hands of on-the-ground responders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Created in 2017, four-year term, GBP 10M (UKAID) ▪ Objective: To be geographically closer to “under-the-radar” emergencies and small-to medium-sized crises ▪ Grown from 20 INGOs to include 27 local/national NGOs ▪ Activated 29 times, allocated GBP 6.85M to date ● Start Fund COVID-19:³⁷ addresses small to medium responses at the local level to respond to neglected or underfunded COVID-19 effects in low-income countries. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Launched in April 2020, funded 59 projects in 31 countries with over GBP 7M allocated. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Countries prioritized based on the INFORM index. ○ Key donors: IKEA Foundation, UKAid, Jersey Overseas Aid, German Federal Foreign Office, and private donors.
Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Website ● Localization Review

¹ “Advisory Group,” United Nations – CERF, [Advisory Group | CERF \(un.org\)](#)

² [The Emergency Relief Coordinator | IASC \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#)

³ “Rapid Response,” United Nations – CERF, [Rapid Response | CERF \(un.org\)](#)

⁴ “Underfunded Emergencies,” United Nations – CERF, [Underfunded Emergencies | CERF](#)

⁵ [The Emergency Relief Coordinator | IASC \(interagencystandingcommittee.org\)](#)

⁶ [Disaster Relief Emergency Fund \(DREF\) | IFRC \(ifrc.org\)](#)

⁷ [National Societies | IFRC \(ifrc.org\)](#)

⁸ [Emergencies | IFRC \(IFRC.org\)](#)

⁹ [Forecast-based Action | IFRC \(ifrc.org\)](#)

¹⁰ [About us | ECW \(educationcannotwait.org\)](#)

-
- 11 [Information for Grantees | ECW \(educationcannotwait.org\)](https://www.educationcannotwait.org/)
 - 12 [Strategic plan 2018 2021 | ECW \(pcdn.co\)](https://www.pcdn.co/)
 - 13 [Governance | GAVI \(gavi.org\)](https://www.gavi.org/)
 - 14 [Donor profiles | GAVI \(gavi.org\)](https://www.gavi.org/)
 - 15 [How our support works | GAVI \(gavi.org\)](https://www.gavi.org/)
 - 16 [Gavi Matching Fund | GAVI \(gavi.org\)](https://www.gavi.org/)
 - 17 [Investors Group | Global Financing Facility \(globalfinancingfacility.org\)](https://globalfinancingfacility.org/)
 - 18 [Trust Fund Committee | Global Financing Facility \(globalfinancingfacility.org\)](https://globalfinancingfacility.org/)
 - 19 [Secretariat | Global Financing Facility \(globalfinancingfacility.org\)](https://globalfinancingfacility.org/)
 - 20 [Partnership | Global Financing Facility \(globalfinancingfacility.org\)](https://globalfinancingfacility.org/)
 - 21 [GFF-eligible-countries.pdf \(globalfinancingfacility.org\)](https://globalfinancingfacility.org/)
 - 22 “[Guidance Note: Investment Cases,” Resource Library Global Financing Facility](https://globalfinancingfacility.org/) online, February 9, 2016, (globalfinancingfacility.org)
 - 23 [How SHF Works | SHFund \(shfund.org\)](https://shfund.org/)
 - 24 “Global leaders welcome the Sanitation and Hygiene Fund as key to increasing investment.” United Nations online, November 17, 2020, <https://unsdg.un.org/latest/announcements/global-leaders-welcome-sanitation-and-hygiene-fund-key-increasing-investment>
 - 25 [Governance | SHFund \(shfund.org\)](https://shfund.org/)
 - 26 [Financial and Results Reporting | SHFund \(shfund.org\)](https://shfund.org/)
 - 27 [FINAL The Sanitation and Hygiene Fund Strategy 2022-2025 web.pdf \(shfund.org\)](https://shfund.org/) (shfund.org), page 21.
 - 28 [SUN Movement Pooled Fund \(2017-2020\) | Scaling Up Nutrition \(scalingupnutrition.org\)](https://scalingupnutrition.org/)
 - 29 [Impact Statement Pooled Fund.pdf | Scaling Up Nutrition \(scalingupnutrition.org\)](https://scalingupnutrition.org/)
 - 30 [Our Approach | Scaling Up Nutrition \(scalingupnutrition.org\)](https://scalingupnutrition.org/)
 - 31 [History of the Start Network | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)
 - 32 [Governance & Assurance | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)
 - 33 [Donors and Partners | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)
 - 34 [What we do | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)
 - 35 [Start Fund | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)
 - 36 [National Start Funds | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)
 - 37 [COVID-19 | Start Network \(startnetwork.org\)](https://startnetwork.org/)

Annex II: Key Informant Interviewees

1. Kitchinme Bawa, Sanitation Project Manager, African Minister's Council on Water (AMCOW)
2. William Carter, Senior Officer / Global Focal Point, WASH, International Federation of Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies (IFRC)
3. Mariam Claeson, Former Director of the Global Financing Facility / Former Director of MNCH, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation
4. Yaye Sophiétou Diop, Advocacy Manager, Speak Up Africa
5. Leah Finnegan, Head, Humanitarian Policy, Advocacy and Communications, GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)
6. Katrin Gronemeier, Project Manager, BMU Water Dialogues, GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)
7. Maren Heuvels, Advisor Water Policy, Resilient WASH, GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)
8. Daniela Heyn, Assistant Desk Officer, Division for International Humanitarian Organizations & Multilateral Policy on Humanitarian Assistance, German Federal Foreign Office
9. Christelle Huré Regional Head, Advocacy, Media & Communication, Norwegian Refugee Council Africa Regional Office
10. Aïda Kabo, Program Officer, Speak Up Africa
11. Christoph Leitner, Advisor, WASH, GIZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit GmbH)
12. Yunia Musaaazi, Executive Director, Uganda Water, Sanitation NGO Network
13. Ryuji Ogata, Senior Advisor, WASH, Japan (JICA)
14. Betty Ojeny, WASH Governance Systems, Strengthening & Market Regional Advisor, WASH, Oxfam International
15. John Oldfield, Director, WASH Advocate
16. Nikos Papamanolis, Officer, WASH, ECHO
17. Guillaume Pierrehumbert, Head, Water & Habitat Unit, International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
18. Dominick Revell de Waal, Senior Economist, Water and Sanitation Program, the World Bank
19. Leah Selim, Advocacy Specialist (WASH), Division of Communications, UNICEF
20. Yuko Shibata, General Manager, Overseas Program Division, Japan Platform
21. David Andres Vinas, Specialist, Humanitarian Advocacy, UNICEF
22. Tracy Wise, Acting Team Lead, WASH, USAID

-
23. Laurence West, WASH & Urban Humanitarian Advisor, WASH, UK Foreign Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO)
 24. Yvonne Takang, ACF West Africa Regional Office