

Outline questions for ODI / HPN - paper- deadline 13 January 2022

1. HAF: Capacity Building	
Capacity: GUS is a stronger organization now than ago- is this true? If so, what made it possible?	<p>GUS is implementing different types of activities including humanitarian response for the development of the crisis affected people in Kurigram since 1998 with the financial support from different donors. But GUS was not too much strong as we didn't have all the policies at organization level, staff were not highly trained, and we were not well connected with different platforms and networks beyond Kurigram district.</p> <p>Since 2016 GUS got the opportunity to be engaged with the ELNHA project which supported us to build their organizational capacity by providing number of training and workshop to the organization core staff that includes Need assessment training, CTP local leadership Development Training, Project proposal development training, training on coordination mechanism, training on resource mobilization, CHS training, training on SOD, training on equitable partnership, Gender & safe guard training, Humanitarian advocacy training, training on contingency plan and supported to develop/update contingency plan accordingly, SOP, Disaster Management Plan, develop different policies in the organization such as gender policy, financial policy, HR policy, safe guard policy, and so on.</p> <p>Therefore, the ELNHA project linked us with the different networks, UN clusters and Working Groups in Bangladesh which helps us to be connected with the national humanitarian architecture. Also supported us to be more united at the district level for collaborative humanitarian response. ELNHA project also created opportunity to interact with various government line department, private sector, media, INGOs & donors.</p> <p>The other lead Actors of ELNHA in Kurigram also received same kind of capacity building opportunity like GUS and build their capacity in Humanitarian sector. We all the lead actors of Kurigram basically develop our capacity building plan through Joint Action Planning. Before the ELNHA project, LNHA's in this district were not too much united and organized in humanitarian works but now a days we are more confident, organized and united in humanitarian response in Kurigram. So, we think GUS is a stronger organization now than it was ago.</p>
Why do you think the ELNHA capacity building was important for GUS?	<p>Though GUS has started its journey since 1998 but we didn't have required organizational knowledge, skill and capacity that essentially required for effective humanitarian response. Through the Joint Action Planning workshop, we got the scope to identify our gaps and subsequently worked for that to improve the organization capacity. ELNHA provided us the financial support to develop our capacity by developing/ updating relevant Policy, guidelines, staff training and link us with different platforms and networks which build our level of confidence level. ELNHA also develop our negotiation and bargaining skill and capacity. Earlier, we didn't have enough resource to invest for organizational capacity building but ELNHA provided us that resource to develop the organization capacity.</p>
What was different (if anything) in the	<p>The ELNHA project is an exceptional type of project. The diversified the bottom up capacity building approach was very much effective that provided us a space to grow. The joint action planning was a real bottom up capacity</p>

<p>ELNHA capacity building compared with other projects/ organizations?</p>	<p>building approach that was exceptional compared with other organizations. The lead actors of Kurigram also experienced this new dimension of capacity building approach such as HUCOCA and later Joint action Planning engaging all the districts actors. The systematic capacity building initiative made the ELNHA project unique. ELNHA capacity building provided us the freedom to explore our capacity gaps and invest to improve that gap accordingly. Another uniqueness of the ELNHA capacity building was locally managed HAF which supported us to be more confident in management and coordination aspect. Beside the capacity building, ELNHA project also provided another scope to demonstrate that capacity in to practice level through accessing the HRGF.</p>
<p>What made it more useful or less useful? Why?</p>	<p>The Joint Action Planning provided us the scope to identify our capacity gaps collectively and provided us the scope to work together with other humanitarian actors in the district. HAF fund created an opportunity to work together with other actors. The decentralization of HAF approach increased the district level ownership and leadership. The freedom of choice for the capacity building activities identification under HAF helped the organizations for the improvement of their real laps and gaps, Freedom of choice increase the ownership that contributed future sustainability beyond ELNHA. Improved district level collaboration and coordination that strengthen their collective capacity at the district level.</p>
<p>What were the challenges? What would you change about it?</p>	<p>The back to back training and workshops sometimes created challenges as most of the organizations are small so it was difficult to nominate people for the trainings or workshops. Identification of appropriate resource person for conducting workshop and training was some time challenging. Minimizing the district level power dynamics was challenging. Engagement of the government and private sectors officials in this capacity building initiative. However, it was managed by effective planning in consultation with other lead actors at the district.</p>
<p>2. DISASTER RESPONSE (HRGF):</p>	
<p>Has anything changed in the way that GUS prepares and implements responses from before and after ELNHA? If so, what changed?</p>	<p>Many things have changed in Preparedness and Response level as well as response level. Such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Updated contingency plan - Component trained staff for humanitarian response - GUS follows the CHS in response - Able to develop the situation report - Need assessment - Market assessment - Able to plan, design and deliver the response project following the agreed standard and criterion - Membership of UN clusters, Working Groups and networks associated in the humanitarian sector - Now GUS has strong network across the country and Global Level. - Experience to work in consortium approach - CTP expert at organization level

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Familiar with the Complain Response Mechanism - GUS familiar with the Cash packages in Bangladesh - More competent in Beneficiaries selection and Post Distribution Monitoring - GUS is more confident in accessing donor funding - GUS got the opportunity to work with the bigger organization in a consortium approach and learnt from the bigger one.
Did the HRGF support this change? If so, what elements of the HRGF helped the change?	HRGF provided the opportunity to get access to humanitarian fund where they abled to demonstrate their capacity that they gained from the ELNHA capacity building initiatives. Therefore, this funding builds their confidence level as well as to provide the opportunity to work together with other actors in a consortium approach. The HRGF provided them an opportunity to know how to plan, design and deliver the humanitarian response in an effective way following humanitarian policy and criterion. This funding also created an avenue to build trust and relationship among the humanitarian organizations when they worked in the same consortium for achieving a single goal. It also created another scope to learn from each other. From the consortium modality they learnt about the equitable partnership and practiced accordingly.
Were there other things, aside from HRGF, that changed the way GUS responds?	We acknowledged that this is the HRGF which changed the way of GUS humanitarian response capacity. The knowledge GUS learnt from the different coordination platforms was introduced in response operation such as flow the SOD of Government, utilized the findings of Need Assessment Working Group Report, UN clusters recommended packages and Cash Working Group recommended Packages and report back to them accordingly.
What were the challenges? What would you change about it?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Funding was less comparing to the actual need of the ground - The allocation of the HRGF was too small where number of organizations participated. - Meeting donor Due diligence but consortium approach made it easier and accessible - If it was open competitive call for HRGF then organization could get the opportunity to demonstrate their capacity more effectively - HRGF funding allocation could be more at district level - Initially more dependency on the HRGF. But later we started to focus to the other funding opportunities as part of contingency plan and resource mobilization plan
3.COORDINATION LOCALLY AND NATIONALLY:	
In what ways does GUS engage in coordination spaces?	Through the ELNHA project, GUS got opportunity to involve with number of coordination platform and network from district level to Global level. That includes local level coordination platform such as Humanitarian Actors Platform in Kurigram (HAP-Kurigram, COVID-19 District &Upazila) Comity Member, ADAB, FNB, NGO Forum, RajibpurRowmari NGO Network, Sujan, KonnaShishu Advocacy Forum, Red Crescent Societies Bangladesh, KNA; at national level GUS engaged with Need Assessment working group, Cash Working group, food Security Cluster,

	<p>National Alliance of Humanitarian Actors Bangladesh (NAHAB), Localization Working Group; at international GUS is connected with Charter 4 Change (C4C) Endorsers, NEAR, Alliance for Empowering Partnership (A4EP), GIVEWATTS East Africa Limited, Smart Response, Global Giving, MYCORPS MISSION 8 @ SOUTH ASIA II. These platform and network created a wider space to the GUS as well as increased their visibility towards the humanitarian actors in the country level and Global level that upholds their voice and space in the humanitarian sector.</p>
<p>What changed in GUS approach with ELNHA?</p>	<p>Earlier than ELNHA project, GUS was maintaining a limited relationship and networking at the sub-district level while the national or international level was beyond their thinking. The importance of being part of the coordination platform was not clear to GUS. But after the 4 years rigorous capacity building of GUS by ELNHA in a systematic way, GUS understood the importance and grab the opportunities to be the part of coordination platforms. Now GUS is taking part in a wider coordination mechanism and contributing in decision making. This wider networking has strengthened the organization capacity and built their confidence. The visibility of the organization spread out beyond the sub-district. Now GUS is an active member of the District level coordination platform as well as other national and global level coordination bodies.</p>
<p>Why is it important and what has it led to?</p>	<p>Taking part in the different coordination platform and network provided them different opportunity and increase their visibility among the humanitarian actors in the country as well as they are getting different types of information from here which enriched GUS knowledge level. GUS is introducing with different people by taking part in different meeting, seminar, workshop organized by these network and platform. This also elaborating their funding opportunity as it improved their voice and space in the humanitarian sector in the country. They are also getting the opportunity to include the local community voice in the decision making for effective and appropriate humanitarian assistance to the affected people in a timely manner.</p>
<p>What were the challenges? What would you change about it?</p>	<p>As a local organization we have to face number of challenges to be the part of this coordination bodies that includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The people of this region are deprived of all basic needs. all kinds of disasters happen. Compared to the scarcity of people in this area Co-operation of public private and various donors the amount of humanitarian assistance is far less than the needs of people in the area. - Technical knowledge and skill. But ELNHA project provided that scope to build their technical knowledge and skill - Limited staff in the organization - Institutional capacity such as resource both financial and human. - Distance between sub-district and national level as most of the UN cluster and working group situated at Dhaka. However, COVID 19 minimize that distance as now all the meeting is online based, so it is easier to participate - Bigger organizations dominating tendency. However, it is resolved by building relationship