Governance Framework

COUNTRY CCD Platform

[ This document lays out the advised Governance Framework of a local CCD.

It is advised to follow the same structure, though content of each paragraph is likely to be very different depending on the context and priority identified by the members. References are made to tools helping to think through the different paragraphs and take decisions regarding the governance.

Defining the Governance Framework should be done in the set-up phase of the CCD, led by the Collaboration Manager, in parallel of or following one to one meetings, and workshops to think through the different aspects/dimensions.]
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# Introduction

## Background:

COUNTRY Collaborative Cash Delivery (CCD) Platform is a coalition of # Non-Governmental Organisations (INGOs) aiming to harmonize cash delivery for increased scale, efficiency, effectiveness and collective impact.

[Explain here if various initiatives have already started - is it in an organic way? still organized? etc...]

In order to enhance the clarity around the various initiatives, and to ensure decision-making is collaborative and representative of the wider membership, an overarching governance framework has been developed.

[Explain here what the process was to design the Governance framework: Collaboration Manager had dialogues with members? literature review of other CCD networks and/or cash collaboration? guidance from Global CCD? meetings with HINGO? review by CCD members/directors? etc... ]

Through this methodology, it was found that 3 core elements of governance were necessary:

**Strategic** – how leadership is decided within the collaboration and the role of the leadership

**Technical** – how the ‘collaboration unit’ will be governed and supported by the CCD members

**Operational** – how consortia are set up and the pathways to decisions[[1]](#footnote-0) for operational establishment

This document lays out the proposed structure and mechanism at each of these levels. The framework aims to cover the following areas:

* How the CCD membership governs itself, including roles and individual member responsibilities
* How the governance framework ensures members are accountable to each other and the Platform
* How decisions are made, within all 3 dimensions
* How the ‘collaboration unit’ works, who it reports to, what role it has in the collaboration and how members are expected to support it

The document is broken down into the three key dimensions of governance (strategic, technical and operational) providing more detail on decision-making. It also includes an overview model so CCD members have a picture of the overall layout. A description on the ways of working accompanies each section, which shows the processes for the governance to be successful.

## Timeframe

The governance model is designed to support the COUNTRY CCD Platform in the short to medium term. As the collaboration develops, it is likely that changes will need to be made for the collaboration to continue to be flexible and adaptable to the context.

It is suggested that the governance model is evaluated by the Steering Committee on a [period to determine: yearly basis? twice a year? once every second year?] (along with the Memorandum of Understanding) to determine whether it is still fit for purpose.

The narrative explains the simplified version necessary to launch the CCD, and gives an oversight of the final shape the CCD is aiming at for future improvements.

## The role of the Collaboration Manager

The CCD Network is supported by a Collaboration Manager whose role is essential to ensure things are moving forward[[2]](#footnote-1).

[Give a quick overview of the responsibilities of the Collaboration Manager, specify if they work full-time or are assuming other responsibilities, and the strategy for funding their position]

The Collaboration Manager provides overall coordination for the Country CCD Network. He/she is a neutral party providing support to all CCD collaboration members. He/she is the head of the Collaboration Unit (CU) which includes Technical Working Groups (TWG) made up from technical staff from the Country CCD Network members. The CU may potentially have additional staff that reports to the Collaboration Manager if deemed necessary (i.e. M&E manager, database supervisor, etc.). The Collaboration Manager (and any needed CU staff) will be funded by the Country CCD Network’s members (either direct funding, or through the budget of CCD Cash consortiums).

The Collaboration Manager provides the following support to CCD collaboration members:

* Provides technical oversight and coordination for the Country CCD Network;
* Serves as a chair (non-voting member) of the Steering Committee;
* Establish and support relevant Technical Working Groups (TWG)
* Monitor risk and provide mitigation recommendations to the Country CCD Network members;
* Represent Country CCD Network to the Cash Working Group and other external stakeholders as needed;
* Organize and provide capacity building and training to Country CCD Network and other partners; and
* Manage Collaboration Coordination Unit (CCU) staff (if any).

# The three dimensions of Governance

## Strategic

The strategic dimension of the CCD focuses on how the CCD represents itself as a national network, and how to deliver cash programming in a more effective, efficient and harmonized way. This role will lie with a Steering Committee, and be supported by the Collaboration Manager.

The Collaboration Manager will ensure continuity and stability and will be responsible for capturing all decisions made by the Steering Committee. They sit as the Chair of the Steering Committee but have no voting right.

*i - Responsibilities and role*

The responsibilities of the Steering Committee are[[3]](#footnote-2):

* Provide strategic oversight for CCD in COUNTRY
* Deliver and be accountable to the members for implementing the yearly prioritization plan
* Ensure CCD is working alongside other cash networks and initiatives within COUNTRY
* Manage and mitigate the shared risk of the CCD COUNTRY Network
* Manage the complaints and feedback from within and external to the membership[[4]](#footnote-3)
* Determine whether stakeholders outside of CCD should become part of the CCD Network membership[[5]](#footnote-4)
* Review performance of Members and can vote for exclusion in case of misconduct or lack of implication[[6]](#footnote-5).
* Determine whether concept note (Operational dimension) can be endorsed by the CCD based on the Technical inputs from the Collaboration Unit (Technical dimension).
* Approve the tools and standards, delivered by the CCD Collaboration Unit (CU), on behalf of the CCD membership
* Ensure CCD remains relevant as an organization by yearly reviewing the mandate and vision for the CCD

*ii- Governance*

[Explain here the Steering Committee’s governance ]

Example from Ethiopia (recommended approach):

The Steering Committee will be formed by members at a time, these members will be the Country Directors (or their Delegate). The Steering Committee will be chaired by the Ethiopia CCD Platform Collaboration Manager who is a non-voting member.

The suggested approach to the Steering Committee enables a rotation system, allowing all CCD member to participate in strategic oversight and the direction of the Ethiopia CCD Platform every two years[[7]](#footnote-6). For this option, the Steering Committee would be comprised of 6 CCD members at any one time[[8]](#footnote-7). The initial committee would be formed through a consensus-decision[[9]](#footnote-8) with all 12 members. The Steering Committee would rotate its members every year. 3 members would step-down from the Steering Committee after the first year, allowing 3 more CCD members to take their place. The other 3 members that started on the first Steering Committee continue until the end of the 18 months, when they rotate out for the next 3 CCD members (see Figure 2 below).

Figure 2: The Rotating Steering Committee Option 

*iii- Decision making*

[Explain here the Steering Committee’s decision making process ]

Example from Ethiopia (recommended approach):

Decisions on relevant issues is to be trialed through collaborative decision-making[[10]](#footnote-9), where the committee members aim to come towards ‘shared thinking’ rather than using a voting system. All Steering Committee members should have a chance to input into the discussion, which will be facilitated by the Collaboration Manager. If an agreement cannot be reached in the Steering Committee through collaborative decision-making, then the Steering Committee should organise a vote. Those members that are not part of the Steering Committee in that given year will support the collaboration through providing input into the CCD Collaboration Unit either through the Technical Working Groups or Innovation Scaling (see Technical section below) and are able to attend Steering Committee meetings as a non-decision-making member (their role will need to be managed by the Collaboration Manager).

The Steering Committee will be accountable to the rest of the membership for ensuring the development of the Ethiopia CCD Platform. The Steering Committee will meet at least once every three months, and whenever decisions have to be taken (meetings will be called by the Collaboration Manager, but members can also request for the Steering Committee to be meet).

## Technical

The Technical Dimension of the CCD Network is designed to support the CCD membership and wider stakeholders working in cash programming in COUNTRY.

The Technical dimension is materialized by the CCD Collaboration Unit, that is made of different workstreams: [put here the workstreams that your CCD network has decided to develop. Ex: Technical Working Groups, Support Services, Innovation Scaling, Pool of funds, Technical review Committees etc...]

[Explain here if the CCD Collaboration Unit is expected to change over time: maybe start with a simplified version: reduced Support Services made of only one Collaboration Manager; and ad hoc Technical Groups; but will then develop an Innovation Scaling workstream and a Pool of funds).]

#### The Support Services

[Explain here the Support Services ways of working. Here is a recommended one from the Ethiopia model]

The CCD Support Services is at the core of the Collaboration Unit, it is the structure under which the Collaboration Manager and the potential other CCD full-time staff are working.

The CCD Support Services is managed by a CCD member, who provides the staff with a working space and include them on their pay-roll[[11]](#footnote-10).

[ Include here the process for selecting the hosting agency, and the frequency at which it will be changed]

The first staff within the CCD Support Services is the Collaboration Manager.

The job-description of the Collaboration Manager will be developed by the hosting Organization, using the template provided by Global CCD, and reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee. The recruitment will be managed by the Hosting Organization under the supervision of the Steering Committee[[12]](#footnote-11).

If the CCD Network wishes to hire more staff, their job-descriptions will be developed by the Collaboration Manager and reviewed and approved by the Steering Committee. The recruitment will be managed by the Hosting Organization under the supervision of the Steering Committee[[13]](#footnote-12).

Collaboration Manager:

The role of the Collaboration Manager is to ensure a continuous and equitable collaboration and hold the Ethiopia CCD Platform together. by:

. chairing the Steering Committee

. ensuring communication in-between and within the Steering Committee (Strategic dimension), the Collaboration Unit (Technical dimension) and the Consortia Responses (Operational dimension)

. supporting the set-up and the progress of the Technical Working Groups

. disseminating learning and feedback amongst the membership and more widely.

. creating and updating the multi-dimensional membership matrix[[14]](#footnote-13) for decision-making

. supporting members in finding the best combination for the elaboration of new consortiums when there are funding opportunities (using the multi-dimensional membership matrix)

. setting-up ad hoc Technical Review Committee to assess Proposals in case of absence of consensus

. supporting members in seeking new funding opportunities

. ensuring coordination with external stakeholders to CCD Platform Ethiopia (including ECGW, Donors, Government etc…)

Other CCD Staff:

[ Explain here if the CCD Network is anticipating to hire other CCD staff, in the short, middle or long term.]

Other positions could be:

. Technical lead (explain role, responsibilities and coordination with the Collaboration Manager)

. MEAL Manager (explain role, responsibilities and coordination with the Collaboration Manager)

. I&M Manager (explain role, responsibilities and coordination with the Collaboration Manager)

#### Technical Working Groups

[Explain here the Technical Working Groups goal and ways of working.]

The Technical Working Groups (TWGs) will lead the technical development of the CCD COUNTRY Platform. The TWGs are expected to be ad hoc, dependent on the needs of the membership. Each group will support a different area of expansion and innovation (e.g. shared operating procedures, MEB analysis, data sharing etc…) and will be led by a technical expert from a CCD member[[15]](#footnote-14).

These technical areas will be directly linked with the on-going or planned implementations of the CCD members, and will be operational. In this sense, they will and should not be a duplication of the efforts engaged at the CWG level: if technical areas are already addressed in the CWG, CCD should not set-up a parallel TWG but keep on participating in the existing CWG one. Members of the CCD will keep on participating in the CWG, and outputs of the TWGs will be shared whenever relevant and appropriate.

Some priority areas have already been identified by the membership :

. [Put here the priority areas identified during the completion of the gaps and priority identification tool ]

The objectives of the TWGs are[[16]](#footnote-15): [Example from the Ethiopia CCD, can be adapted - some points can be removed or added]

* Provide technical advice and support to the ongoing or planned CCD Responses to promote a harmonized approach within the CCD membership
* Develop set of tools and/or guidelines (using best practices from CCD members) to be endorsed by the CCD
* Train CCD members on the CCD endorsed tools to promote their use within the Membership
* Facilitate sharing of information, both within the CCD and with the CWG, including best practices, developed tools, lessons learned, and research findings

In the absence of a Technical Lead at the Support Services level, each TWG will be led by a Technical Expert from one of the member, volunteering to take this role. They will have a responsibility to lead and facilitate the group, reporting to the Collaboration Manager[[17]](#footnote-16). The TWGs will make decisions on a consensus basis. These decisions will be fed up to the Steering Committee for sign-off and dissemination through the CCD Platform. Over time, the TWGs should utilise the idea of ‘Innovation sprints’[[18]](#footnote-17), which are short bursts of collaborative activity (usually in a form of a workshop) centred on a challenge/problem and/or opportunity. Funding can be obtained for Innovation sprints, which is likely to increase member buy-in and the efforts of the TWGs.

#### Technical Review Committees

[Decide if you want to include those Technical Review Committees]

Example from Ethiopia:

This committees are ad hoc committees to be set-up by the Collaboration Manager in case of lack of consensus about proposals[[19]](#footnote-18). There are two cases when they can be formed:

1- Before review by the Steering Committee, if no consensus was found regarding the creation of a consortium, and that multiple concept-notes competing on the same geographical area and with similar objectives were developed.

The role of the Committee is then to assess the concept notes using the matrix, filling the Partners selection Justification tool[[20]](#footnote-19), the CCD Standard Checklist and giving recommendation to the Steering Committee for the best concept note to be endorsed.

2. After submission of an endorsed proposal, if the donor asks to reconsider the geographical area and that different agencies are expressing their interest to be reconsidered to be lead agency (and that no consensus is found).

The role of the Committee is then to reassess the strength of the agencies and to give a recommendation regarding the best-positioned agency for this role (using the matrix and the partners selection justification tool). Steering Committee will have to endorse the choice.

Such Committees will be composed of at least 3 technical individuals from agencies that do not have a part in the conflict. The OCHA Coordinator of the ECWG can also be called in to participate in the discussion. The Collaboration Manager will facilitate the discussion.

#### Innovation Scaling

[Decide if you want to include this Innovation Scaling aspect]

Example from Ethiopia:

In the longer run, the CCD Governance Framework aims at developing a forth workstream: the Innovation Scaling[[21]](#footnote-20).

The Innovation Scaling is an opportunity to bring together the shared resources of the CCD COUNTRY Platform to enable more effective and efficient cash delivery. Figure 3 below shows the difference between how different NGOs hire cash expertise to support their own individual organisation (left hand side of the figure). The right-hand side of the figure details how CCD can cluster the shared cash expertise from across the membership that can be utilised by all members (and potentially outside stakeholders). The Innovation Scaling will operate on a shared services model; members will be both a user and contributor to the CCD Collaboration Unit. The vision is to create a model where users of the expertise ‘held’[[22]](#footnote-21) in the CCD Collaboration Unit (under the Innovation Scaling stream) would pay for their services. This would create a business model where the more expertise members give to the CCD Collaboration Unit, providing demand for services was available, the more you would be paid. Staff could either be deployed or seconded into the Collaboration Unit in person or virtually.



Figure 3: Clustering approach for the Innovation Scaling workstream

#### The Pool of funds

[Decide if you want to include this pool of funds and how it will work]

Example from Ethiopia:

The Pool of Fund[[23]](#footnote-22) will capture potential additional or remaining funding. It will allow the CCD to rapidly access funds to conduct activities that support the membership. Largely, this is expected to cover Multi-Agency Assessments, Training and Innovation Sprints (at least until more funding is available). Members should request access to the funds through the Collaboration Manager who will bring the request to the Steering Committee for decision taking.

## Operational

The operational dimensions of the governance structure focuses on how CCD formulates consortia for a humanitarian response, through a specific funding and governance model; and how the CCD determines the endorsement[[24]](#footnote-23) of a new proposal. The CCD aims to be flexible and adaptive and therefore does not advocate for a particular operational governance model[[25]](#footnote-24). The governance model will depend on how the funding is being given (multilateral/bilateral) and the existing responses of CCD members in the geographic area. It is expected that most operations will take on a Mixed Governance Model, providing that members can bring in bilateral funding that is non-comingled to a CCD response.

Figure 4: Governance Models





[Explain here if there are different processes for different cases - These discussions can be facilitated using the tool *B.2.4 - New proposal submission process* ]

Example from Ethiopia:

The paragraphs below explain the process that members have agreed to follow for i) multi-lateral proposal submission process and/or proposal over one million USD; and ii) bilateral unsollicited submission process and/or proposal under one million USD.

#### Multi-lateral Proposal Submission Process / Proposal over one million USD

For funding opportunities over 1 million US$[[26]](#footnote-25) (Crisis strikes, call for proposal, ECHO and OFDA funds), members of the CCD agree to always coordinate with the rest of the membership, to consider multi-lateral approaches and to comply to the following steps:

1. The Collaboration Manager reaches-out to members and ask if there are some interests for a multi-lateral response. Partners can also directly reach-out to each-other and inform the Collaboration Manager that they are looking into doing a multi-lateral response. Partners thinking of bi-lateral responses for these funds should inform the rest of the membership and not go directly to the donors. If the rest of the membership does not want to set-up the response as a consortium and judges the member well positioned to submit a proposal, then they can go individually, but will follow the same endorsement steps.
2. If there is interest for a multi-lateral response, the Collaboration Manager calls a meeting for partners to discuss the optimum combination of partners and roles considering the membership multi-dimensional matrix (operational presence, risk and capacity for grant management). This meeting should enable to determine who will be the lead agency for that particular donor; and identify the partners. Each member can opt-in on whether they want to be the lead agency.

The CCD Collaboration Manager (and other Support Services staff if any) will act as a neutral arbiter: they will facilitate the discussion and try to help find a consensus and encourage completing interventions rather than competing interventions: identify where the gaps and/or synergies are with current CCD Network responses both geographically and/or across the value chain. They will complete the Partners Selection Justification Tool[[27]](#footnote-26).

Case 1: Consensus is found about the Lead Agency and the partnering agencies.

Case 2: Consensus is found about the Lead Agency, but more than one member wants to undertake a partnering role, and no consensus was found during the meeting: the lead agency is responsible for choosing their partner. They should include the CCD Support Services as a neutral entity for advice on the appropriate operational set up, and use the multi-dimensional matrix to make an assessment.

Case 3: No consensus is found regarding the Lead Agency : partners can set-up different consortia and develop competing concept notes.

1. The lead agency is responsible for the design, in collaboration with its co-partners.CCD members, through signing the MoU, acknowledge that the lead agency will make decisions based off the shared vision[[28]](#footnote-27) of CCD. Projects should aim at using the technical tools developed within the Collaboration Unit. The CCD Support Services should also be supporting members in making sure appropriate costs for collaboration are included in their funding proposal and that the response proposed fits within the scope of the COUNTRY CCD Network. The Technical Working Groups can advise on technical aspects.

The CCD Collaboration Manager (with other Support Services staff is any) will pre-fill the CCD Standards Checklist that will help the Steering Committee decide on the endorsement[[29]](#footnote-28). The Support Services will inform the partner in case of any flag, to give the partners the opportunity to adapt their concept note before submitting for endorsement.

Case 1: Only one concept note was developed: The Support Services is in charge of filling the CCD Standard checklist with the partners to submit to the Steering Committee for endorsement.

Case 2: Multiple concept notes were developed, but not competing on the same geographical area or with different objectives: The Support Services is in charge of filling the CCD Standard checklist with the partners of each concept note to submit to the Steering Committee for endorsement.

Case 3: Multiple concept notes were developed, with the same geographical area and same objectives (competing concept notes): The Collaboration Manager is responsible for setting-up a Technical proposal review committee[[30]](#footnote-29). Such committee will be ad hoc, and formed of cash technical individuals whose agencies are not submitting a proposal. They will be responsible for assessing the concept notes, by filling the Partners selection justification tool, the CCD Standard Checklist and giving recommendation to the Steering Committee for the best concept note to be endorsed.

1. Parallel to developing their concept note, the Collaboration Manager should inform the Steering Committee of a date for the review of the concept note for endorsement by the CCD[[31]](#footnote-30). Agencies can choose to attend the Steering Committee meeting to present their concept note and answer potential questions, or can decide to let the Collaboration Manager present.

Case 1: Review of only 1 concept note: If the concept note meets the requirements and has a favourable opinion from the Support Services, the Steering Committee endorses the concept note.

Case 2: Multiple (not-competing) concept notes: If the concept notes meet the requirements and have a favourable opinion from the Support Services, the Steering Committee endorses the concept notes. Ok to have multiple CCD endorsed proposals as long as they are not competing/duplicating.

Case 3: Multiple competing concept notes: The Steering Committee will endorse only 1 concept note, following the opinion of the Technical Review Committee.

1. The Collaboration Manager should inform the Members of the endorsement status of their Concept Note no later than the day following the Steering Committee meeting.
2. The Lead Agency submits the proposal.

Case 1: if the proposal was endorsed, the proposal is CCD branded.

Case 2: if the proposal was not endorsed, the consortia can still submit the proposal, but not with a CCD branding.

1. For CCD endorsed proposal, in case of feedback from donor asking for a change in the geographical area, the lead agency should inform the rest of the membership. Members are given the opportunity to say if they want to be reconsidered if their agency is better positioned to respond in the new area.

Case 1: no agency asks to be reconsidered

Case 2: multiple agencies asking to be reconsidered: the Collaboration Manager calls for a meeting with the implicated partners to try to reach a consensus (using the matrix to inform decision).

Case 2.1: Consensus is found

Case 2.2: No consensus is found and the conflict is about the partnering organizations: the Lead agency and the Collaboration Manager are responsible for selecting the agencies, using the Matrix.

Case 2.3: No consensus is found and the conflict is about the lead agency: the Collaboration Manager will call for an ad hoc technical committee (composed of members not applying to this position) to take the decision.

If the alliance has changed, the Collaboration Manager and/or the Technical Committee will fill a new Partners selection justification tool and resubmit to the Steering Committee to endorse the change.

#### Bi-lateral unsolicited Proposal Submission Process (excluding OFDA and OCHA) / Proposal over one million USD

Members agree that it is possible to reach-out directly to donors without necessarily consulting the rest of the membership for funding opportunities under 1 million USD and/or for private donors and/or unsolicited proposals (excluding OFDA and ECHO). However, it remains strongly encouraged.

Members agree to comply to the following:

* Members submitting a bilateral proposal including cash components are encouraged to use CCD Standards[[32]](#footnote-31).
* Members can choose to ask the Steering Committee for CCD endorsement before submission to the Donor (endorsement process will be similar to the one for a multi-lateral response – using the checklist).
* Members can choose not to go through the endorsement process before the proposal is been granted (if concept note has to be done very quickly or in case of a budget under one million USD). They can still mention in their proposal that they are a CCD Member and will follow the Standards.
* If the proposal is granted by the donor, the Member is requested to inform the rest of the Membership of their program (whether they want to have it CCD endorsed or not).
* The Member can request the Steering Committee to properly endorse their Program after granted by the Donor if it was not done before (endorsement process will be similar to the one for a multi-lateral response – using the checklist).

Remarks:

* If a project is not endorsed by the CCD, the partners can still go directly to the donors for submission, but won’t benefit from the CCD branding. Partners will still benefit from the technical support of the Collaboration Unit as members of the CCD.
* If a multi-lateral response includes an INGO that is not a CCD member, the proposal can’t be endorsed by the CCD, but CCD Members will still benefit from the technical support of the Collaboration Unit. This INGO will be encouraged to join the CCD.
* Local NGOs can be part of consortiums endorsed by the CCD without being a member of the CCD.

# Summary

The governance framework explained in this document is the proposed approach for the CCD COUNTRY Network. It is important to note that the Governance Framework will evolve over time, as the collaboration grows, flexes and adapts to the changing context. Therefore, it is imperative that the Steering Committee review the document once a year as part of its actions to ensure the Framework remains relevant.

# IV- List of Tools, ToRs and Annexes

1. Memorandum of Understanding – Available
2. Collaboration Manager ToR – *Available*
3. Steering Committee ToR – Available
4. TWG ToRs – *To be finalized*
5. Multi-Dimension Matrix – *To develop*
6. Partners selection justification – *To develop*
7. Standards Checklist – *To develop*
8. Support Services Governance – *To develop*
9. Application Package for new members – *To be finalized*
10. Pool of Funds ToRs – *To develop*
11. Innovation Scaling ToRs – *To develop*
12. Technical Proposal Review Committee ToRs – *To develop*
13. Accountability mechanism (feedbacks, complaints, exclusion) – *To develop*

1. This may change over time and is the current model that seems to make sense. As the collaboration develops, INGOs may determine areas of geographic coverage that they want to work or parts of the cash value chain they want to work on [↑](#footnote-ref-0)
2. cf ToR of the Collaboration Manager. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
3. See full Steering Committee ToRs [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
4. Process for feedbacks to be established [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
5. Process for integration of new memebrs to be finalized [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
6. Process for exclusion to be established [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
7. This is an adaptation of the Start Fund Model, which has a rotating operational decision-making committee to disburse project funding. This rotation allows all members to have an opportunity to be part of the committee. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
8. Through the literature review, six members in the Steering Committee was deemed to be the optimal amount to allow Collaborative Decision-Making to occur. See WCOD & ReadyToManage ‘A Collaborative Decision-Making Model’, 2012. It allows ‘shared thinking’ to occur, where steering committee members ‘think together’ for the benefit of Ethiopia CCD Platform. Too many members would lead to consensus decision-making, where compromise must occur (some members will not agree with the overall decision). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
9. Chaired by the Collaboration Technical Unit Lead, members that want to form the Steering Committee will be given a timeframe to propose to be on the Committee. The proposal will be discussed by the membership, with concerns or support being raised (or no objections). [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
10. See Wilson, M A (2003): Collaborative Decision-Making: building consensus group decisions for project success. Available at: https://www.pmi.org/learning/library/collaborative-decision-making-group-7667 [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
11. Establish process for selection of the hosting agency. For the 1st year, CRS is the hosting agency. [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
12. Process for recruitment to be established. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
13. Process for recruitment to be established. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
14. See notes at the end of the document for more information on this [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
15. This expert can be from the global, region or national level [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
16. Finalize the ToRs of the TWG [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
17. See TWGs ToRs for more details on responsibilities of Technical lead and members [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
18. https://medium.com/outware/what-is-an-innovation-sprint-and-why-should-your-company-be-running-them-4d3f63c9b1ab [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
19. See paragraph *Multi-lateral Proposal Submission Process* under *3. Operational* [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
20. Partners selection justification tool to develop [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
21. ToRs of the Innovation Scaling to be developed [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
22. Either virtually (support can be asked for on a call-down basis) or part-time staff [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
23. Develop Pool of Funds ToRs [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
24. The endorsement of a proposal implies that the CCD considers it to be CCD compliant and is supporting its submission : it is CCD branded and therefore is a proof of quality for the donors. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
25. See Practical Guide to building Operational Models in Cash Programming, CCD Network, Collaboration Governance Model Selection [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
26. It is understood that it might not be worth developing multi-lateral responses for grants under a million. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)
27. Partners selection justification tool to be developed [↑](#footnote-ref-26)
28. A more harmonised, effective and efficient approach to cash delivery to enable collective impact [↑](#footnote-ref-27)
29. Check-list to be developed : listing what needs to be reflected in proposal for it to be “branded” as CCD to the donor. [↑](#footnote-ref-28)
30. Technical Proposal review committee ToRs to be developed [↑](#footnote-ref-29)
31. Revision should be done within a maximum of 2 weeks following the request. Members are encouraged to request the review in advance to enable timely review. [↑](#footnote-ref-30)
32. As detailed in the Standards Checklist [↑](#footnote-ref-31)