**Micro-grant Handout #1 and #2: Flyers and criteria**

* We will now look at messaging to announce support for self-help plans.
* This session is key for the whole micro-grant success. So allow all the time needed. You can catch up alter
* We will look at the flyer (handout #1)
	+ Could be a verbal messaging such as a radio communication
	+ Change what you feel in order to make it work in your context but also start thinking and take note on how you will spread the information in order to limit the possible scam (they exist everywhere!)
* And we’ll look at the criteria for which group can apply (handout #2)
	+ This is an internal document
	+ The list in the handout is based on practice, but can be adapted to any context.
	+ It is useful to look at it at the beginning, so some information can be included into the flyer
* Stress: PALC volunteers will go out and reach people (especially IDPs) and suggest creating new SHG. The SHG will select the members. The volunteer need to motivate to take action. Even if there is no funds available. To shall self-organise, people have to proactively engage. This is already a massively important aspect.

It is important that volunteer do not promise anything.

You can reinforce the message with the example of ECOWEB, where they mobilised people without funds, and survivors took action using their own resources.

Group work: in ToT divide with mix of organisation, gender and skills. Keep the same group during the day; in co-design workshop you can group them per organisation and/or geographical area

* Task: review the two documents and adapt them to the context based on their experience
* Mention that we are training to move from fail-safe (donor led) to safe to fail (for learning)
* Each organisation will receive some funds. There are risks attached but we are creating a space where if things go wrong, they can go wrong. It’s ok. We make risk smaller. Not everything will go well but we can learn from it!
* Plenary discussion on group work.
	+ Take note of key points

...............................................................................................................

**Handout micro-grant #3: Applicant details: office formality / record (to be filled in by the NNGO staff for the files)**

...............................................................................................................

**Handout micro-grant #4 and #5: Proposal guide and Review check list**

*NB. Some thought that better to break this one into 2 (ie one session for proposal with feedback, then a second one for review checklist). However, same old problem of time and remember that they will actually sort this out when they translate into their language*

Group work: Same groups

* We will now look at the community micro-grant proposal form (#4) and checklist for reviewing applications (#5)
* The checklist is an internal document. Used to assess the proposal submitted. We cannot fund any proposal (especially with limited funds), so we must do a selection. Also, to minimise the risk identified (such as scam)
* Task: review the two documents and adapt them to the context based on their experience
* Optional: This session can be used to translate the proposal format into local language (and look for improvement) and improve the checklist
* Feedback from groups and Plenary discussion (take note)
* Some points of discussion:
	+ Is it difficult to fund a village with high level of illiterate? = you can link groups to students to develop proposals. The important is the idea
	+ In North Kenya groups have paid ‘proposal writer’ paying 50USD and then the project was unsuccessful= we need to be aware of this and find a way. What can be done? = NNGO to follow up with certain groups which have a good idea and provide support
	+ M&E is more mentoring, supporting SHGs to achieve their goals
	+ Would you support small businesses? Yes, why not. Marsabit example of shop gone burst because of too much credit. If they provide a service and they are recognised to contribute to the community, why not. We should add it into the flyer
	+ Make example of pest control in Myanmar as collective (village level action from PVCA) project.
	+ Example from ECOWEB: one grant for a large group to do a bulk purchase of building materials. Then they discovered the needs were too specific and the group decided to redistribute the grant in cash to each HH and each did their own reconstruction.
	+ The important is that risk management (if things go wrong) is in place to convince the donor.
	+ Example of Nargis (Myanmar) where 3,000 micro-grants were audited. And only 0.7% of 1M euro had a question mark. This is impressive! = micro-grants are auditable
	+ In Marsabit Kenya they involved an elder in the panel for selection to triangulate the information from micro-grants
	+ If groups are ‘integrity and legitimate’ is the most important thing! ‘we can build capacity but not integrity’ = how do you know with IDPs? =they won’t choose one group but many sub-groups based on trust. Then they select a leader who they trust and put in place internal system to the SHG to minimise risks like two/tree receive the funds and spend them for the whole group, or the group informed at any stage. People are very creative and know accountability.
	+ This is one aspect why NNGO should handle the process not INGO. local knowledge! = ‘local know better and can read the not obvious, plus they know how local accountability works’
	+ Triangulation is key, plus follow up on SHGs
* We can just reduce the risks. We’ll do whatever possible but there is no risk proof!
* Make it explicit: volunteers and NNGO must highlight the trust. Once money is transferred to the groups, it is their responsibility. If they screw up, it is their fault, they have wasted the money.
	+ If it is the case, you can include that SHGs need to add their contribution
	+ INGO are more aware of their own reputation than of the peoples
* Briefly present the record of decisions. Handout micro grant #6

...............................................................................................................

**Handout micro-grant #6: Record of decision making office formality (to be filled in by the NNGO staff for the files)**

**Handout micro-grant # 7 & 8 Letter of agreement template and procurement guidelines**

Group work: Same groups

* We will now look at the letter of agreement (#7) and financial guidelines (#5)
* These are simple documents as need to be quick and accessible
* Financial/procurement guidelines were added as practice has shown that these can create tension within groups and within the community (purchase from uncle). These are for NNGO and SHG to protect themselves (do no harm) and improve accountability
* It was suggested to change from contract to letter of agreement.
* Task: review the two documents and adapt them to the context based on their experience. Look for gaps!
* Optional: This session can be used to translate the proposal format into local language (and look for improvement) and improve the checklist
* Feedback from groups and Plenary discussion (take note).

**Extras: grant transfers modalities**

* Plenary brainstorm

Additional issue to be taken into consideration:

* + Size/frequency of micro-grants
	+ Micro-grant transfer mechanism
	+ Gender/inclusion issues
	+ Complain mechanisms
	+ Monitoring individual initiatives: this is the role of the PALC volunteers. This can help when there is a growing portfolio of initiatives
	+ Overall monitoring. Let’s avoid overburdening NNGOs
* What about bookkeeping training for SHG?
	+ Needs to be simple. They just need to have an account person and been able to show how they have spent the money (receipts)
	+ What is needed is:
		- Money IN and OUT
		- Receipts
		- Procurement
* Practice has shown that having a finance person from NNGO during the co-design workshop helps a lot to adapt the formats to their internal procedures while keeping it accessible to SHGs
* For NNGOs reporting: once the micro-grant is out, then that is recorded as expenditure
	+ Donor (1 expenditure) > INGO (1 expenditure)> NNGO (x expenditure)> x micro grants (collect receipts)
* The important is transparency in the process to minimise risk.
	+ Micro-grants purchase can be documented with photo or witnesses

**Complaint mechanisms**

* Plenary discussion:
* Idea is good but doesn’t work everywhere
* Safeguarding:
	+ Part of the orientation with communities is how they can express complains. Either by phone/Facebook
	+ The important is to make the organisation accessible
	+ Local decision making increase accountability and access.
	+ PALC volunteer do not identify with NNGO but if they start gaining power we must intervene
	+ Example of Kenya: one volunteer started to bully one group. The group used traditional system asking the elders. The elder forced the volunteer to step down and they replaced him. Then they communicated to the NNGO what happened.
	+ A team of PALC going around is better than individual volunteer going around, they can control each other and avoid concentration of power.
* SCLR give power to locals. So we should find solutions for their problems (let them be). Classic humanitarian approaches concentrate power in few. While SCLR dilute the power an addresses the root causes.

...............................................................................................................

**Handout micro-grant #9: Reporting guidelines**

Group work: Same groups

* We will now look at the final activity and financial report, handouts micro-grant #9
* These are simple documents as need to be quick and accessible
* Task: review the two documents and adapt them to the context based on their experience. Look for gaps!
* Optional: This session can be used to translate the proposal format into local language (and look for improvement) and improve the checklist
* Feedback from groups and Plenary discussion (take note).