

Minutes of the Selection Committee Meeting for the selection of partners for the ECHO grant awarded to the Global Shelter Cluster

August - September 2021

Background

The Global Shelter Cluster (GSC) is an Inter-Agency Standing Committee coordination platform co-led by UNHCR and IFRC with 45 partners at the global level. To effectively meet its global responsibilities, the GSC has a Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) to advance GSC strategic direction and overall workplan; elected by and composed of organisations from the GSC partnership. The GSC SAG is composed of 10 organizations and the two GSC co-lead agencies.

A new proposal was submitted to the DG ECHO Enhanced Response Capacity grant in October 2020. The proposal seeks to mobilise collective efforts towards a greener and climate smart humanitarian shelter and settlements response. It has three components: 1) global level support to green shelter partners' response, 2) environmental research and advocacy available to make country-level shelter responses greener and climate smart, and 3) country-level shelter clusters effectively design and implement greener and climate smart shelter and settlement responses. As was the case with previous ECHO ERC grant applications, the SAG requested UNHCR to be the coordinator of the new submission and manage the implementation on behalf of the GSC.

The ECHO-funded GSC project will help advance on greening interagency shelter and settlements responses which has been recently highlighted as a priority. The Logistics Cluster reports that around 80% of their supply chain relates to shelter items. Decisions taken in the shelter sector can have an enormous influence in the cost and environmental impact of a response, in the short and long term.

As a result of this project, UNHCR received EUR 650,000 on behalf of the GSC. The GSC will contribute with co-funding to reach a total of EUR 930,571. The project has a starting date of 1 July 2021 for a period of 24 months and the contribution of EUR 650,000 is recorded as follows: EUR 81,779 in 2021, EUR 396,709 in 2022, and EUR 171,512 in 2023. The contract with ECHO was signed on 30 June 2021 reflecting these figures.

Methodology

A transparent process for the selection of partners was agreed within the GSC SAG. This process was recorded in an [ECHO selection process document](#) that was made public in the [GSC website](#). The document provided clear steps to be followed in the process. It also outlined the activities and selection criteria, the partner responsibilities and commitments, and provided a timetable. The SAG also agreed on the activities to be called for expressions of interest and the criteria for the selection of partners. The steps outlined in the selection process document were followed:

- A Selection Committee composed of UNHCR staff and volunteer SAG members was created, it included three members and one observer from the following organizations: UNHCR (Brett Moore (observer) and Miguel Urquia), IFRC (Pablo Medina), and CARE International (Step Haiselden).
- A [Global Update](#) was sent on the 28 June 2021 to all GSC partners asking for expressions of interest to participate in the implementation of certain activities of the ECHO grant. The deadline to submit these activities was the 1 August 2021. The following documents were sent along with the Global Update:
 - The [ECHO selection process document](#) explaining the process.
 - The [Expressions of Interest Excel document](#): A summary of the activities to be implemented by GSC partners, and the criteria for the selection of partners for each activity. This document was also used as the format for partners to submit their applications, to justify how they fulfill the criteria set by the GSC.
 - The [Partner Declaration](#) document for those organizations which are not already UNHCR partners.
- A **webinar** was organized on 6 July 2021 to explain the process in detail and answer questions. The webinar was [recorded and made available](#) along with the [presentation](#) in the [GSC ECHO webpage](#). [Questions received and their answers](#) were made publicly available to all partners through the same webpage.
- A total of 30 expressions of interest were received from 12 organizations and consortia (this includes original submissions and subsequent resubmissions required for clarification during the negotiation process) as follows: CANADEM, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), CRS Malawi, CRS Nepal, Caritas Bangladesh, CraTerre, Federal Institute of Technology Zurich (ETHZ), Fundación Senderos (FUNDASEN), International Humanitarian Infrastructure Platform and Shelter Centre (IHIP-SC), Nepal Red Cross Society and Habitat for Humanity Nepal (NRCS-HfH), Shelter Centre and Better Shelter (SC-BS), and the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF).
- The GSC Support Team compiled all expressions of interest and prepared an evaluation grid for the Selection Committee to evaluate and score each proposal.

- The Selection Committee analyzed the submissions and met on several occasions to finalize a recommendation on which GSC partner implements which activities. These minutes record the recommendation made by the Selection Committee. The Selection Committee met on the following days: 4 August, 6 August, 11 August, 17 August, 24 August, 3 September, and 8 September. The committee found several challenges when making its decisions:
 - None of the organizations that applied to item 6 were deemed suitable to implement this item: the committee proposes not to allocate it to any organization and award it to IFRC as global cluster co-lead agency which is also implementing activities of the grant and is implementing advocacy-related products under another grant received by the cluster so has the required capacity to undertake the work.
 - Several applications were received from country-level branches of CRS. These applications were not substantive enough independently, but they could be of merit if combined and centralized. The headquarters of CRS were contacted to revise the applications accordingly.

The decisions of the selection committee can be found in the next section.

Next steps in the process:

- A waiver will be submitted to UNHCR's Implementing Partnership Management Service to explain the selection process so that it can be accepted as equivalent to the internal UNHCR partner selection process.
- The GSC coordinators from UNHCR and IFRC will decide on the allocation of the grant based on the recommendation.

Recommendations on the items

Item 1: Global Focal Point (GFP) for Environment

The Selection Committee recommends **CANADEM** for this item. Two organizations expressed an interest in this item: **CANADEM** and the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		CANADEM	ETHZ
Organization has an institutional commitment to this issue.	20	16.6	13.3
Organization ensures that the time dedication required will be met	20	20	16.6
Organization is committed to continuing the activity after the end of the ECHO funding, for a period of 6 months	20	16.6	6.6
Organization commits to providing more co-funding than the minimum required for this activity	20	6.6	6.6

It will be possible to deploy the GFP to any country	20	20	6.6
Total	100	80	63.3

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: CANADEM is better placed to implement this item given their past experience and capacities. Little detail on co-funding and sustainability is provided but the applicant is fully compliant. ETHZ has framed the position as being technical which is not the case and no clear demonstration is provided of their operational capacity, other than research. ETHZ mentions commitment but limited co-funding, and, most importantly, offers very limited travel options which could hinder the effectiveness of this role.

Item 2: Support to the Environment Community of Practice

The Selection Committee recommends **WWF** for this item. Two organizations expressed an interest in this item: **the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF)** and the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		WWF	ETHZ
Organization has carried out the activity in the past (continuity)	30	25	10
Organization is committed to continuing the activity after the end of the ECHO funding, for a period of 6 months	20	20	20
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	20	16.6	20
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	30	25	25
Total	100	86.6	75

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: WWF has been supporting the Environment Community of Practice (ECoP) for the last few years using their own funding and resources. They have well-known expertise on the subject, and they are a reputable organization. ETHZ has explained in their application some experience and level of commitment, however there is little detail in how the applicant understands the nature of the task and the organization has not been involved with the GSC or the ECoP in the past. The ECoP, chaired or supported by the GFP for Environment, will prioritize the activities. The cluster lead agencies and other partners will contribute to this activity through the ECoP. It should be noted that there will also be co-funding from UNHCR and IFRC for this activity.

Item 3: Energy Options Description

The Selection Committee recommends **ETHZ** for this item. Two organizations expressed an interest in this item: **Fundación Senderos, FUNDASEN** and the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		FUNDASEN	ETHZ
Organization has an institutional commitment with this issue	20	13.3	20
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	20	16.6	16.6
Organization is committed to continuing the activity after the end of the ECHO funding, for a period of 6 months	20	16.6	20
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	20	6.6	10
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	20	13.3	16.6
Total	100	66.6	83.3

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: The proposal from ETHZ needs further clarification but ultimately this activity fits very well with their expertise. The experience that they mention in their application of supporting ICRC with a design tool to enhance environmentally appropriate construction projects in conflict-affected settings, is very interesting and relevant. The skills developed during that collaboration will be very well suited for this item. They should be encouraged to link up with FUNDASEN to understand their product. They should also consult the cooking compendium developed by UNHCR. The proposal from FUNDASEN is not strong enough, it focusses on a single product which seems good but limited in scope and may not be applied everywhere.

Item 4: GFP for Advocacy

The Selection Committee recommends **CANADEM** for this item. Three organizations expressed an interest in this role: **CANADEM**, the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**, and a **consortium between the International Humanitarian Infrastructure Platform (IHIP) and Shelter Centre (SC)**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		CANADEM	ETHZ	IHIP-SC
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	25	25	0	12.3
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	25	25	16.5	4
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	25	12.5	12.66	25
Organization can undertake this activity in any country	25	25	4	15.6
Total	100	87.5	33.16	57

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: CANADEM has been hosting this role for the last few months through another project and will continue doing so for fifteen more months. The support provided by CANADEM has been excellent and the current

candidate is doing a good job. Continuity in the role is an advantage in this type of global roles. CANADEM has a proven track record of more than ten years deploying experts to UNHCR. The other organizations propose to host the role themselves, but they do not demonstrate enough experience hosting roles for clusters, enough expertise in the area of advocacy in the humanitarian system nor the capacity to deploy to any country which is an essential requirement.

Item 5: Development of 5 Environmental Profiles (conflict)

No organization expressed an interest in this item, so the Selection Committee recommends merging this item with item 2 and award it to **WWF**. WWF has the expertise and the capacity to undertake this activity and both activities 2 and 5 are highly complementary.

Item 6: Increased Advocacy

The Selection Committee recommends not to award this item to any of the applicants because none of them have demonstrated capacity to implement it. Instead, the committee recommends to award to IFRC who will also implement activities for this grant. Two organizations expressed an interest in this role: the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**, and a consortium between the **International Humanitarian Infrastructure Platform (IHIP) and Shelter Centre (SC)**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		ETHZ	IHIP-SC
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	25	7.6	15.6
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	25	8.3	8.3
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	25	16	7.3
Organization can undertake this activity in any country	25	4	16.6
Total	100	36	43.6

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: ETHZ does not indicate the experience or capacity to undertake this task largely due to lack of implementation capacity and presence. The limited experience in field training is mostly on material research and workshops, very different to the type of products included in this item. IHIP and Shelter Centre have experience in tools, guidance, and convening partners but not in advocacy.

Item 7: Localization Initiatives

The Selection Committee recommends **CRS** for this item. Three organizations expressed an interest in this item: **CRS**, the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**, and a consortium between the **Nepal Red Cross Society and Habitat for Humanity Nepal**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		CRS	ETHZ	NRCS-HfH
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	20	20	6.6	16.6
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	20	20	6.6	16.6
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	30	25	25	25
Organization can undertake this activity in any country	30	30	10	15
Total	100	95	48.3	73.3

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: CRS has demonstrated experience and commitment in localization and in managing grants at global level, it is a strong operational organization with robust expertise in shelter. ETHZ has no operational presence at country level and therefore will find it challenging to implement this activity. The proposal from NRCS-HfH has limited description of how the partnership would scale up localization internationally. The explanations are very limited.

Item 8: Cash Champions

The Selection Committee recommends **CRS** for this item. Two organizations expressed an interest in this item: **CRS, and a consortium between the Nepal Red Cross Society and Habitat for Humanity Nepal**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		CRS	NRCS-HfH
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	20	20	6.6
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	30	25	25
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	30	25	20
Organization can undertake this activity in any country	20	20	13.3
Total	100	90	65

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: CRS has demonstrated experience and commitment on the use of cash and they were one of the Cash Champion organizations in previous ECHO grants. Their strong grant management capacity, operational presence and expertise in cash and shelter will be great assets to implement this item. The proposal from NRCS-HfH is unclear and has limited description of how the partnership would scale up the reach of this activity beyond Nepal.

Item 9: Local Building Practice Profiles

The Selection Committee recommends **CraTerre** for this item. Three organizations expressed an interest in this item: **CraTerre, the Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ), and a consortium between the Nepal Red Cross**

Society and Habitat for Humanity Nepal. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		CraTerre	ETHZ	NRCS-HfH
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	20	20	6.6	3.3
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	30	30	15	10
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	30	20	15	20
Organization can undertake this activity in any country	20	16.6	3.3	10
Total	100	86.6	40	43.3

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: CraTerre has demonstrated a good track record and have the capacity to implement this activity which they have been successfully doing for some years. They are best placed to implement it given their expertise and experience. However, it would be beneficial for them to collaborate with ETHZ and benefit from some of their research capacity. ETHZ is a university with experience in research, study of materials and training which may be too theoretical and detached from the field for this item. Their proposal does not give a clear explanation of how the task is understood and how it would be implemented. The proposal from NRCS-HfH seems very generic with little indication of how the organizations would undertake the task, mainstream it, and make it available for other organizations.

Item 10: Pilots of environmentally appropriate shelter solutions or approaches in conflict settings

The Selection Committee recommends **CRS** for this item. Three organizations expressed an interest in this item: **CRS**, the **Chair of Sustainable Construction - Federal Institute of Technology ETH Zurich (ETHZ)**, and a **consortium between Shelter Centre and Better Shelter (SC-BS)**. The results of the marking by the members of the Selection Committee are reflected in this table:

Criteria		CRS	ETHZ	SC-BS
Organization has carried out similar activity in the past (experience)	20	16.6	0	10
Organization has the technical capacity and expertise required	30	25	20	15
Organization commits to providing co-funding for this activity	30	30	20	30
Organization can undertake this activity in any country	20	20	5	10
Total	100	91.6	45	65

The Selection Committee members added the following comments: CRS is a strong operational partner with innovative shelter programming and presence either directly or through

partnerships in all countries where a conflict-related cluster is activated. They are well placed to undertake this item and to provide knowledgeable contributions. They have demonstrated an excellent implementation in past ECHO grants and have produced good case studies of innovative practices. ETHZ has limited relevant experience and very limited presence on the ground to implement this activity, as an academic institution they would have to partner with other organizations for every single pilot which gives a degree of uncertainty to their proposal. It is also the first time they collaborate with the GSC. Shelter Centre and Better Shelter are a new consortium, neither of them is an implementing agency with presence on the ground. Better Shelter is a provider of one shelter solution, the Refugee Housing Unit, very interesting and with many options but just one of them.

Project components allocated to Cluster Lead Agencies (UNHCR and IFRC)

Several components in the project were allocated to UNHCR and IFRC during the design of the project with the approval of the SAG and were not included in the call for Expressions of Interest. The allocation of certain components directly to the co-lead agencies responds to the fact that UNHCR and IFRC as co-leads of the GSC for conflict and natural disasters respectively have special functions that no other organization can fulfill such as deployment of surge capacity to the field, management of the grant, and others. Both organizations also contribute most of the co-funding to the project given their co-leadership role. These components are not part of the project activities open for awarding to partners, but they are captured in the summary table for ease of reference when drafting the partner agreements.

Signed by:

Pablo Medina, IFRC



18/09/2021

Step Haiselden, CARE International



21/09/2021

Miguel Urquia, UNHCR



18/09/2021

Brett Moore, UNHCR (observer of evaluation process)



18/09/2021

Summary table with all organizations by activity in the ECHO project

	Description of item	Recipient Organization	Amount	Co-funding
Activity 1.1 Shelter partners green their response				
1	Global Focal Point (GFP) for Environment 18 months at 100% dedication	CANADEM	€ 114,400	
2	Support to ECoP	WWF	€ 33,300	
	Support to ECoP	IFRC		€ 15,000
3	Energy Options Description	ETHZ	€ 20,589	
	GFP for Technical Coordination	IFRC	€ 61,740	€ 10,000
Activity 1.2 Environmental research and advocacy available to make country-level shelter responses greener and climate smart.				
4	GFP for Advocacy	CANADEM	€ 70,000	
5	Development of 5 Environmental Profiles in conflict settings	WWF	€ 29,540	
	Development of 5 Environmental Profiles in natural disaster settings	IFRC	€ 29,540	
6	Increased advocacy	IFRC	€ 33,760	
Activity 1.3 Country-level shelter clusters effectively design and implement greener and climate-smart shelter and settlement responses				
7	Localization Initiatives	CRS	€ 13,760	€ 6,000
8	Cash Champions.	CRS	€ 33,760	€ 20,000
9	Local Building Practice Profiles.	CraTerre	€ 27,980	
10	Pilots of environmental shelter solutions or approaches in conflict settings.	CRS	€ 60,960	€ 30,000
	Pilots of environmental shelter solutions or approaches in natural disasters.	IFRC	€ 15,000	
	Website development	IFRC		€ 8,440
	GSC meeting and workshops	IFRC		€ 8,000

Summary table by organization

Description of item		Amount	Co-funding
CANADEM		€ 184,400	
1	Global Focal Point (GFP) for Environment 18 months at 100% dedication	€ 114,400	
4	GFP for Advocacy	€ 70,000	
CRS		€ 108,480	€ 56,000
7	Localization Initiatives	€ 13,760	€ 6,000
8	Cash Champions.	€ 33,760	€ 20,000
10	Pilots of environmental shelter solutions or approaches in conflict settings.	€ 60,960	€ 30,000
CraTerre		€ 27,980	
9	Local Building Practice Profiles.	€ 27,980	
ETHZ		€ 20,589	
3	Energy Options Description	€ 20,589	
WWF		€ 62,840	
2	Support to ECoP	€ 33,300	
5	Development of 5 Environmental Profiles in conflict settings	€ 29,540	
IFRC		€ 140,040	€ 41,440
	Support to ECoP		€ 15,000
	GFP for Technical Coordination	€ 61,740	€ 10,000
	Development of 5 Environmental Profiles in natural disaster settings	€ 29,540	
6	Increased advocacy	€ 33,760	
	Pilots of environmental shelter solutions or approaches in natural disasters.	€ 15,000	
	Website development		€ 8,440
	GSC meeting and workshops		€ 8,000