



VOICE Advisory Board Meeting, 17 to 19 May 2022

Zoom Online Meeting / FINAL MINUTES

Advisory Board (AB)

1. Rinaldi Ridwan (RR), Co-founder and Vice-Chair, Indonesian Adolescent Health Association, Indonesia
2. Christine Kandie (CHK), Founder and Director, Endorois Indigenous Women Empowerment Network Kenya
3. Caroline K (CAK), Executive Director, Initiative Sankofa d’Afrique de l’Ouest, (ISDAO), Ghana
4. Dumiso Gatsha, Founder, Success Capital Organization, Botswana

In attendance

1. Ishita Dutta (ID), Programme Manager, Voice
2. Inez Hackenberg (IH), Linking and Learning Coordinator, Voice

DAY 1: 17 MAY 2022

1. Welcome, check-in and review of the meeting agenda

ID facilitated the introduction of all participants by asking them to share something in their current practice that is bringing them joy. After a round of sharing, the agenda for the day was reviewed collectively.

2. Brief status update on Voice

ID and IH shared the following updates.

- Following the last meeting of the Voice advisory board in October 2021, the main activity undertaken by the Voice global coordination team (GCT) was the first in-person meeting in 2 years. This took place in Nairobi from 13 to 17 December 2021. Unfortunately, a number of the GCT members fell sick on this trip and therefore, all the objectives of the meeting in terms of completing operational planning for 2022 were not completed.
- In the first quarter of 2022, the Voice teams continued working on the Voice@5 learning document. This was finalised and submitted to the Ministry originally in January 2022 and then reviewed and re-submitted finally in April 2022. The teams also worked on and submitted the Voice annual report 2021. Currently, the team is beginning to consider how the learning document can be made more digestible and accessible and how it can be shared with a wider community. In addition to that, the team organized the first global knowledge exchange in February, which was on interrogating whether *Linking and Learning is a pathway to inclusion*. The knowledge exchange had great turnout of nearly 100 participants each day over two days. In the linking and learning activities, some countries (Mali and Niger) have continued in-person engagement, whereas other countries have been working digitally. While the digital spaces attract large numbers of participants, there is also a longing among participants for in-person meetings.
- The Voice core team (Clemens, Inez, Ishita) has also started discussions with the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA) following the first Voice Director’s level policy dialogue in January 2022. At this meeting, the Voice core team shared with MoFA that all Voice teams are continuing to see considerable delay in terms of budget expenditure on the grant side. This is not only from the side of Voice in terms of being



able to make approvals on time, but also in terms of the grantee partners ability to be able to expend funds once the transfers are made to them. This is following from a delay that the programme has been facing since 2020, where MoFA made a commitment stop for a couple of months when the COVID-19 pandemic first hit. That is a backlog that the team has been struggling to catch on together with the closures of phase one and the start-up of the extension phase. Based on all these reasons, what MoFA itself suggested to Voice was to consider the possibility of extending the end of the program implementation period from December 2023 to June or September 2024. This negotiation is currently ongoing. The other offer that MoFA has made to Voice is on convening a donor roundtable where we can present what we are learning about Voice as a grant making facility and gauge interest from other on the possibility of investing in an initiative like Voice in the future.

- Lastly, the teams are working on the final context analysis update for the Voice programme and keeping the planning for the Voice external evaluation in view. The external impact evaluation is planned to take place starting early 2023. The external evaluation will also help us assess if we need to continue Voice, and if, yes, what form and shape should it take?

AB members gave comments and raised questions on the programme update.

- DG asked if it would be helpful to have a transition phase that would be more medium term (4-5 years) (in line with the Black Feminist Fund, Equality Fund, the Global Fund to End AIDS, Malaria & TB, and a few others) to help carve out ideal models and strengthen a foundation beyond the Dutch MFA? We can advocate and educate up for more meaningful and sustainable ways of phasing and figuring out. It's also an opportunity for a more prolonged/phased evaluation. That way you can get an expansive and rich data set. It would be a missed opportunity to just delay because of the time. The value of insights as initially planned are as important at the delay point.
- CAK asked about the context of delayed expenditures and what that translates to in terms of ability to get funding out the door to communities who need these resources. And also sought understanding on whether the six-month extension is enough. Also, the annual report 2021 mentioned a gap between the plans and the target achieved in terms of funding to formal organizations, informal organizations, and networks. It would be helpful to really unpack and understand that to assess how the initiative is responding and resourcing informal organizing and other organizations that would have historically had less access to other sources of funding for their work.
- In response to CAK, ID stated that the terms of the 'further extension' of the current extension phase of Voice are as follows: there is no addition to Voice's grants budget. Voice is allowed a 10% top-up on the current program management budget which will let us manage the grants for an additional period of six months. We are asking for six-months and not longer to be realistic in terms of the budget ballpark that comes up based on the 10% top-up.
- ID also responded to the question on the context for delays in grant expenditure as follows: one reason was the commitment stop from MoFA in 2020, which led to late start of the calls for proposals in the extension phase. The second major reason for 2021 on the side of the Voice teams, was that they were focusing on closures of the phase one grants. Therefore, they had to constantly balance between meeting the planned approvals for 2021 versus an equal pressure to close the 400+ grants from phase one. Lastly, we also saw delays in the expenditure being done by grantee partners themselves. Even the grantee partners who had designed projects post COVID, are facing quite significant delays in rolling out the activities. For the remainder



of 2022 and 2023, the plan is for teams to really focus on approvals and providing grant management support to the grantee partners to keep the spending on track.

- CAK followed up with a question on the extension to ask whether the discussion with MoFA on the next iteration of Voice was also a factor creating time pressure to wrap up the current phase of Voice.
- ID clarified that the pressure on time is not tied to the future of Voice because MoFA has not made any commitment at this point. IH added to the response highlighting that 'further extension' of the extension period of Voice would need to happen within the framework of the tender that originally created Voice. Any changes to the programme that go beyond the terms of the tender, such as changing the 70-30 breakdown between the grant and programme management budget, cannot be allowed by MoFA. MoFA itself is restricted from being flexible due to the tender. Voice similarly found itself restricted by the tender. Therefore, one of the scenarios the Voice team would like to develop and propose for the future is to get out of this tender framework. Voice is not restricted from raising funds from outside sources by the tender. Therefore, it has been able to obtain additional funds from the Hewlett Foundation, for instance.
- IH also clarified on Voice's reach to informal groups and organisations, that a fundamental challenge is the administrative compliance requirements of MoFA itself which require any recipients of Voice funds to have a bank account with 2 or 3 legal signatories and some form of registration. Voice has sought to work around this by supporting informal groups through fiscal hosting arrangements. On the question of grants to networks, Voice also supports a number of consortiums and alliances that work across rightsholder groups or countries. Although numbers on both these categories is currently not disaggregated, this is something that could be investigated further.
- DG added that the funding landscape currently is quite competitive and dynamic with a lot of different networks and collaborations emerging. A unique facet of Voice is that it not only emerges from a tender but also has experience of channelling bilateral funding directly to grassroots communities. Not many other initiatives have been able to do so. So, it might be worth considering a blended approach where the restrictions of the tender are eased through raising funds from other sources for instance. Here, the point is considering how we can continue to nurture and leverage on the strong relationship with MoFA. In considering this blended model, Voice could assess the possibility of being hosted by a different entity such as the New Venture Fund.
- ID closed this section of the meeting by stating that all these points should be taken into the following days discussion that looks specifically at the future of Voice post 2024.

Key issues for current decision making for the Advisory Board

- ID stated that given the short time remaining in the meeting for the day, the discussion on ways of working could be merged with the key decisions to be made by the advisory board currently, including on:
 - Selection of a chair
 - Profile and process for filling the current vacancy in the Voice AB, and
 - Nomination of a focal point for engagement in the ideation and design process for Voice post 2024.
- RR proposed on the ways of working and decision-making that the Chair could put the matter for decision before the rest of the AB and give them 1 to 2 weeks to respond. If 2/3rd of the members, in the case of the Voice AB, 4 out of 6 members made a decision that would be communicated to the Voice team and the other AB members would be requested to honour it.



- CAK said it would be good to have additional clarity about what types of decisions are expected to be made by the AB other than the ones pending about the chair and the recruitment. Since the Voice AB is advisory in nature, it has implications on the ways of working and how decisions made by the AB are followed.
- ID mentioned that the terms of reference of the AB currently only mentions the approval of the Voice annual plan as an action requiring a decision. The other areas are more broadly defined in terms of brainstorming and engagement. There is openness within the Voice team to assess what the role of the AB in its current formation would look like as this part of the movement accountability piece for the programme. Given the short time, it was agreed that the AB members and Voice team would review the AB TOR and bring any relevant points for discussion to the next day's meeting.
- CK said that she wished to understand how things are being done within Voice because most recently she was surprised seeing that an annual linking and learning event happened in Kenya in which she was not involved. She made the observation that it would be good to ensure the participation of relevant AB members in activities happening in the countries that they are based in or even in their region. This will ensure that AB members are well informed about the workings of Voice.
- IH said that this should certainly be ensured. This message will be reinforced to all Voice teams, and it would also be helpful to know if the AB members planned to travel to any of the Voice countries.
- With this, the meeting for day 1 was closed.

DAY 2: 18 MAY 2022

- IH opened the meeting with a short update on the agenda where it was proposed that the first half-hour be spent on continuing the discussion from yesterday on ways of working and decision-making by the advisory board. The remaining hour and a half would be used to share and discuss the roadmap to Voice post 2024.

Contd. Key issues for current decision making for the Advisory Board

- IH started by sharing a Google Slides presentation [<https://bit.ly/3PO2JL7>] with the following three topics:
 - Priority issues where Voice would like to have engagement from the AB
 - Voice post 2024
 - Context analysis update and external evaluation
 - Strategic positioning and strategic communications
 - Issues for collective decision making
 - Selection of chair
 - Profile of AB member to be selected to fill the current vacancy
 - Process for selection of AB member to fill the current vacancy
 - Proposal for ways of working that echoed the recommendation of RR made the previous day:
 - Chair makes proposal to all AB members. All AB members respond within 2 weeks. If no response, silent AB members honour decision taken by 2/3rd majority.
- CAK sought more clarity on the issue of strategic positioning and communications. ID responded that this area focuses on strengthening and cultivating partnerships with other philanthropic and development sector actors, understanding the landscape in which Voice operates better with a view to contributing to and learning from ongoing sectoral discussions around #ShiftThePower and decolonisation of aid. This is both to ensure that Voice is complementary to the efforts of likeminded actors in the sector but also to scope out partnerships for the future.



- RR sought further clarity on the scope of engagement requested from AB members, whether this would entail direct participation in Voice activities taking place nationally or regionally, more frequent meetings with the Voice teams, or inputs into strategic discussions. It would be important to understand whether there is a departure from the commitment the AB has made to Oxfam Novib and Hivos at the start of their tenure that focused very much on the present of Voice, to a different engagement focused more on the future of Voice. CAK added to RR's recommendation stating that it is important for the AB members to have a level of connection and level of engagement with the programme which not all of us have in a regular way. She lifted up the point that CK made yesterday, that it would be important to continue to think about how the strategic questions that are being asked are responded to from a grounded perspective of what the Voice programme is actually doing.
- In response ID mentioned that the comments from the AB echo the thinking of the Voice team. On the issue of Voice post-2024, it would be important to clarify that the discussion on it was in very early stages when the AB ToR was developed in 2019-2020. That has certainly shifted within Voice in the last few months. Additionally, to take into account the need for the AB to get a more grounded understanding of the Voice programme in action, the team would like to invite the AB to join the Voice annual reflection meeting in Cambodia from 28 to 30 July 2022.
- Following this and based on an input from CAK that some sort of clarity needs to be reached in this meeting to keep the work of the Voice AB moving forward, IH proposed that the Voice team members step out of the meeting room so that the AB has some time to discuss the issues requiring key decisions.
- Upon reconvening, CAK on behalf of the AB shared that the Voice AB has agreed to have a co-chair model to regulate its ways of working. Decision on who the co-chairs are could not be made as two AB members who have had the most extensive engagement with Voice- Nidhi and Christine are not present. Consequently, the AB offers to share their decision on the co-chairship within 1-week from the date of the meeting. Until the selection of the co-chairs, RR offers to be the focal point for communications with the Voice team. The AB members will also create their own WhatsApp group to have direct conversations, without involvement of the Voice team.
- A detailed discussion also took place on the process of recruitment of the new AB member. The following steps were proposed to take this process forward:
 - Draw up a profile of the AB member to be brought on board based on current needs. For instance, ID shared that as the programme manager it would be important for her to have someone with a strong background on prospecting and fundraising with an eye to the future of Voice. Another aspect shared was familiarity/ knowledge of transition processes, e.g., Amplify Change and Equality Fund. Consider what the implications are of having a Netherlands based AB member for the future.
 - Share the profile within the Voice community- all teams, SC and AB, for nominations of persons fitting the profile.
 - Conduct direct outreach with the nominated better and initiate the selection process.
 - Ideally, have the person on-board by the time of the annual reflection meeting in July.
- Relating to the issue of Voice post-2024, DG shared information about the CSEM model- the civil society engagement mechanism for universal health coverage. It mobilizes resources from States, such as France and Japan who contribute around €34 million to the Secretariat. It is housed by the World Health Organization a multi-



lateral agency and it is interesting to learn more about this model as it has States in its governance body and is vastly different from a number of other intermediaries. This includes funds like FRIDA, the Climate Resilience Fund, etc., and INGOs like Oxfam, Hivos, CIVICUS etc. It might be interesting to look at a blended model of fundraising for the future where Voice secures resources not only from bilateral funders but also private foundations. It would be interesting to explore the possibility of being able to leverage off of the history of nurtured relationships and ensure they're continuously evolving infrastructure in a way that it can be future fit. While at the same time building a more blended and more flexible operating model that is distinct and unique and that has a very clear equitable advantage in comparison to many other actors and funders.

- IH responded by stating that the way Voice has evolved over the last few years, the focus can never only be on getting the funding in, but also on how the funders think and behave. CAK also sought additional clarity from DG on the issue of black-and-white thinking in relation to funding models.
- DG clarified that it's important to get a proper understanding of the modalities and the limits and the challenges and then having an overview of what might be ideal. And then more importantly, recognize that when you are limited to binaries it means that we're closing ourselves out from being meaningful, intentional and inclusive enough because that's creating a hierarchy in what is possible.

Roadmap to Voice post-2024

- IH presented the roadmap to Voice post-2024:
 - What is being presented has nothing to do with what will be the outcome of the process. It is a process we're proposing to Oxfam, Hivos and the AB.
 - The starting point for this trajectory is of the fact that it was recognized in the Voice mid-term review report that Voice is resourcing the right self-led rightsholder groups. This has also been confirmed by the team's own observations as well. There is an untapped potential to move resources to those most left behind. Linking it very much with the bigger objective, why MoFA started to think about this fund- putting intersectionality in practice with inclusion as the end.
 - The Voice coordination team will run a survey with all key stakeholders. This information will be taken together with the results of the grantee perception survey report, information generated through ongoing monitoring and evaluation, and soon the external evaluation report to create an analysis of where Voice stands now and what the aspirations for the future are. The phase that we are in is 'setting the scene and exploration', where the roadmap is being presented to all relevant stakeholders. In this phase, we will also put together the core team that will be implementing the roadmap moving forward. This will include representation from the country teams and also from the AB. Following this, we will undertake a mapping of actors looking not only at funding possibilities but also developing relationships for the future.
 - The next step would be the scenario development and the prospecting, and we hope to do that in the second half 2022. The kick-off will likely take place at the July meet where MoFA and AB members will also be present. A diverse group of stakeholders will be involved in the analysis of all the data and scenario creation in a writeshop. At the writeshop we will clarify on the funding, partnership, vision and strategy, but also defining the value add.



- In 2023, we plan to have the draft scenarios out. The external evaluation probably will only start when the first draft ideas about two or three scenarios are already developed. The external evaluation could also provide feedback into the scenarios
- It would be ideal to come up with the final scenario more or less by June 2023, when Voice hopefully would still have a full year of program implementation and still one and a one and a half year more if you look at the administrative closure of the tender, so very leading questions, how to live our values and be purpose driven.
- In the second half of 2023, will be the design and fundraising period. Before this would be the investigation and looking for partners on implementation, partners on funding.
- Whatever the shape or form we choose for voice, the operationalization needs to start while the other program is still running hopefully in 2024. And that will of course also mean the start of legal processes, depending on our choices. Based on the most probable legal form we would have to take steps including selection of a board or a revision, depending on whether we become independent or remain a program, the organizational and or program strategies and systems, fundraising, communications, and the whole setup of structures.
- This timeline is also set in a roadmap where we can constantly engage with and have it as a monitoring tool and a living document.
- There are a number of strategic entry points when we start thinking about and working towards Voice post-2024. It's the grant making agenda. Continue shifting resources to those most left behind by complementing the constellation of women's funds and thematic funds by continuing resourcing through an intersectional lens and an intersectional way of working. There is also the influencing agenda which relates to where funding sources come from, the shift the power discussion, negotiating power relationships with grantee partners as an intermediary grant maker, cross cultural relationship management, demonstrating the value of investing in linking and learning as a strategy.
- It's important to realize that there might still be a moment where we say the conditions that are created do not allow Voice to go the way it would like to go. So, we are closing the program that is still there. We hope it won't get there.
- CAK asked that in future such documents be shared ahead of time as it really helps with preparations. She further inquired about the process of deciding which communities and countries Voice would work with in the future. Have decisions about this already been made? This relates to DG's point about including people as early as possible in the process of envisioning and creating, rather than developing a proposal and then taking it to the communities or countries. Have there been discussions within the Voice programme to see where the gaps are, are there particular places where Voice is well positioned and should be doing more or engaging in a way that maybe hasn't been the focus to date?
- IH responded that the original choice of the 10-focus countries was motivated by the focus of the Dutch MoFA at the time based on political considerations that inform development and aid policies, as well as internal discussions with Oxfam and Hivos about where this work could take place. This issue certainly requires serious reflection for the future. The rightsholder groups that Voice focuses on were similarly chosen based on a context analysis carried out by Oxfam and Hivos at the start of the



programme. In the view of the teams and the grantee partners, the rightsholder groups are defined broadly enough that it allows Voice to reach the most marginalised and discriminated groups. The combination of grant making and linking and learning is also expected to be retained in future in terms of programme strategies. IH also highlighted that LGBTQI persons and ethnic minorities remain under-served through the Voice programme currently. This fact also needs attention in the future.

- CAK asked whether discussions with Oxfam and Hivos have already happened and whether they will continue to hold Voice in the future.
- IH and ID responded that this discussion needs to be had with Oxfam and Hivos, how they see their future engagement with Voice. However, based on personal impressions, the overwhelming feeling within the Voice teams is for Voice to be separate from Oxfam and Hivos.
- DG posited from a decolonial framing that it would be important to reflect on the ways of working and how decisions are made about the future of Voice post-2024. Articulating our intersectional praxis and being intentional about it would be supportive to enabling the AB members to fulfil their roles.

The meeting closed with a quick discussion about the preparations for the meeting with MoFA the following day. In the absence of a decision about the chair of the Voice AB, CAK offered to chair the meeting. The team shared information on the historical context of the relationship between Voice and MoFA, also reflected in chapter 1 of the learning document and flagged to the AB that MoFA was interested in understanding two issues better- 1) is their understanding of Voice how well is it fulfilling its current mandate, and 2) what is their take on a future of Voice post-2024.



DAY 3: VOICE ADVISORY BOARD MEETING WITH THE NETHERLANDS MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Participants:

Advisory Board (AB)

1. Rinaldi Ridwan (RR), Co-founder and Vice-Chair, Indonesian Adolescent Health Association, Indonesia
2. Christine Kandie (CHK), Founder and Director, Endorois Indigenous Women Empowerment Network Kenya
3. Caroline K (CAK), Executive Director, Initiative Sankofa d'Afrique de l'Ouest, (ISDAO), Ghana
4. Dumiso Gatsha (DG), Founder, Success Capital Organization, Botswana
5. Nidhi Goyal (NG), Rising Flame, India

Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MoFA)

1. Pieter de Vries, Team Lead, Civil Society Division
2. Marinka Wijngaard, Policy Officer, Civil Society Division
3. Maya Puran, Intern, Civil Society Division

Voice team

1. Ishita Dutta (ID), Programme Manager, Voice
2. Inez Hackenberg (IH), Linking and Learning Coordinator, Voice
3. Clemens Wennekes (CW) Finance Coordinator, Voice

The meeting was chaired by CAK. It opened with a round of introductions where all present shared about their journey to Voice.

Questions from the Advisory Board to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

- DG sought to understand what would be deemed as a success for Voice in the context of sustainability and for Voice to be really seen as a benchmark or effective for the Ministry.
- CAK asked a related question, seeking to find out how learnings from Voice are influencing the programming of MoFA. Are their shifts being seen in the context of grant making? Are their shifts being seen in the broader context of Shift the Power?
- MW responded first on the success factors of Voice that one of the biggest ones is putting the leave no one behind principle in practice. Voice directly funds a lot of rightsholder-led groups. And as logical and normal as that sounds, it's really unique in ODA funding and also in grant making.
 - In terms of how Voice has influenced the conversation within MoFA, MW shared that the MoFA's policy in terms of its reach is considering what does inclusion truly mean, also in financing. That is a great success of Voice. There's always more to be done or that can be improved. For instance, the Voice mid-term review report found that most Voice grantees are based in capitals and that there are many more groups in rural areas that the programme is not reaching.
 - Another interesting learning and success factor is the linking and learning element of this program. Monitoring, evaluation and linking and learning is an inherent part of this program. Linking and learning really strengthens the work



of every grantee. It strengthens the work of the Voice team. That is quite an important lesson because we often forget to make enough space in terms of both funding, but also time and capacity to invest in the linking and learning element within programming. Points like these have directly also led to the thinking about the new policy frameworks of the MoFA, for example, the new Power of Voices policy framework.

- Lastly, on Shift the Power and more direct funding to rightsholders, there has been much more critical thinking within MoFA on the type of organizations that we want to fund in the future. In practice, all programs that are now financed under the latest strengthening civil society policy framework have been critically assessed on the way that they address power dynamics within their own consortium, but also within their complete work field, how they reach target groups.
- PdV stated the discussion on localization of the MoFA's development cooperation, shifting the power, etc., are ongoing. It is struggle for donors and it is constant a debate. MoFA is following the Barcelona initiative mentioned in the chat. It is not there yet, and it is to be determine what can be done, to what extent can MoFA localize its development cooperation efforts. MoFA is very happy to have a programme like Voice, as stated in the introduction, which gives so much information on a model that MoFA is very interested in to explore further.
- Following this round of questions and responses, MW asked the AB members what the Voice community can do to better reach out to LGBTIQ rightsholders. This has been a challenging issue for Voice for several years and since several AB members have expertise in this area, there advice would be helpful for the present and for the future.
- CAK proposed that the response to this question which essentially seeks to address a gap in Voice's present work, be addressed towards the end in view of the time.

Roadmap to Voice Post-2024

- IH presented the roadmap to the future of Voice. She stated that the process will being by asking all Voice stakeholders people open questions such as what is their dream about Voice? What is something about Voice that should continue? And what would they not want to continue? Following this, there will be an analysis and few scenarios will be developed. Together with the key Voice stakeholders- MoFA, the Voice team, the advisory board, the steering committee we will come to a core decision of what is the scenario to take forward. From there, concrete steps will be taken to fundraise and change the legal status or the organizational form in case that is needed for the chosen scenario.
 - Presently, we are setting the scene which includes developing the roadmap and initial conversations with Oxfam Novib and Hivos to embark on this trajectory. The analysis will begin soon and consider the findings of the grantee perception survey, the impact stories for phase 1 that have been documented and the upcoming context analysis update. We will also conduct a mapping of actors, possible partnerships, funds, develop a vision on that. A core team will soon be selected involving some Voice coordination team members, some country team members, and an advisory board member.



- In the second half of 2022, all the information gathered will be used to start the scenario development and prospecting. This will include a multidisciplinary workshop where we have people from the Voice team, from the AB, from some grantee partners to collectively think about the scenarios and then present those as drafts for internal feedback. The external evaluation can potentially further validate the efficacy of the different scenarios.
- Eventually, we will come to a core decision based on what will help Voice to live its values and how best resource rightsholders and their organizations intersectionally.
- Once that decision is taken, we would start designing a transition process to whatever form we have come to. This could involve, if necessary, recruitment, relationship and partnership building and prospecting and fundraising.
- In 2024, the transition process will start and depending on the scenario chosen, it might include a legal process, it might include different or new board selections and revisions. It might require considerable organizational program, strategy changes and systems to be set up. It might need fundraising and then the communications and the launch. The branding, launch, structure, and recruitment will depend on the scenario chosen- more independent, less independent, more interdependent.
- This roadmap will need to be detailed along the way. It will be a monitoring and guiding tool.
- Some strategic entry points for Voice post-2024:
 - The grant making agenda- here we are looking at continuing to shift resources to those most left behind through complementing the constellation of women's funds and thematic funds
 - The influencing agenda- here we consider our contributions to the discussions around shift the power, localisation, negotiating power relationships with grantee partners as an intermediary grant maker and enable more trust-based relationships and openness from both sides. Sharing our experience of cross-cultural relationship management is also part of the influencing agenda, very much linked also to again shifting the power and North South relations. Lastly, we will demonstrate the value of investing in linking and learning as a strategy.
- CAK started the reflections on the roadmap presentation stating that she felt there was a level of enthusiasm and interest among the AB around what has been proposed as a process, especially because it creates space for us to really reflect on what's the best model, that will both respond to the needs and that best suits how we want to actually resource communities and undertake this work.
 - The thinking around updating the context analysis is appreciated because we do know context are shifting dramatically.
 - Also appreciated that there's a level of thoughtfulness and consultation that is going into this. Integration of the evaluations that have been undertaken so far, including the grantee assessment, is important in shaping this.
 - It feels ambitious. It's a lot in a very short period of time, but it also feels important as opposed to just moving forward the plan of the status quo of the Voice as it is right now



- Also appreciated the clear articulation of the value add of the linking and learning. Linking and learning has come up quite a bit as one of the really important features of Voice. Articulation of that as a key strategy is also important.
- MW stated that the plan was ambitious yet quite open. It did raise questions about what the starting point of this roadmap. Voice is officially a program that is managed by Oxfam Novib and Hivos. From the presentation, it feels like there is an ambition to make Voice an independent entity. What is the ambition of Oxfam and Hivos as organizations with this programme? Voice, as it is now, will close after 2024. We do not have the opportunity to extend the program in its current form. There are opportunities for you to, look for completely new donors, whether Voice becomes an independent entity or whether Oxfam and Hivos do this.
 - There are also options to look at what can future collaboration between Voice and MoFA look like. There will always be new policy frameworks. A new one will likely be launched before 2025. So is Voice a program that, for example, Oxfam and Hivos would like to use to raise funding through upcoming policy frameworks? Or do you see opportunities or the need to discuss with us a new Voice tender that needs to be brought into the market, whoever would be the executing party? Or do you feel more opportunities to look for completely new donors?
 - It's an ambitious and very great start of roadmap for Voice as a program. However, struggling to understand how it relates to the relation you have with Oxfam, Hivos and MoFA.
- IH stated that there is more and more a feeling among the Voice team that an independent model would be more conducive for what we are trying to do. How broadly is this feeling is carried within Voice and within Oxfam, Hivos and MoFA is to be determined and articulated?
- ID added that a conversation with the Ministry on what the ownership of Voice would be in the next phase hasn't happened yet. We've only heard from MoFA so far that there is interest in pursuing a future of Voice. What that is going to look like has not been determined. And therefore, this process that we are proposing will validate the three possibilities put on the table. We have also expressed this to our colleagues in Oxfam and Hivos, including through the steering committee and to the directors, that the aspiration within the Voice team is to lead the process of ideation. We will certainly not lead it in a way that directs it to where we want it to go, which is our aspiration to be independent even if several of us want that.
 - We have considered that we might need an incubatory period, or a transit period where we are still within Oxfam Hivos. And this could be part of the next strategic framework with the Ministry, or it could be, like you said, a basket fund. The guiding question for us is the one that was put by Caroline in the beginning, which is what lets Voice live out its values The starting point is also open right now.
- MW further asked if this is something that has been discussed actively within Oxfam and Hivos as well? She knows a little bit also about this ambition of the Voice team and understands it as well. Knowing the program for the past years, it has a lot of positive sides also. A lot of complexities as well. And where it comes to the option of



future relationship with the Ministry, it would be very important to keep actively working together on that, for example, also by making sure that we draft the outlines of the upcoming evaluation together to use that in our common thinking, et cetera. But I'm confident that that is also the way the Voice team looks at it. Also, super interested to hear from the advisory board here today what advice they would give Voice for the future and us as MoFA?

- ID responded that the Voice team does not have a clear answer Oxfam and Hivos, on which way the organisations would like it to go. From the Voice team's side, we would also like to approach this conversation with colleagues in Oxfam and Hivos based on what emerges from this consultative process and see what decision MoFA makes with Voice. The aspiration within the Voice team also comes from the space of dialogue over shifting the power and localisation. We would also ask this question to Oxfam and Hivos- how can the two organisations deliver on the localisation of development aid agenda best by participating in this process and making a decision for the future?
- Nidhi stated that this is an important phase in the trajectory of Voice and a very interesting moment to come together as the new Advisory Board around it. Thinking about some of the questions that were based off what does this independence look like- What would be the connections with Oxfam and Hivos? How are we defining independent identity? How are we defining intersectional funds? Having an in-person meeting and some external consultations with similar yet different funds who have worked with MoFA or continue working with the MoFA and other bilaterals would be the next step. Important to have the scenarios ready as a critical step of this discussion.
- MW followed up with a question based on learnings from a grant facility like Leading From the South. To a certain extent, it has the same ambitions as Voice, but more focused on women and girls specifically. They are a consortium of grant makers which has added value because they together have the capacity to cover, a large part of the global south. When you look at the ambition of Voice to become an independent entity very seriously, I'm wondering will there be other partners that you could directly work with that are also Southern led or that are strongly focused on inclusion that you could build a coalition with and in that way theoretically become a really strong group of grant makers that can fund local, that can fund Southern, that can fund rights holders groups?
 - If you look at discussions ongoing right now internationally, within donors, within MoFA, those are the themes and topics that are really important and interesting. Voice has a lot of experience but it's also still maybe relatively small if it would work separately from Oxfam and Hivos.
- DG shared that looking at the dynamics and how a lot of funding mechanisms, if not all of them were compromised by the COVID pandemic. Also now looking at what happened with Ukraine and its implications with financing the Global South. The conversation is really quite early and some of the things are yet to be articulated and maybe even shared. For me, it's really trying to make sure that we're intentional and trying to make sure that we address all the different elements, not just from a stakeholder perspective, but also just looking at the broader context and where conversations are going. Looking at the commitments from the Generation Equality Forum, looking at a block of EU States recalibrating an SRHR strategy for the Global



South. These are all important factors that are to some extent quite structural, but from a feminist decolonial lens need to be addressed in a holistic manner.

- When looking at rightsholders groups, particularly within the context of trauma, informed intergenerational harm and trying to make sure that the linking and learning is quite practical, but that it can also transcend to meaningful impact and transcend to meaningful relationships that are nurtured equitably.
- It's about how we ensure that we're inclusive, that we're a bit more diverse, that we ensure that certain ways of working can work in parallel with whatever is envisioned beyond 2024 such that it's not a shock, whether in operations, the governance level, or in compliance functions.
- CAK followed up by stating that the questions raised by MW are important ones. This is really the stage of ideation before consultation and creation. And just drawing from the experience of establishing ISDAO, it was not something that happened overnight. It actually was a process of building for over several years and extensive consultations, sometimes going back to the drawing board. It's a good thing to start these conversations in 2022, because we need to have the time and the space to think about the different scenarios, to have those engagements, but also to learn from other mechanisms.
 - Dumi shared a number of examples of different ways of doing and different partnerships and coalitions. ISDAO certainly learned quite a bit from other activist funds, including a FRIDA Young Feminist Fund, UHAI, the other foundation. The key is, to look at what are the different ways of doing and if the last two years of the pandemic have taught us anything it is that we need to shift the ways in which we think about organizing and how we resource organizing. This is a good exploratory moment in terms of thinking about what we want Voice post 2024 to look like, and then what is the best body in which that exists, and what does that look like?
 - Appreciate the point around partnerships in the presentation. There's this element around also mapping of the philanthropic environment with other feminist funders, other funders to really understand what the unique contribution of Voice is. We're also working in a context where when Voice started activists led funds like ISDAO weren't fully operational and doing grant making. Organizations like the International Trans Fund had just started doing grant making. There are different kinds of mechanisms that exist across the different communities and regions and rights holder communities. The important work of that landscape mapping and understanding how this connects with other work that's happening in the regions and countries is also going to help create, help contribute to that clarity.
 - Learning from other partnerships- leading from the south, but also other partnerships that have been funded within the last year by MoFA including the Love Alliance, which ISDAO is a part of and that is doing partnerships in a different way in terms of very Africa based or looking essentially how we shift the power around decision making.
- RR commented on the trend of the funders providing innovative grant, urgent fund or emergency fund, particularly during the pandemic. His reflection was so far looking through these different grants. Sometimes most of the funding will be directed towards the partners that have been working with this grant for years. This is not specific to



Voice. Most of the grant in terms of the amount is pretty small compared to their annual budget, which raises questions whether this kind of mechanism will be really sustainable for the guarantee in the long run because it's very specific for emergency. Meanwhile, the issues might be beyond emergency. We might consider in the future specific to this whether our mechanism will be focusing on emergency fund in a smaller amount or core fund that might be directly supporting the organization on a daily basis or some innovative funding that might be try to find new ways in navigating the current circumstances.

- Lots of organizations, particularly in Asia are struggling with the operations particularly those that are most marginalized in this context, such as disability focus organizations, LGBT organization, and then Indigenous groups. We should be really mindful when we want to have a specific plan mechanism, whether it might be innovative, being much more mindful to the needs of the society at the moment.
- CHK stated that it would be important to demonstrate the success of what we have done so far. Because our key mandate is to allocate resources to those who have been left behind, will be able to maybe bring out how many documents on both. Will we be able to provide grants that focus specifically on persons with disabilities? When I look at the granting system at the moment, PWDs, LGBTI persons and many other people that have been left behind are being put together, have been categorized together. Why don't we specifically design a grant that reaches them directly instead of putting them in one category?
 - During COVID-19, we had access to rapid response funding. It is not only about COVID-19, but we have many issues happening like the issue of climate change. We have issues which are impacting us differently. We have issues of election. We have the issues of war, like what's happening in the other parts of the world. So, can we also try to reach out to matching issues happening in different communities or different parts of the world?

Closing comments

- On behalf of MoFA, MW asked for the minutes of the previous days discussion to also be shared. She highlighted that this is the start of a conversation in different places. It has been very useful, first of all, to get to know this wise advisory board that we have for Voice and to know where to find you in the future for further discussions and questions, but also to start up this conversation today. So, thanks on our behalf, and I'm sure this conversation will, of course, continue.
- ID stated that on the roadmap itself, the intention of the Voice team was to share it with the three key stakeholders- the steering committee, the advisory board and MoFA and get an initial sign off on whether we can pursue this process. The next step in this process is a joint meeting during Voice annual reflection meeting in July 2022. That will be a concrete moment for all of us to be together in person and also come to it with probably a bit more clarity on where each of the key stakeholders stand and move forward. We know it continues to be an especially challenging time for everybody and all of you are doing incredibly important work, so we really appreciate your care and support to the Voice program. Thank you so much.