**Step 3: Resource mobilisation**

Promising Practices & Resources from Country Clusters

The following table contains promising practices of CP-EiE Collaboration from country clusters and where available, the resources they used. Examples are categorised following the [CP-EiE Collaboration Framework](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/9mqsahd102pzwwiq7cpobxxo0jc4cmkg) structure. Global resources related to these steps are included at the end. *This is a living compilation of promising practices; if you have examples or tools to add, please* [*get in contact*](mailto:mackenzie.monserez@savethechildren.org) *with us!*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3a. Define resource mobilisation & advocacy responsibilities** | **3b. Costing** | **3c. Agree complementary allocation of resources** |
| Fundraising for integrated responses plans/frameworks   * CAR’s Protection Matrix in Education is part of an integrated response plan and is funded though Education donors funding an integrated response plan (**CAR**) * Somalia’s Education-CP Response Framework included in donor proposals (GPE, ECW, ECHO, UNICEF) encouraging them to take up the integrated approach, leading to institutionalization. This also supports fundraising on behalf of CP with education donors (**Somalia**) * Joint PCAs are a requirement from UNICEF (**Niger**) | Costing framework was standardised for cross-sectoral items, using the new costing methodology **(Afghanistan)**  Example of joint MHPSS costing (**Iraq)** | Humanitarian Pooled Funds   * Education and CP successfully advocated to the HC for a joint HPF allocation. Sectors jointly develop a joint [HF Allocation Strategy](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/290icp15pjukbjzwppsina6niiwab7ft); the HC gives the envelope per sector, then Education and CP coordinators total the allocated funds to disburse. Partners are required to submit integrated proposals for HPF funding (a mandatory requirement for projects). Funding is then allocated to the successful integrated projects based on quality of the project submission, with the % funding per sector roughly balancing with what the HC originally allocated per sector. Project vetting was done separately by Education and CP coordinators, but feedback to partners was given jointly **(oPt).** * Education proposals to Somalia HF are required to include activities from the CP-Education Response Framework (mandatory integration). Partners can select indicators for either education or CP (they are linked in the system) – coordinators do not dictate strongly on the CP/Ed division, leaving it to the strengths of each partner. Proposals for Somalia HF are reviewed together by both sectors (**Somalia**). * Based on the Mosul guidelines for integrated spaces, Iraq HF accepted joint project sheets. The IHF meeting was done jointly for CP and Education and partners were advised which sector to appeal to for inter-sector activities, and how joint project sheets would be reviewed by the sector with the greatest % budget (**Iraq**). * The Afghanistan Education Cluster required education projects submitted to 2019 Afghanistan HF to include minimum 10% budget on CP activities. GMS reviews are done with both coordinators (**Afghanistan**). * Where there are inter-sector/ complementary activities, partners decide which sector to include them in, and both coordinators review the whole project when joint activities are included (**Myanmar**).   Cross-sectoral allocation of funds   * Cross-sector mechanisms established where funding was predominantly available through one sector, and delivery planned through the other to maximise impact on children (**South Sudan** – PSS funded through CP, delivered through teachers) |
| **GLOBAL LEVEL RESOURCES** | | |
| * Example of top-line CP-EiE donor analysis ([Annex 9](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/3jymgq0qqh2plhz3dlh8gz3qtj04zuwe)) * For gender considerations in resource mobilisation, see [INEE Guidance Note on Gender](https://inee.org/system/files/resources/INEE_GN_Gender_2019.pdf) (2019) for strategies for gender-responsive EiE financing p. 97-98 |  | * Considerations for vetting joint projects ([Annex 10](https://educationcluster.box.com/s/3jymgq0qqh2plhz3dlh8gz3qtj04zuwe)) |