

**South Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)  
2015 First Round Standard Allocation Strategy Paper  
25 November 2014**

**Introduction**

1. In its meeting of 24 November 2014, the CHF Advisory Board agreed to launch the process for the 2015 first round standard allocation.
2. This amount of this allocation is established as \$60 million, as illustrated in the table. The amount is based on expected fund availability of US\$40 million by the end of January 2015, and a further \$20 million by the end of March 2015. Disbursements to partners will be tailored according to the actual amounts and the timing of donor contributions deposited.

Donor	Amount \$	Remarks
Current MPTF balance	6.4 m	As of 24/11/14
Netherlands	6.2 m	Committed
Norway	1.5 m	Committed
Sweden	3.4 m	Committed
Switzerland	1.0 m	Committed
UK	17.0 m	Pledged
Others	28.5 m	Estimated
Less fees	4.0m	Estimated
<b>Total for this allocation</b>	<b>60.0 m</b>	

**Overarching humanitarian response strategy**

3. The Strategic Response Plan (SRP) for 2015 encompasses three strategic objectives: saving lives and alleviating suffering through multi-sectoral assistance; protecting the rights of the most vulnerable, including freedom of movement; and improving self-reliance and coping capacities by protecting, restoring and promoting livelihoods.
4. The SRP draws on an analysis of the four main underlying drivers of humanitarian need, set out in the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO): conflict; death, injury and disease; food and livelihoods insecurity; and malnutrition. It presumes an intensification of violence and displacement, particularly during the dry season through to May / June 2015; a decline in food/livestock production; and further progressive deterioration in state-provided social services.
5. The total financial requirement of the SRP amounts to some US\$1.8 billion. It recognises that the extent of humanitarian needs will continue to outstrip the collective response capability of the humanitarian community, necessitating rigorous prioritisation. Life-threatening needs will exist across the country, but will be highest and most complex in areas directly affected by the conflict.

**Parameters for prioritisation**

6. This allocation will provide resources to kick start most critical elements of the humanitarian operation at the start of the 2015 SRP. The following overarching, strategic parameters will frame the allocation, which will support:
  - activities that best capitalise on the window of opportunity offered by the dry season, including those which will ensure continuity and cost effectiveness of assistance during the ensuing wet season. Of particular note are:
    - the opportunity for pre-positioning of supplies for core pipelines, however this should be seen in relation to supply chain lead times, as well as risks of confiscation and looting, and mitigation measures.
    - the opportunity for infrastructure repairs and works, however these should be seen in the light of execution capacities and completion times<sup>1</sup>.
  - activities that directly address life-threatening needs, and in locations where such needs are greatest. The ‘heat maps’ produced for the HNO, will guide geographical prioritisation. These set out the relative severity of needs at county level, drawing on analysis of the different underlying drivers of need. The CERF<sup>2</sup> life-saving criteria and guidance will guide the prioritisation of activity types.
7. In addition, the following criteria will be used to inform the prioritisation, with preference given to:
  - proposals linked to high-immediate or high priority projects, as classified in the SRP.
  - proposals to undertake most time-critical activities.
  - proposals where the needs to be addressed are substantiated by robust evidence.

<sup>1</sup> This refers only to essential infrastructure to sustain humanitarian life-saving interventions – not to development infrastructure

<sup>2</sup> The Central Emergency Response Fund [https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/CERF/FINAL\\_Life-Saving\\_Criteria\\_26\\_Jan\\_2010\\_\\_E.pdf](https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/CERF/FINAL_Life-Saving_Criteria_26_Jan_2010__E.pdf)

**South Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF)**  
**2015 First Round Standard Allocation Strategy Paper**  
**25 November 2014**

- proposals that address acute needs. Where chronic needs will be addressed, robust justification is required<sup>3</sup>.
- proposals that demonstrate higher quality in relation to gender programming. The quality of the proposal will be taken into account, and the gender marker of the project to which it is linked in the SRP.
- proposals that show stronger analysis of conflict sensitivities and the principles of 'do no harm', and which mainstream protection (where they are not stand-alone protection proposals).
- proposals that show higher quality regarding accountability to affected populations, environment and HIV/AIDS.
- proposals that demonstrate better value for money:
  - partners that have received funding from previous CHF allocation rounds or from other donors for similar activities are required to demonstrate how any new funding will be complementary and not duplicative;
  - partners should similarly indicate the amounts and sources of any co-funding of proposals;
  - proposals demonstrating better cost efficacy will be preferred, where;
    - for comparable activities and outputs, the total cost of the proposed action is least;
    - the level of indirect costs is reasonable and in line with normal levels for any given type of activity;
    - the proposed period of implementation represents best use of resources<sup>4</sup>.
  - in cases where clusters wish to endorse more than one proposal for the same activities within the same county, robust justification must be made for the efficacy of such arrangements.
- proposals from national NGO (NNGO) partners, where other criteria are adequately met.
- proposals from partner organisations that demonstrate better historical performance in relation to CHF processes and project implementation.

Each cluster may develop additional prioritisation criteria based on programmatic specificities and best practices.

#### **Other stipulations**

8. The following stipulations will apply:

- proposals must link to projects included in the 2015 SRP.
- proposals linked to projects classified as low priority in the 2015 SRP are excluded.
- support to food aid is excluded given the scale of requirements and the limited impact CHF resources may have.
- proposals which require a disproportionate, unrealistic amount in relation to available funding will be excluded.
- the needs of Abyei displaced people will be considered only in relation to life-saving activities to be supported through the core pipelines.
- proposals from new CHF partners are eligible in principle, though the organisation must demonstrate compliance with minimum capacity standards<sup>5</sup>.
- 'pass through' is discouraged. Exceptional cases may be considered where the pass through is to a NNGO and there is a compelling explanation of how the partnership would improve the NNGO's capacity, the resources the intermediary organisation would contribute for this, how success would be measured, and how commensurate risks would be managed. Direct applications from NNGOs are preferred, where eligibility requirements are met.
- minimum allocation amounts will apply as per standard CHF guidance (for national NGOs US\$50,000; for international NGOs US\$200,000).
- proposals may cover an implementation period of up to a maximum of 12 months<sup>6</sup>.
- OCHA's on-line Grant Management System (GMS) will be used to administer this allocation, with on-line proposal submissions and enhanced support to transparency in the prioritisation and selection process.

*Ends.*

---

<sup>3</sup> In some cases the CHF has been asked to fund the same activities in the same locations for the previous 3 years, effectively supporting recurrent costs to address long term chronic needs. Given the scale of acute needs in the current context, such cases will require extraordinary justification.

<sup>4</sup> The objective of the allocation is to address life-threatening needs of affected people quickly and effectively, rather than to maximize the period for which partner organisations' recurrent costs are supported. Implementation periods should not exceed the time that is genuinely needed to achieve the intended outputs. At the same time implementation periods should not be unrealistically short, which may result in unwarranted no-cost extensions.

<sup>5</sup> As the CHF Managing Agent, UNDP conducts a capacity assessment of all prospective new partners.

<sup>6</sup> Though see comments under section 7 and footnote 4 regarding project implementation periods.