Management, Funding and Implementation of the Evaluation

This evaluation is commissioned by OCHA and is funded by six CBPF donors: Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, the UK and the US. An evaluation team from KonTerra is conducting the evaluation.

Acknowledgements

The evaluation team would like to thank the staff of CBPFs, OCHA, the Advisory Board members, clusters, partners and community members that engaged in the each of the five country case studies and the global interviews. We are grateful for the time and support they provided, and for the information and documentation they shared. We would also like to thank the members of the OCHA's Strategy, Planning, Evaluation and Guidance section for the generous support they provided.

Evaluation Team (The KonTerra Group)

Andy Featherstone
Tasneem Mowjee
Charlotte Lattimer
Lydia Poole

The KonTerra Group
700 12th St NW
Washington, DC 20005, USA

Evaluation Management

OCHA Evaluation Manager
Nicolas Rost
OCHA Evaluation Support
Anne Danker
KonTerra Managing Director
Menno Wiebe
Quality Assurance
Belén Díaz [The KonTerra Group]

Disclaimer

The contents and conclusions of this inception report reflect the opinion of the authors, and not necessarily those of the United Nations, OCHA, donors or other stakeholders.

OCHA encourages the use, reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Except where otherwise indicated, material may be copied, downloaded and printed for private study, research and teaching purposes, or for use in non-commercial products or services, provided that the appropriate acknowledgement of OCHA as the source and copyright holder is given and that OCHA's endorsement of users’ views, products or services is not implied in any way.

Cover Photo: IDP settlement in Baidoa. Hindiya left her home village of Momooda 5 months ago fleeing severe drought. In Horosed settlement, she also faced problems to have safe water. Thanks to INTERSOS, implementing SHF-funded projects on water and sanitation in Baidoa, she now has clean water close to her house. Credit: OCHA/ INTERSOS
Table of Contents

Annex 1: ToR for the evaluation .......................................................... 3
Annex 2: Detailed methodology ......................................................... 15
Annex 3: Evaluation matrix ............................................................... 24
Annex 4: CBPF Operational Impact model ......................................... 27
Annex 5: Summary of stakeholder survey results ................................. 28
Annex 6: Interview participants ......................................................... 39
Annex 7: Bibliography .......................................................... 52
Annex 8: Team itinerary and work plan .............................................. 61
Annex 9: Case study selection criteria ............................................... 62
Annex 10: Issues raised in recent evaluations and audits ..................... 64
Annex 11: The context of the evaluation: An overview of CBPFs, 2015-2018 68
Annex 12: Limitations and proposed mitigation measures .................... 73
Annex 13: Summary table of findings, conclusions & recommendations .... 75
Annex 1: ToR for the evaluation

Presented below is a summary of the evaluation ToR. The full version is available on the OCHA website at: www.unocha.org/themes/evaluations-and-reviews/reports

OCHA Evaluation of Country-Based Pooled Funds
Terms of Reference

Final version, 18 December 2018

Summary

OCHA is commissioning an evaluation of the currently 18 country-based pooled funds (CBPFs) it manages, covering the years 2015-2018. This will be the first evaluation of CBPFs since they were standardized globally in a 2015 Policy Instruction and Operational Handbook. The evaluation will examine the results of humanitarian action supported by CBPFs, and will assess the standard evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, connectedness and impact. The evaluation methodology will include a document review, data analysis, in-person and remote interviews, a survey, and 2-week visits to each of five countries with a CBPF, including project visits. The deliverables will include an inception report, short country reports for each of the visited pooled fund, and a global synthesis report.

The purpose of this evaluation is to draw lessons on what has worked well and to identify challenges to the effective functioning of CBPFs in order to provide recommendations on how to continue to strengthen the CBPF as a funding mechanism in support of timely, coordinated and principled humanitarian response for affected people. The evaluation will also contribute to greater transparency and accountability for all stakeholders involved. Areas of focus include results and outcomes, governance and management, gender and other cross-cutting issues, complementarity with other funding mechanisms and key CBPFs’ contributions to the Grand Bargain and Agenda for Humanity.

CBPF Objectives, Operational Impact and Principles

The evaluation will assess how CBPFs have performed against their strategic objectives and principles, as per the 2015 OCHA CBPF Policy Instruction. The CBPF’s three strategic objectives or expected outcomes are to:

1. Improve effectiveness of the humanitarian response by directing funding towards priority humanitarian needs
2. Strengthen the leadership and leverage the coordination role of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC)
3. Mobilize resources and support coordination in support of the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)

As shown in the graphic below, these outcomes are expected to lead to the overall operational impact of CBPFs, i.e., “the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity.”[2]

- Inclusiveness: A broad range of humanitarian partner organizations (UN agencies and NGOs) participate in CBPF processes and receive funding to implement projects addressing identified priority needs.

[1] This is the definition of the CBPFs’ expected operational impact, as per the 2015 Policy Instruction. The OECD DAC evaluation criterion of “impact” is defined as follows: “Impact looks at the wider effects of the project – social, economic, technical, environmental – on individuals, gender- and age-groups, communities and institutions. Impact can be intended and unintended, positive and negative, macro (sector) and micro (household)” (ALNAP (2006): “Evaluating humanitarian action using the OECD-DAC criteria: An ALNAP guide for humanitarian agencies,” available at https://www.alnap.org/help-library/evaluating-humanitarian-action-using-the-oecd-dac-criteria, accessed 13 December 2018). This evaluation will focus on the operational impact of CBPFs.
• Flexibility: The programmatic focus and funding priorities of CBPFs are set at the country level and may shift rapidly, especially in volatile humanitarian contexts. CBPFs are able to adapt rapidly to changing priorities and allow humanitarian partners to identify appropriate solutions to address humanitarian needs in the most effective way.

• Timeliness: CBPFs allocate funds and save lives as humanitarian needs emerge or escalate.

• Efficiency: Management of all processes related to CBPFs enables timely and strategic responses to identified humanitarian needs. CBPFs seek to employ effective disbursement mechanisms and minimize transaction costs, while operating in a transparent and accountable manner.

• Accountability and Risk Management: CBPFs manage risk and effectively monitor partner capacity and performance. CBPFs utilize a full range of accountability tools and measures, including the Common Performance Framework.

Link to humanitarian reforms

A major Humanitarian Reform was initiated by the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) in 2005. Based on an independent Humanitarian Response Review[1] the reform’s four pillars included one to provide “adequate, flexible and predictable humanitarian financing.” While the first CBPFs date back to the 1990s, the first larger funds – the Common Humanitarian Funds in Sudan and the DRC – were set up as part of the reform effort in 2005. In 2011, the IASC launched a new reform, the Transformative Agenda, focusing on the three areas of leadership, coordination and accountability but not specifically on humanitarian financing.

In line with the first-ever World Humanitarian Summit in 2016, the Agenda for Humanity encourages humanitarian actors to fulfill five core responsibilities, 24 ‘key transformations’, dozens of initiatives, partnerships, platforms and alliances, and 3,700 commitments. These include targets by OCHA “to enhance engagement with national and local NGOs, leveraging the role as partners in the programming and delivery of humanitarian assistance through country-based pooled funds” and to ensure that CBPFs are ready to support cash programming.[2]

As one of the initiatives under the Agenda for Humanity, the Grand Bargain[3] aims to increase efficiency in humanitarian action. The Grand Bargain partly responds to a 2016 report by the Secretary General’s High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Financing.[4] It references two related aspects of country-based pooled funds: the UN Secretary-General’s commitment to increase the portion of appeal funding that goes to CBPFs to 15 per cent, and a commitment to make greater use of CBPFs to increase and improve assistance delivered by national and local responders to strengthen the localization of the humanitarian response. OCHA has identified seven of the ten Grand Bargain workstreams, to which CBPFs can contribute: transparency (workstream 1), support to local responders (2), cash-based programming (3), reduced management costs (4), a participation revolution (6), unearmarked funding (8), and reporting (9).[5] OCHA has been able to increase the share of CBPF funding to national and local NGOs by improving risk management, including the implementation of more robust accountability frameworks and risk management systems.[6] In 2017, CBPFs already allocated 23 per cent of funding directly to local NGOs, compared to 2.7 per cent of humanitarian funding globally going directly to local NGOs.[7] The CBPFs’ share of HRP varies, with the proportion in 2017 ranging from 9.5 per cent in Afghanistan to 1.8 per cent in Colombia.[8]

CBPFs embody the fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and

[4] https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/%5BHLF%20Report%5D%20Too%20Important%20to%20Fail%208%2094addressing%20the%20humanitarian%20financing%20gap.pdf
[8] Figure taken from the OCHA CBPF Grant Management System (GMS) – Business Intelligence (7 November 2018). The percentage is CBPF funding over HRP funding requirements (not HRP received funding).
function according to a set of specific principles:[1]

**Governance**

Country-based pooled funds were until recently separated into (typically larger) Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs) and (smaller) Emergency Relief Funds (ERFs). In 2015, the two models were merged in a Policy Instruction and an accompanying Operational Handbook, which prescribed global standards in different areas of fund management ranging from grant duration to accountability and risk management. The handbook took into account lessons learned from previous evaluations, allowing for the implementation of a number of recommendations. A Common Performance Framework contributed to strengthening accountability and oversight. The present evaluation is the first evaluation of CBPFs since the publication of the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework.

Local Governance. The Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) acts as the custodian of the CBPF on behalf of the ERC. The HC decides the strategy for the use of the fund and ensures that the fund is delivering on its key objectives and is managed in accordance with the Handbook. The HC is supported in the day-to-day management of the fund by the OCHA Head of Office and Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU). An Advisory Board advises the HC on the allocation of funds and other strategic issues. Specific HC responsibilities include leading the process of opening and closing of CBPFs, leading country-level resource mobilization in coordination with headquarters, defining the strategic focus of fund allocation, approving projects and initiating disbursements, and ensuring the CBPF operates in complementarity with other funding sources including the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and other funding sources depending on the context.

The Advisory Board (AB) supports the HC in steering the strategy and oversees the performance of the CBPF. The final decision-making authority rests entirely with the HC, who is the chair of the AB. The AB consults on four key areas of the CBPF: strategic focus, risk management, transparency and operational reviews. The composition of the AB is determined based on consultations between the HC, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), contributing donors and NGOs, and therefore varies from country to country. The HC and the OCHA Head of Office are the only permanent members, with other members serving as technical or strategic experts.

CBPF allocations pass through two types of project review: a strategic review and a technical review, which assesses the technical soundness and quality of project proposals. The strategic and technical reviews are conducted by respective review committees operating separately by sector/cluster.

Global Governance. The Emergency Relief Coordinator holds authority over and is accountable for all CBPFs. The ERC monitors the performance of each fund through the CBPF Section at OCHA headquarters and makes decisions on their establishment, re-organization and closure.

The CBPF Section, part of the Humanitarian Financing and Resource Mobilization Division in OCHA’s headquarters, is responsible for policy, operational, programmatic, administrative and financial issues related to the management of CBPFs. The CBPF section supports OCHA country offices in the establishment, management and closing of CBPFs.

**Previous Evaluations**

OCHA is committed to undertaking periodic evaluations of its country-based pooled funds every three years. The Operational Handbook stipulates that evaluations are an important component of the accountability framework and help in continuously improving the funds. Global evaluations have been conducted of the two precursors of CBPFs: in 2015 and 2011 of the Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs), and of the Emergency Relief Funds (ERFs) in 2013 and 2007. Also in 2007, an evaluation of the CHFs in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Sudan was conducted and an evaluation of the ERF in Haiti was published in 2011. [2] A 2018 UNDP evaluation of Inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services contains useful findings, and there are numerous studies and reports on humanitarian financing mechanisms more broadly.

Independent evaluations of humanitarian pooled funds have proven useful tools for promoting accountability and learn

---


Evidence-based findings and recommendations from the evaluations, as well as from external audits, have helped improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the funds, enhanced accountability and oversight, and strengthened their capacity to support timely and coherent humanitarian response, to address humanitarian needs, and to support the leadership role of Humanitarian Coordinators. Since 2005, 188 recommendations related to CBPFs have been issued in evaluations and audits, with 157 (84 per cent) having been closed (143 implemented, implemented but pending approval and 14 rejected) and 30 currently in progress. Out of these 188 recommendations, OCHA’s CBPF Section has received 109 recommendations, including 52 from the Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), 37 from OCHA evaluations, 13 from the Board of Auditors (BOA) and 7 from the Joint Inspection Unit (JIU). The other 79 recommendations have been directed at OCHA country offices, 67 of these coming from the 2015 OCHA evaluation of Common Humanitarian Funds and 12 from OIOS audits.

Three years have passed since OCHA conducted the last evaluation of country-based pooled funds, making it appropriate to undertake another evaluation of the funding mechanism at this time. This is in line with the CBPF Operational Handbook, in which a commitment was made for the next global evaluation of CBPFs in 2018.

**Purpose, Objectives, Scope and Use of the evaluation**

**Purpose**

The fundamental goals of evaluation are to improve accountability and learning. In accordance, the purpose of this evaluation is to draw lessons on what has worked well and to identify challenges to the effective functioning of CBPFs in order to provide recommendations on how to continue to strengthen the CBPF as a funding mechanism in support of timely, coordinated and principled humanitarian response for affected people. The evaluation will also contribute to greater transparency and accountability for all stakeholders involved.

**Intended Users**

The intended users at global level are the ERC and OCHA, UNDP and MPTFO, the Pooled Fund Working Group (PFWG), the CBPF/NGO platform, UN and NGO partner organizations, and the OCHA Donor Support Group (ODSG). The intended users at country level are the Humanitarian Coordinators, Humanitarian Country Teams, Advisory Boards, OCHA offices including Humanitarian Financing Units, UNDP offices where they act as Managing Agent, representatives from the affected population, NGOs including local NGOs, UN agencies and donor representatives.

**Evaluation Objectives and Scope**

The scope of the evaluation is global; it will provide an assessment of all CBPFs. In addition, country studies will review the funds in five specific country contexts. The selection of the countries will be based on a number of criteria (identified by OCHA and the Evaluation Team, in consultation with the Advisory Group). This will allow the evaluation to assess how CBPFs operate in different environments, including natural disasters, conflict situations and complex emergencies, protracted crises and new emergencies.

The evaluation will provide an independent assessment of the funds during the period January 2015 to December 2018, since the inception of CBPFs as a single type of country-based pooled funds following the issuance of the 2015 Policy Instruction.

The evaluation will assess the CBPF’s strengths, weaknesses, and areas where improvements can make a positive difference to the functioning and impact of funds. The evaluation will assess the past performance of CBPFs and include concrete recommendations to make the funds fit for the future.

A key area of focus of the evaluation will be on the extent to which CBPFs contribute to the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity. The evaluation will seek to identify the impact, results and outcomes of CBPFs in supporting a timely, coordinated and principled humanitarian response to humanitarian needs. The evaluation will also consider the impact of CBPFs on the utilization of other funding mechanisms and the effectiveness of the overall humanitarian response.

[1] The data on CBPF recommendations is as of 19 November 2018, as recorded in OCHA’s Recommendations Tracking System (RTS).
response for people affected by crisis. This will include an assessment of the number of people reached by CBPF-supported humanitarian action and the extent to which the assistance received made a difference in their lives, in particular in the countries visited. While the detailed methodology for this component of the evaluation will be defined during the inception phase, it will include a review of the monitoring data of recipient organizations, project visits and the collection of feedback from affected people, focusing on a sample of funded projects. This is in line with conclusion 3 of the UNDP evaluation on inter-agency pooled financing services, which found that (for UNDP/MPTFO-managed funds) “donors remain concerned about the reporting on outcome-level changes further down the results delivery chain.”[1]

The evaluation will also assess how CBPFs have performed against their three expected outcomes and five principles. The outcomes, as listed above, focus on response, leadership, coordination and resource mobilization; the principles on inclusiveness, flexibility, timeliness, efficiency, and accountability and risk management. Thus, it will assess the governance and management of CBPFs, including the role of Humanitarian Coordinators, Advisory Boards, Review Committee(s), Clusters, OCHA offices and, where applicable, UNDP offices as managing agents at the country level. At the global level, it will include OCHA headquarters and the MPTFO as administrative agent. It will assess whether CBPFs are managed and administered consistently across countries according to the CBPF Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework. The evaluation will assess how OCHA manages accountability for CBPF performance, oversight and risk management.

This evaluation will not assess in detail the links between CBPFs and early recovery or development programming. However, examples of good practices in this regard should be identified where they exist.

The evaluation will include a gender analysis, in line with the UNEG Guidance on Integrating Human Rights and Gender Equality in evaluation,[3] and will consider other cross-cutting issues of good programming, such as age, disability or other relevant factors depending on the context. Thus, it will analyze how pooled funds are used to mainstream these issues in humanitarian action.[4]

The evaluation will assess how Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators use CBPFs in complementarity to the other mechanisms over which they have control or influence. This will include complementarity with the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and other mechanisms depending on country context. The evaluation will also assess complementarity between CBPFs and bilateral donor funding.

The evaluation will assess how CBPFs have contributed to relevant Grand Bargain and Agenda for Humanity commitments, ensuring complementarity with a planned OCHA/NRC study on, among other aspects, links between CBPFs and the Grand Bargain.[5] Relevant aspects of the Grand Bargain and Agenda for Humanity include: unearmarked funding, localization (funding to local NGOs), transparency, cash-based programming, reporting requirements, management costs and the participation revolution (accountability to affected people).

**Evaluation Criteria and Questions**

The evaluation will assess these issues under the following selected and agreed standard evaluation criteria:[6]

- **Relevance**

  To what extent are CBPFs being used strategically to meet the most urgent, prioritized humanitarian needs? To what extent are they aligned with Humanitarian Response Plans or other relevant strategies? To what extent are

---


[4] Disability, for example, will only be disaggregated in the number of people targeted starting in January 2019.

[5] The study’s working title is “OCHA-Managed Pooled Funds: Fit for Purpose? The NGO Perspective”. The study’s concept note states that “NRC and OCHA will ensure that the study complements the planned global evaluation of CBPFs from a(n) NGO perspective, and does not create duplication.”


[7] Such as, for example, the Humanitarian and Disaster Resilience Plan in Ethiopia
CBPFs adequate to meet the expected outcomes they have been set up to achieve? Are the expected outcomes and principles that have been set for CBPFs still relevant?

- **Effectiveness**

  Do CBPFs support HC leadership? How do they contribute to a coordinated response? Do they support overall resource mobilization for HRPs? To what extent are the funds able to meet newly emerging needs in a timely and flexible manner? Are risks managed appropriately, and is there sufficient oversight and accountability, including monitoring and reporting systems? Do CBPF contribute to the relevant aspects (see above) of the Agenda for Humanity and Grand Bargain?

- **Efficiency**

  Is the management of CBPFs ‘fit for purpose’ and ‘fit for the future’ and do they operate efficiently? Has the global standardization of CBPFs (as per the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework) increased efficiency? To what extent do CBPFs employ effective disbursement mechanisms and minimize transaction costs?

- **Connectedness**

  Do RC/HCs use CBPFs strategically and in complementarity to other mechanisms and do CBPFs complement bilateral donor funding? Do CBPFs drive forward the localization of humanitarian action and make use of the best placed partners to respond to identified needs?

- **Impact**

  To what extent do CBPFs contribute to the provision of timely, coordinated and principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity? To what extent do they make a difference in the lives of affected people?

Under these evaluation criteria and questions, which are linked to the evaluation scope, more detailed key areas of inquiry will be further identified during the inception phase through consultations with members of the Pooled Funds Working Group, Heads of OCHA Offices in CBPF countries, fund managers, representatives from relevant OCHA branches and the Advisory Group (see below).

**Methodology**

The evaluation will employ mixed methods (qualitative, quantitative, participatory) and a number of data collection tools. Information will be derived from primary and secondary sources, including a desk review of relevant documents, an analysis of datasets, key informant interviews, focus groups, and a survey. All information will be triangulated for validation.

The evaluation process will include (1) an inception phase including a visit to New York, after which the Evaluation Team will submit an inception report, (2) a data gathering phase which includes visits to five CBPF countries, New York and Geneva, remote interviews and a survey, and (3) a reporting phase at the end of which the team will submit the global synthesis report.

Individual country reports for the CBPFs visited during the evaluation will also be submitted, which will give insights into how CBPFs operate across different contexts and to provide direct constructive feedback to the Humanitarian Country Teams, Advisory Boards and OCHA offices including Humanitarian Financing Units in those countries. The choice of which CBPFs to visit will be made during the inception phase, ensuring that funds with different characteristics and in different types of contexts are included. A CBPF country selectivity matrix, which provides data on these aspects, is available and may be supplemented during the inception phase. The country selection will take place in collaboration between the Evaluation Team and OCHA, and in consultation with the Advisory Group. It will take into account requests from countries to be included. Country reports will identify best practices and lessons learned that may be systematized and applied to other CBPF contexts.

A sample of funded projects will be analyzed to provide insight into the full project cycle and the impact of CBPF funding,
including the tracking of the project until its eventual impact in the field, for the degree to which they are meeting their initial targets in terms of the number of people reached, usefulness and results of the assistance provided. Project visits should include focus group discussions with affected people. The sample of projects should cover different sectors, groups of affected people (e.g., displaced or not), modalities (e.g. cash or in-kind) and types of implementing partners (UN agencies, international and local NGOs, and the Red Cross/Red Crescent associations).

A survey of stakeholders with an interest in CBPFs will be conducted and analyzed. The methodology should also include the interpretation of existing survey data, e.g. from the annual OCHA partner surveys.

As part of the evaluation, the team should conduct a thorough data analysis, in particular of primary data from the CBPF Grant Management System (GMS), as well as humanitarian financing data from the Financial Tracking Service (FTS). This should include an analysis of CBPF allocations by sector compared to the severity of needs, where this data is available. The team should also review and interpret existing data analyses, e.g. the Global Humanitarian Assistance and World Humanitarian Data and Trends reports.

The methodology will include the review of previous evaluations and audits of country-based pooled funds, including the 2015 CHF evaluation. It will review how recommendations have been implemented to improve the funds or why they remain open or have been rejected.

Perspectives from all stakeholders should be solicited including (but not limited to): OCHA, UNDP, the MPTFO, recipient and relevant non-recipient organizations (including NGOs who chose not to pursue CBPF funds), HCs, HCTs, Advisory Boards, clusters, Government stakeholders in recipient and donor countries, civil society groups and members, and affected people. Local and national NGO perceptions (recipient and non-recipient) will be sought throughout the evaluation process. People at headquarters level, in the five visited countries and, remotely, in other CBPF countries should be interviewed.

The detailed methodology, including standardized data collection instruments (surveys, interview guides, etc.), will be developed during the inception phase of the evaluation. The Evaluation Team will visit New York during the inception phase. During the data gathering phase, the team will visit New York and Geneva, and five CBPF countries, to be selected during the inception phase.

Governance

Advisory Group

The Advisory Group will be comprised of, preferably, experts with substantive evaluation background from UN agencies, NGOs and donors, though they will not represent their own entities. Alternatively, Advisory Group members should consult colleagues in their respective evaluation functions. Advisory Group members should also have a thorough understanding of CBPFs. The Advisory Group will review and comment on draft outputs throughout the evaluation process including the Terms of Reference, inception report and final report. The Advisory Group provides advice to key deliverables during all stages of the evaluation. OCHA, as Evaluation Manager, will take final decisions on the management of the evaluation. To safeguard the independence of the evaluation, the Evaluation Team will respond to all comments on draft deliverables in a timely and transparent manner. Not all comments will necessarily be incorporated in the revised deliverables. In this case, the Evaluation Team will provide a rationale for any comments that were not incorporated.

The Advisory Group's main role will be to contribute to the relevance, quality and credibility of the evaluation process by providing advice throughout the process of the evaluation.

Concretely, the Advisory Group will:

- Provide background information and contextual knowledge, to help ensure that the evaluation is relevant, appropriate and adds value to the existing body of work on CBPFs, and that the evaluation contextualizes CBPFs within the overall humanitarian architecture
- Provide advice and technical guidance to the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team on key evaluation questions and additional areas of investigation
• Provide inputs to the development of the evaluation and review draft documents
• Assist the Evaluation Manager to ensure quality control according to relevant standards (UNEG/ALNAP)
• Ensure consideration of gender, age and, to the extent possible, disability mainstreaming in the evaluation
• Ensure the utility of the evaluation and its recommendations, by ensuring that recommendations are helpful and targeted, and by participating in the dissemination of the report and its findings

Specifically, the Advisory Group will review and provide comments on the:

• Terms of Reference
• Country/fund selection for case studies
• Draft inception report
• Any interim updates
• Draft country reports
• Draft final evaluation report

The Advisory Group consists of:

• Five representatives of CBPF donors
• Two representatives from UN agencies
• Two representatives from NGOs that receive CBPF funding, including one local NGO
• One representative from each of the three entities managing and supporting CBPFs: OCHA’s CBPF section as the fund manager, UNDP as Managing Agent of some funds, and the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office as Administrative Agent of some funds
• OCHA’s Strategy, Planning, Evaluation and Guidance Section, as Evaluation Manager and chair of the group

(See the separate Terms of Reference for the Advisory Group for further details.)

Reference Groups

At country level, the CBPF Advisory Boards will function as in-country Reference Groups. The Advisory Boards include the Humanitarian Coordinator as chair, OCHA, donors, UN agencies, national and international NGOs, and are supported by OCHA’s Humanitarian Financing Unit as secretariat.\[1\] If necessary in exceptional circumstances, relevant stakeholders or experts may be added to these in-country Reference Groups, in addition to the Advisory Board members. Members of the Reference Groups should not represent the interests of any specific entity. In contrast to the Advisory Group, each Reference Group focuses on the evaluation’s case study in their respective country.

Similar to the global-level Advisory Group, the main role of the in-country Reference Groups is to contribute to the relevance, quality and credibility of the evaluation process by providing advice throughout the process of the evaluation.

Concretely, the Reference Groups’ main roles will be to:

• Provide background information and contextual knowledge for their specific country context, to help ensure that the evaluation is relevant, appropriate and adds value to the existing body of work on CBPFs, and that the evaluation contextualizes CBPFs within the country’s overall humanitarian architecture
• Provide advice and technical guidance to the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team on key evaluation questions and additional areas of investigation in their country

- Participate in an exit briefing by the Evaluation Team at the end of their country visit, and provide feedback, advice and comments on preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations
- Provide inputs to the development of, review and provide appropriate and timely feedback on the draft country report

(See the separate Terms of Reference for the Reference Groups for further details.)

**OCHA**

The evaluation will be managed by an Evaluation Manager in OCHA’s Strategy, Planning, Evaluation and Guidance Section (SPEGs). The Evaluation Manager will ensure consistency throughout the evaluation process, from the drafting of the Terms of Reference to the dissemination of the report and will support the preparation of the management response and follow-up to recommendations. The Evaluation Manager will be the contact person for all administrative and organizational issues and will coordinate activities of the different actors involved in the evaluation. He will organize and supervise the different phases of the evaluation process and ensure the quality of all deliverables submitted by the Evaluation Team. The Evaluation Manager will participate in at least some of the field missions. SPEGs will chair the Advisory Group.

The Humanitarian Financing and Resource Mobilization Division/CBPF Section will appoint a focal point for the evaluation to facilitate access to pertinent information, documents and contacts relating to CBPFs.

OCHA country offices will help facilitate the Evaluation Team’s access to in-country informants and documentation and organize the in-country field missions and the exit workshops/presentations. OCHA country offices may propose additional issues specific to the CBPF under consideration.

**Deliverables**

**Inception Report**

The Evaluation Team will produce an inception report not to exceed 10,000 words (excluding the executive summary and annexes), setting out:

- The team’s understanding of the functioning of the Country-Based Pooled Fund mechanism, the contexts in which the CBPFs operate and OCHA’s mandate in managing CBPFs
- Any suggested deviations from the Terms of Reference, including any additional issues raised during the initial consultations
- The evaluation framework, second-level questions and identification of key areas of inquiry
- An evaluation matrix showing, for each question, the indicators proposed and sources of information
- A methodology, including any changes to the proposed methodology, how the comparative analysis of the funds will be conducted, details of the approach and the triangulation strategy
- The evaluation criteria to be used, including the rationale for using each evaluation criterion and, if needed, for rejecting any of the criteria proposed in the Terms of Reference
- How gender, age and other cross-cutting issues will be analyzed during the evaluation
- Data collection tools (survey, interview questions, document with the preparation of field visits and schedule of interviews, etc.)
- Description of any limitations of the chosen methods of data collection and analysis
- Other methodological limitations and evaluability issues and how they will be addressed
- Stakeholder analysis and a plan for their involvement in the evaluation process
• Data collection plan
• Detailed fieldwork plan, after the strategic selection of the five CBPF field visits
• Draft dissemination strategy of the evaluation findings and recommendations
• Draft outline for the country reports and global synthesis report

Interim Updates

The Evaluation Team will produce a short interim update (about 2 pages, in bullet points) outlining the preliminary findings within one week after the completion of each field mission. In addition, the Evaluation Team should keep the Evaluation Manager regularly updated on any issues, findings and concerns.

Country Reports

The Evaluation Team will produce a report of no more than 5,000 words (excluding the executive summary and annexes) for each of the five CBPFs visited. The country reports should have a uniform structure and present analysis of issues specific to each fund and context. They should identify any improvements that would help strengthen the functioning of the respective funds and identify best practices that might be systematized and applied in other CBPF contexts. Common issues will be addressed in the global synthesis report.

The country studies will identify best practices and innovative solutions, factors influencing the achievement of objectives, and any barriers or procedural obstacles or redundancies affecting the funds and their accessibility for all. The country reports will contain a small number of recommendations to stakeholders in the specific country. Recommendations in the different country reports must not contradict each other. Any recommendations that apply to all funds or at the global level should be in the global synthesis report.

Global Synthesis Report

The Evaluation Team will produce the global synthesis report, written in a clear and accessible manner, allowing the readers to understand readily evaluation findings and their inter-relationship. While relying on the five case studies, the report should provide a global assessment of all 18 CBPFs. It should not simply summarize the findings for each of the five countries. The report should not exceed 15,000 words (excluding the executive summary and annexes) and should be comprised of:

• Table of contents
• Executive summary of no more than 2,000 words
• Summary table linking findings, conclusions and recommendations, including where and with whom responsibility for follow up should lie
• Analysis of context in which CBPFs were implemented and operating
• A desk review of previous evaluations and studies relating to pooled funds, and a summary explanation of how this evaluation is positioned among them
• Overview of how the CBPF is being used in each country: objectives, amounts to various categories of agency and types of activity, etc.
• Methodology summary – a brief chapter, with a more detailed description provided in an annex
• Main body of the report, including findings in response to the evaluation questions, conclusions and recommendations
• Annexes will include: (1) Terms of Reference, (2) detailed methodology, (3) analysis of CBPF funding flows, (4) list of persons met, (5) details of all surveys undertaken, (6) details of any quantitative analysis undertaken,
(7) team itinerary, (8) all evaluation tools employed, (9) bibliography of documents (including web pages, etc.) relevant to the evaluation and (10) description of selection of case studies including the Field Visit Country Selectivity Matrix, (11) list of acronyms

For accuracy and credibility, recommendations should be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions. Recommendations should follow logically from the evaluation findings and conclusions and be:

- Categorized as a) Critical, b) Important, or c) Opportunity for learning
- Relevant, realistic and useful, and reflect the reality of the context within which CBPFs operate
- Clearly stated and not broad or vague
- Realistic and reflect an understanding of OCHA and the humanitarian system and potential constraints to follow up
- Suggest where responsibility for follow-up should lie and include a timeframe for follow-up
- Small in number

**Evaluation Briefs**

The Evaluation Team will produce evaluation briefs of no more than 2 pages for the global synthesis report and of no more than 1 page each for the country reports.

**Dissemination and Follow-up**

The Evaluation Team will conduct the following presentations:

- At the end of each 2-week country visit, the Team will conduct a validation workshop with a presentation of the main findings to primary stakeholders and intended users. The presentations (slide decks) will be shared with the Evaluation Manager.
- Upon completion of the draft synthesis report, a validation workshop will be held in New York with a presentation of the main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The presentation will be shared with the Evaluation Manager.
- Once the evaluation is completed, presentations of the main findings and recommendations will be made to various fora as decided by OCHA and the Advisory Group. The Evaluation Team may be requested to assist with these presentations.
- In addition to the global synthesis report and briefings, the evaluation findings and recommendations can be presented through alternative ways of dissemination, such as video. The Evaluation Team will consider possible ways to present the evaluation and include a dissemination strategy proposal in the inception report.
- The recommendations addressed at OCHA’s partners will be discussed at the Pooled Fund Working Group to develop action plans for their implementation. Follow-up to country-level recommendations will be determined by CBPF Advisory Boards.
- For recommendations relating to OCHA, a Management Response Plan will be prepared as per OCHA Evaluation Policy.

For all deliverables, draft versions will be submitted for comments, which should be considered for the final version. Several rounds of comments may be necessary. For each round, the Evaluation Team will prepare a comments matrix, listing all comments received and explaining how they have been addressed or why not.

All deliverables must be written according to the OCHA Style Guide.[1] The final versions must be proofread and undergo

professional graphic design. All deliverables should include relevant graphs, charts and maps to present findings and trends visually.

OCHA intends to publish the inception, country and synthesis reports. A Management Response Plan (MRP) will be developed in response to the evaluation's global and country-level recommendations, and will track the implementation of the MRP through established mechanisms and procedures, as it does for all other evaluations and audits.

**Evaluation Team**

The Evaluation Team will be recruited by the company contracted to conduct this evaluation, in close cooperation and mutual agreement with OCHA. The Evaluation Team will include a Team Leader, a Senior Evaluator, an Evaluator and a Data Analyst. A local/ national evaluator should be recruited, to the extent possible, for the country visits, and in particular to support research on the impact and results of CBPF-funded humanitarian action. The OCHA Evaluation Manager, who has a humanitarian financing background, will accompany the team on some of its headquarters and country visits, to act as a liaison between the team and OCHA and to ensure that the evaluation meets with relevant colleagues and has access to related information on CBPFs. Collectively, the team will have the following experience and skills:

- Extensive evaluation experience of humanitarian strategies and programmes and in the areas of key humanitarian issues, especially humanitarian finance and funding instruments
- Experience with and institutional knowledge of the humanitarian system, UN and NGO actors, the inter-agency mechanisms headquarters and in the field and the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC)
- In-depth knowledge of the humanitarian reform and coordination processes and issues, including the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC)
- In-depth knowledge and experience with identifying, assessing, monitoring and managing risks in unstable contexts
- Knowledge and experience with using human rights and gender analysis in evaluations; good understanding of cross-cutting issues
- An appropriate range of field experience
- Experience in facilitating consultative workshops involving a wide range of organizations and participants
- Excellent writing and communication skills in English, and communication skills in French

The Evaluation Team will include a Team Leader, who is responsible for the overall conduct of the evaluation in accordance with the TOR, including:

- Developing and adjusting the evaluation methodology
- Managing the Evaluation Team, ensuring efficient division of tasks between mission members, managing conflicts and addressing shortcomings within the team
- Representing the Evaluation Team in meetings, e.g., with senior managers at field and headquarters level, the in-country Reference Groups, Advisory Group, and OCHA, including SPEGS, and the Humanitarian Financing and Resource Mobilization Division
- Ensuring the quality of all outputs
- Submitting all outputs in a timely manner

The Team Leader will have no less than 15 years of professional experience in humanitarian action, including experience in the management of humanitarian operations. S/he will have extensive experience in leading and conducting evaluations of humanitarian operations and of funding instruments, and demonstrate strong analytical, communication and writing skills.

The Evaluation Team will be gender balanced and, to the extent possible, represent regional diversity.
Annex 2: Detailed methodology

This annex provides an overview of the evaluation methodology including the data collection and analysis tools that will be employed.

Data collection methods and sources

1. The team will use a mixed-methods approach for data collection and analysis. While much of the data collected will be qualitative, the team will collect quantitative data in the form of (i) financial and funding data, (ii) project-related data on outputs, age and gender, and risk management (iii) metrics related to fund review and decision-making timelines, and disbursement.

2. The evaluation will ensure methodological rigor through i) the collection of both primary and secondary data across the evaluation period and triangulation of evidence across multiple data sources; ii) the combination of evaluation tools and multiple analytical methods; and iii) rigorous comparative qualitative analysis through the use of an evidence summary approach.

3. The main methods for data collection and analysis will be the following:

   - Document and literature review;
   - Financial and project-related data analysis;
   - Online survey;
   - Semi-structured key informant interviews;
   - Community engagement;
   - Country visits.

Document and literature review

The evaluation team will conduct an initial review of key documentation to inform the inception report and refine the evaluation design and tools. Additionally, the team will conduct a more extensive review of country-level and global documentation relating to the CBPFs. The purpose of this review will be to identify where there is already documented evidence relating to the key evaluation questions and sub-questions. This will include a review of previous evaluations and audits of country-based pooled funds. Key documentation is listed below (Box 1).

Box 1: Key documents for the evaluation

- Evaluation guidance from OCHA
- Country-specific Humanitarian Needs Overviews and Humanitarian Response Plans
- Humanitarian Reform, the Transformative Agenda and the Grand Bargain
- Pooled fund documents
- CBPF guidelines, evaluations and audits, annual reports and allocation documents
- Country-specific documents

Quantitative data and trend analysis

As part of the evaluation, the team will conduct quantitative data analysis, in particular of primary data from the CBPF Grant Management System (GMS), as well as humanitarian financing data from the Financial Tracking Service (FTS). This should include an analysis of CBPF allocations by sector compared to the severity of needs, where this data is available. The team will also review and interpret existing data analyses, e.g. the Global Humanitarian Assistance and World Humanitarian Data and Trends reports. In addition to undertaking global analysis, the evaluation team will conduct light
country-level quantitative data analyses in advance of each country visit.

**Online survey**

The team will conduct an online survey of stakeholders. The purpose of the online survey will be to gather perspectives on CBPFs from a wide range of stakeholders based in all eighteen countries with CBPFs. Analysis of survey data will complement information gathered during the document review, interviews and community-level consultations. It will allow the evaluation team to consider views from stakeholders beyond the five countries selected for case-studies. Design of the survey and analysis of the results will take into account existing data from other surveys, particularly the OCHA annual partner surveys.

The survey will be available in English, French and Arabic. Responses will be consolidated to provide one overall summary of the results in English. The length of the survey will be kept as short as possible (taking approximately 15 minutes to respond) and questions will be straightforward in order to incentivize a high response rate. Questions will be multiple choice (using ratings), followed by comment boxes to encourage respondents to add detail and give examples to back up their choices; as well as a limited number of open-ended questions to elicit overall feedback and perspectives. All individual survey responses will be kept confidential. Only aggregate results and summaries of open-ended responses will be shared with OCHA and included in the evaluation report. The approach and survey questions are outlined in detail in annex 9.

The team’s analysis of responses will include a review of existing data from OCHA annual partner surveys to provide a comprehensive analysis. The evaluation team will also review other relevant global or country-level survey data gathered during the period under evaluation. This will include responses to the online survey conducted for the recent NRC/OCHA Pooled Funding Study.

**Semi-structured key informant interviews**

Based on a stakeholder analysis that the team conducted during the inception phase, the team will conduct semi-structured key informant interviews (KIIs) throughout the evaluation. These will engage a range of stakeholders at both global and country-level, including those outlined in the ToR.

The team will conduct KIIs as part of the five country visits and will follow these with further HQ-level interviews to triangulate findings and fill evidence gaps. A master set of interview questions have been developed, which build on the evaluation matrix and will be used to inform the team’s line of questioning as part of the country case studies and interviews with global stakeholders (see annex 5). During the inception phase the evaluation team developed, rigorously reviewed, and piloted key informant interview tools. Having a clear set of questionnaires and interview tools will enable the team to ensure consistency across case studies and interviews conducted by different team members.

The semi-structured approach brings a number of strengths in terms of allowing the team to cover a desired range of topics relating to the overarching evaluation framework, while at the same time allowing the emergence of unexpected ideas, good practice, innovations that may not previously have been identified. To explore gaps and bottlenecks, the team may include interviews with international and national organizations that do not apply (or have stopped applying) for CBPF funds despite being eligible as well as those that have applied for, but not received, funding.

**Community engagement**

The evaluation team will conduct Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) with community members at sub-national level during visits to the sites of a small number of CBPF-funded projects in order to validate reports and explore perceptions of whether and how these projects have made a difference to the lives of affected populations. Specifically, the team will use the community consultations to address aspects of evaluation questions 1.1, 2.1, 3.1 and 3.2. The team has developed a methodology that is detailed in Annex 8 and will use this consistently in each of the country visits (where this is possible). A gender-balanced team will be used to ensure access to men and women in each of the countries as part of an approach which will seek to obtain gender-disaggregated data.
It will be important for the evaluation team to work closely with OCHA and the country-based Advisory Board in the early stages of field visit planning to do as much as possible to ensure that community-level visits are feasible, relevant, and useful.

Box 6 below provides a short description of the complementary tools that the evaluation team will use to engage with communities. The project timelines that the evaluation team uses for the project site visits are likely to be for ongoing projects rather than those that have been completed. See section below for further details on project timelines as a data collection tool.

The spokes exercise requires a minimum of 45-60 minutes in order to conduct a meaningful and participatory discussion. If the team has to travel to project locations where security considerations mean that it is not possible to spend this much time with affected populations, the team will rely on the other community engagement tools instead. It will conduct short interviews with randomly selected individuals to obtain their stories and observe indicators of project implementation.

During project site visits and community engagement, the team will work with OCHA staff for translation and facilitation, particularly in volatile environments where it might be problematic for local consultants to travel and get access. The benefit of this approach is that OCHA staff have knowledge of the local context and projects but are not linked to implementation so this will retain the independence of the evaluation.

Box 2: Data collection tools – community engagement approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The project team will use three complementary data collection tools during community consultations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. Project timelines**  
In advance of visits to project sites, the team will work with the CBPF unit and relevant CBPF partners at country level to develop a project timeline with key dates relating to project approval, fund disbursement and activities (see Annex 8 for a detailed list of key dates). |
| **2. ‘Spokes’ exercise**  
The evaluation team will use this exercise to identify whether and how CBPF-funded projects have contributed to improving the lives of crisis-affected communities. The ‘spokes’ technique is a useful way of identifying the characteristics shaping a topic, such as ‘what makes humanitarian assistance most useful for you?’ or ‘what are the characteristics of good quality humanitarian assistance?’ It is then used to score community perceptions of each characteristic. Annex 8 provides an illustration of the spokes exercise, together with the list of prompts that team members will use to guide gender-disaggregated FGDs. The team will refer to the project timeline during the spokes exercise in order to validate project implementation dates and explore perceptions of timeliness. |
| **3. Individual stories**  
During the project site visits, if team members are able to identify individuals with a particularly illustrative story, they will seek to do a short interview in order to obtain details of what assistance the individual received and its impact. The approach will ensure the participation of women and men as well as key vulnerable groups in order to understand the different views of key constituents. The aim will be to highlight how CBPF-funded projects have contributed to making a difference to people's lives and the relevance of these to different parts of the community. These stories will be written up for inclusion in country case study reports and, if relevant, in the synthesis report. |
| **4. Observation**  
During project site visits, team members will look out for indications of the quality of project implementation such as gender sensitivity (for example, gender-segregated toilets in a WASH programme), protection measures (such as lighting in communal areas, including toilets), or the level of use of services (numbers using water points, situation of water points, numbers using health services, etc.). These observations will complement/validate the information gained through the other community engagement tools. |

The team has modest expectations of the extent to which affected populations will be able to provide meaningful feedback on the CBPF specifically, but we do expect that some level of community engagement will be useful to inform country case studies. Collection of beneficiary feedback will be constrained by the duration of field visits, with teams
unlikely to visit more than one or two locations within each case study country. As a result, the community consultations will only offer a snapshot of the assistance provided. When data from the case studies and global level consultations is aggregated for the synthesis report, the data from the consultations will highlight examples of good practice/need for lessons and offer stories of how CBPF-funded assistance has made a difference to people's lives.

Project timelines

In order to assess the timeliness of CBPF funding, the evaluation team will use GMS data to analyze the numbers of days required for project approval and fund disbursement processes across all projects. In addition, it will develop detailed timelines that include project implementation dates for a small number of projects in case study countries. These will be a mix of ongoing projects (that the team will visit for community consultations) and completed projects. The team will need to work directly with partners to obtain dates on project implementation since these are not available from the GMS. This tool has proved to be very effective in country level CERF reviews.

Country visits

The evaluation team will conduct a total of five country visits across a range of humanitarian contexts. In all cases, the evaluation team will arrive in country having discussed the ToR for the evaluation with the country focal point, agreed a draft agenda and identified key stakeholders for interviews to ensure that the time that the evaluators spend in country can be used as effectively and efficiently as possible. Lessons learnt from the first country visit will be discussed by the evaluation team and used to inform refinement of the methods and tools for subsequent visits. Box 3 presents the approach to the field-based country case studies.

Box 3: Country visit process

Preparation for the country visit will include carrying out a light preliminary desk review, which will focus on gathering evidence against the evaluation matrix to be explored in greater depth in-country. The team will agree an itinerary that includes meetings with key stakeholders, field visits and community engagement prior to arrival in country. Each visit will start with a brief kick-off meeting in country with evaluation stakeholders (including Advisory Board members) to orientate the team to the national context, provide background on the evaluation approach, methods and tools, and to enable an initial exploration of key issues.

A series of semi-structured interviews with key in-country informants both at national and field level will follow, together with visits to project sites and focus group discussions with affected populations.

Towards the end of each country visit, a feedback workshop will be held with the Advisory Board, presenting and discussing preliminary findings to fill gaps in evidence, check the validity of the findings, promote learning, and to foster ownership.

Following the visit, the team will produce a short interim update within one week of returning from the field. A detailed data analysis will then be undertaken and a country report will be prepared and submitted for comments. These reports will feed into the cross-country case study analysis and the evaluation synthesis report.

Gender and equity

The team will apply a gender sensitive approach to this evaluation and will seek to examine the extent to which the CBPF addresses issues of equity. Several evaluation questions outlined in the matrix specifically refer to gender, inclusion and vulnerability which will ensure consistent inclusion across the approach. Through the review of literature, key informant interviews, and direct engagement of the team with communities, the evaluation will seek to analyze and assess the extent to which the differential needs, priorities and voices of affected people have been considered in the design, selection, implementation and monitoring of CBPF-funded projects. The IASC Gender Marker/Gender with Age Marker has been adopted in the CBPF process and will be used as one means of verifying gender mainstreaming at a portfolio level. Concerning equity, the evaluation will consider, strategies and approaches used for understanding the needs of
specific groups affected by humanitarian crises and will seek to consistently examine the extent to which these have been addressed by CBPF-funded projects during focus group discussions with community members.

**Approach to sampling**

An important part of the inception phase is the identification of stakeholders for key informant interviews and focus group discussions, as well as the final selection of country visit and desk-based case studies.

**Country Case Studies**

The evaluation ToR listed countries with CBPFs. Building on a matrix that OCHA provided to guide the selection of case study countries (see Annex 5), the team has analyzed existing CBPFs against a number of criteria. These included the administrative model, funding level, proportion of funding disbursed to local and national NGOs, the type of emergency and previous evaluations. This enabled the team to prepare a shortlist of countries for field visits, which was subsequently discussed with OCHA and generated a list of five case studies and one back-up country (see Table 1). OCHA subsequently communicated this list to the Advisory Group before finalising the selection.

**Table 1: Proposed case study countries (with back-ups)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF</th>
<th>Admin model</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Funding level (2015-2018)</th>
<th>Funding to NGOs</th>
<th>Types of Emergency Addressed</th>
<th>Previous Evaluations/ Recent or Forthcoming Audit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Conflict-related displacement</td>
<td>No/2019 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oPt</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Protracted conflict</td>
<td>2013 ERF Evaluation/2018 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (back-up)</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Conflict in Syria (cross-border operation)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>UNDP/ MPTFO</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Protracted conflict and drought</td>
<td>2015 CHF Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it would be desirable to achieve a balance between the criteria listed above in the selection of countries to participate in the evaluation, it is anticipated that any sampling strategy will also need to be sensitive to practical considerations such as security and access in addition to internal factors such as the availability of key staff, competing evaluative priorities, and the ability of countries to host the evaluation. As a result of these practical considerations, OCHA and the team ruled out Yemen, Ethiopia and the DRC, despite stakeholder interest in including these as case studies. However, the team will place emphasis on collecting data on these contexts through remote interviews and document reviews. Some of the practical considerations for the selected countries are listed below (Table 2).
Table 2: Practical considerations for consideration by the evaluation team and Advisory Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF</th>
<th>Practical considerations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>The country has requested a visit. Community engagement will require support in order to address challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oPt</td>
<td>While the context is somewhat unique, this is a good example of a fund that increased rapidly in size.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Second largest fund in region with significant CERF funding. Community engagement will require support in order to address challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey (back-up)</td>
<td>Large fund but focus on cross-border will make community engagement extremely difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia (pilot)</td>
<td>Diverse program portfolio. Access will be difficult in South Central.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Variable access for humanitarian assistance since 2017, high overall levels of funding but currently decreasing.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CBPF project selection**

In each of the case study countries, the evaluation team will use a consistent approach to determining specific projects to visit and to discuss with communities. At a macro-level, because of the nature of the volatile environments that are included among the countries that will be visited, it is anticipated that the selection of areas to visit will be largely purposeful as it will need to consider operational issues of security and access. Once locations have been identified, a review will be undertaken of the CBPF projects that have been implemented and prior to travel to the country, a selection of a small number will be made for more detailed review based on the criteria outlined below:

- Period of implementation (projects that are ongoing or that have recently ended will be prioritized);
- Proportion of total project funded by the CBPF (projects that have received a higher proportion of CBPF funding will be prioritized);
- Each of the projects that meet the two criteria above will then be reviewed in order to identify trends in the CBPF allocations which may include the prioritization of specific sectors (e.g. WASH), cross-cutting themes (e.g. accountability), specific groups (e.g. women, people with disabilities).

The projects selected will provide the basis for the team's engagement with communities and will offer a means of identifying the contribution that CBPF projects have made to the lives of affected people. These discussions will be used to supplement and/or validate key informant interviews and secondary data review.

**Data collection, synthesis and analysis**

**Figure 1: Three-step process for systematic evidence gathering and analysis**

1. **Preliminary assessment**
   - Secondary data
   - Interviews

2. **Field-level assessment**
   - Verification of preliminary analysis
   - Field-level interviews to explore how and why

3. **Data analysis**
   - Triangulation
   - Systematic analysis of patterns
The ToR lends itself to an inductive approach being taken to data collection and analysis and to assessing the contribution made by the CBPFs to achieving results. The evaluation team will take an approach that places primacy on exploration and observation as a way of identifying patterns, and by exploring inductively and collaboratively with key stakeholders where good practice exists. In support of this, the evaluation team has designed a three-step process that will enable it, in a systematic and transparent way, to gather data in a way that minimises bias, and to take a pragmatic but systematic approach to analysing a substantial volume of qualitative and quantitative data and evidence across a range of case studies (figure 1).

**Preliminary assessment**

The evaluation team will conduct a preliminary analysis during the inception phase and prior to travel to each of the case study countries. This will enable a more focused approach to be taken during fieldwork to gathering further data and verifying the quantitative and qualitative data that has already been collected.

**Field-level assessment**

Based on the preliminary assessment of evidence conducted for each country case study, the evaluation team will be able to focus down on the most relevant aspects of the ToR in order to explore the contribution made by the CBPF to change, the relative importance of enabling and inhibiting factors, and the contributory role of key stakeholders.

Interviews and focus groups will be structured so as to minimize bias, for example, questions will ask about outcome-level changes in leadership, coordination and response first and then explore in an open way what contributed to these changes. This approach will allow respondents to provide a more considered view of the range of contributory factors, which should assist in understanding the influence of the CBPF.

**Triangulation of data**

The analytical process brings together evidence from these different streams against the Evaluation Matrix as the main analytical tool. To strengthen the validity of the findings, a series of layered triangulation techniques are applied to the data collection and data analysis processes. These include triangulation of data types, triangulation of data sources, and the triangulation of data collectors. A set of systematic tools (for document review and qualitative exercises) are intended to ensure consistency in application. Finally, a participatory and collaborative analysis process is intended to control for bias. Complementarity will be used to explain and understand findings obtained by one method by applying a second. Where findings diverge from the application of the different methods, these will need to be further investigated to either reconcile or explain the differences in findings.

- **Data Types**: The evaluation will gather information via the six qualitative, quantitative and secondary data tools described earlier. Evaluation Questions to be explored are addressed in both a qualitative and a quantitative tool to serve as possible checks against each other.

- **Data Sources**: The information sources come from a wide range of stakeholders at both global and country-level. The case countries are reflective of different regions with different challenges. The collection of different sources can enhance triangulation.

- **Data Collectors**: The evaluation team contains members from diverse backgrounds, roles and experiences. The plan is to rotate among the team who leads interviews and visits countries so that different members of the team rotate interviewing different stakeholder levels. This is to ensure that no single evaluator had too much influence over the facilitation processes.

- **Consistent Tools**: A set of systematic tools for the six techniques helps ensure that even though different data collectors and sources are engaged, the techniques are being applied in a consistent manner than can be cross-checked by outside agents.

- **Participatory Analysis**: For the conclusions and recommendations, the Evaluation Team will make use of its diversity to ensure that multiple perspectives are considered when reviewing the evidence against the evaluation matrix.
This will be supplemented by an additional consultative approach with findings presented to and validated by the stakeholders – including debriefings at the end of each evaluation field mission.

**Data synthesis and analysis**

The evaluation team has designed a process to gather data in a systematic and transparent way that will minimize bias, and to take a pragmatic but systematic approach to analysing a substantial volume of qualitative and quantitative data and evidence across a range of case studies (see below and figure 2).

- **Step 1:** Prior to commencing each of the country visits, an initial review of secondary data will be undertaken to ensure understanding of the country context.

- **Step 2:** Notes from interviews will be retained and a summary of key evidence will be recorded.

- **Step 3:** For each country visit, an evidence summary table will be prepared, which summarizes key evidence against each of the evaluation questions.

- **Step 4:** The country reports will be developed and written, based on the evidence summary table.

- **Step 5 and 6:** The evaluation team will look across the evidence summary table and country reports to identify common themes and patterns that will be used to write the Global Synthesis Report.

**Recommendations**

The recommendations outlined in the evaluation reports will be the logical implications of the findings and conclusions and will be:

- Categorized as a) Critical, b) Important, or c) Opportunity for learning.
- Relevant, realistic and useful, and reflect the reality of the context within which CBPFs operate.
- Clearly stated and not broad or vague.
- Realistic and reflect an understanding of OCHA and the humanitarian system and potential constraints to follow up
- Suggest where responsibility for follow-up should lie and include a timeframe for implementation

**Dissemination of findings**

**Dissemination**

The evaluation team and OCHA will ensure that each of these user groups has access to the findings of the evaluation in order for them to be able to have access to the findings including their implications for accountability and implementation. It is anticipated that dissemination will occur at two distinct levels: Country and global-level.

Country-level: At the end of each country visit, the evaluation team will conduct a validation workshop with a presentation of the initial findings to primary stakeholders and intended users. The presentations (PowerPoint slide decks) will be shared with the Evaluation Manager.
Global-level: The evaluation team will seek to engage with key stakeholders during the preparation of the draft synthesis report. Specifically, it is proposed that a multi-stakeholder group is formed to support the development of the recommendations to increase engagement and strengthen their relevance. It is anticipated that the engagement of OCHA in this process will strengthen the utility of the recommendations.

Upon completion of the draft synthesis report, a validation workshop will be held with a presentation of the main findings, conclusions and recommendations. The presentation will be shared with the Evaluation Manager. Once the evaluation is completed, presentations of the main findings and recommendations will be made to various fora as decided by OCHA and the Advisory Group.
Annex 3: Evaluation matrix

Presented below is the evaluation framework, consisting of evaluation questions, sub-questions, indicators, data sources and analytical methods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions/Sub-questions</th>
<th>Indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMPACT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1: To what extent do CBPFs make a difference in the lives of affected people by addressing the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1.1 To what extent do CBPFs contribute to the provision of timely and principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity? | Evidence that CBPF-funded projects have contributed to saving lives  
Evidence that CBPF-funded projects have contributed to alleviating suffering and maintaining human dignity regardless of gender, age, disability, ethnicity or other factors.  
Evidence that the selection and implementation of CBPF-funded projects adhere to the humanitarian principles  
Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement  
Evidence of the timeliness of project implementation (in relation to the starting point of the crisis) |
| **OUTCOMES**                       |            |
| EQ2: In what ways do CBPFs contribute to strengthening the outcomes of humanitarian response, leadership and coordination and to what extent are CBPFs likely to remain relevant for future humanitarian contexts? | | |
| 2.1 Improved response: To what extent are CBPFs able to meet newly emerging needs in a timely and flexible manner and to identify and adapt to future changes? | Evidence of mechanisms for identifying newly emerging needs in ongoing crises and in new contexts  
Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement in response to new emergencies  
Evidence of the flexibility of CBPFs to adapt to changes in context  
Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate  
Evidence of CBPF management capacity to scan the horizon and of flexibility to adapt to changes  
Evidence of the extent to which CBPFs have enabled donors to improve the flexibility and reach of unearmarked humanitarian funding |
| 2.2 Better coordination: How do CBPFs contribute to a coordinated humanitarian response? | Evidence of the contribution made by CBPFs to increasing collaboration between humanitarian actors (local, national, international) and coordination within the humanitarian system (clusters)  
Evidence that HCs and CBPF Advisory Boards ensure that CBPF-funded projects are coordinated with the broader humanitarian response when making funding decisions and are implemented in line with the HPC  
Evidence that donors take account of CBPF funding when making funding decisions |
| 2.3 Strengthened leadership: To what extent do CBPFs strengthen the leadership of the HC? | Evidence of ways in which CBPFs strengthen the leadership and coordination function of HCs  
Evidence of strategic decision-making processes  
Evidence that the HC adheres to the Operational Handbook for the CBPFs. |
| 2.4 To what extent do OCHA and HCs use CBPFs strategically? | Evidence that HCs take account of other mechanisms and sources of funding (including bilateral funding) during CBPF allocations  
Evidence that HC decisions are based on the comparative advantage of CBPFs and other funding mechanisms  
Evidence that CBPFs are meeting urgent, prioritized needs  
Evidence that OCHA has an organization-wide approach to humanitarian financing? |
| **ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS**          |            |
| EQ3: To what extent are CBPFs supporting partners to meet the most urgent humanitarian needs in a way that is timely and is consistent with HRP priorities and cross-cutting issues? | | |
| 3.1 To what extent do CBPFs respond to the most urgent needs of people and communities affected by crisis? | • Evidence that CBPF projects are informed by coordinated and participatory needs assessments  
• Evidence that CBPF prioritization processes identify the greatest humanitarian needs including those of marginalized groups  
• Evidence that CBPF selection and implementation processes take account of gender, age and disability issues, as well as broader inclusiveness issues  
• Evidence that CBPF partners involve affected populations in the project management cycle.  
• Evidence that accessible mechanisms are in place for information sharing and for feedback and complaints |
|---|---|
| 3.2 To what extent are CBPFs aligned with Humanitarian Response Plans, prioritized against needs and relevant to the context? | • Evidence that CBPF funding is aligned with HRPs and/or similar strategic plans  
• Evidence on whether CBPFs allocate funding for more than 12 months against multi-year HRPs  
• Evidence that clusters are effective in their prioritization and selection of CBPF projects  
• Evidence that projects take account of relevant quality standards in their design  
• Evidence that CBPFs promote the use of cash and vouchers where relevant |
| 3.3 To what extent do CBPFs employ effective disbursement mechanisms and minimize transaction costs? | • Evidence that CBPF disbursement mechanisms are timely and aligned with project implementation  
• Evidence that CBPF disbursement procedures and reporting requirements are designed to minimize transaction costs  
• Evidence that CBPF decision-making processes are transparent |
| 3.4 To what extent and in what ways do CBPFs promote the use of the best-placed partners and strengthen localization? | • Evidence of outreach at country level to national and local actors  
• Evidence of inclusion of local and national actors in CBPF decision-making processes  
• Evidence that CBPFs have procedures in place to select the most appropriate partners  
• Evidence that CBPF partners are responding to identified humanitarian needs  
• Evidence of targeted training and support to NNGOs throughout the programme cycle  
• Evidence that CBPF documentation and guidance are available in national languages |

**INPUTS**

EQ4: Is the management of CBPFs fit for purpose and do they operate efficiently?

| 4.1 To what extent do CBPFs support overall resource mobilization for HRPs? | • Evidence of HC/HCT efforts to raise funds for CBPFs  
• Level of CBPF funding to HRP projects  
• Evidence on whether CBPFs are able to mobilize multi-year contributions from donors against multi-year HRPs |
| 4.2 Are CBPFs managing risks appropriately, and is there sufficient oversight and accountability, including monitoring and reporting systems? | • Evidence that CBPFs have risk management systems in place  
• Evidence that CBPF accountability and oversight mechanisms operate effectively  
• Evidence that CBPF managers are adequately resourced to ensure oversight and accountability, including monitoring and fraud case management  
• Evidence that CBPF reporting systems strike a balance between accountability and minimising transaction costs |
| 4.3 Has the global standardization of CBPFs (as per the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework) increased efficiency? | • Evidence of added value of harmonization resulting from the global standardization of CBPFs  
• Evidence of the added value of the GMS  
• Evidence of the functionality and transparency of Umoja  
• Evidence that global standardization has reduced management costs of CBPFs  
• Evidence that global standardization has reduced transaction costs for fund recipients over the evaluation timeframe  
• Evidence that harmonization of CBPFs is balanced with flexibility to adapt to local contexts  
• Efficiency implications of different fund management structures |
| 4.4 Is there sufficient capacity in the humanitarian system to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects? | • Evidence that capacity at a global level is adequate to lead, manage and retain oversight of the CBPFs  
• Evidence that the capacity of the HC, the Advisory Board, OCHA (the HFU) at a country-level is adequate to fulfil their governance, management and technical advisory roles  
• Evidence that the clusters are able to meet their strategic and technical review responsibilities  
• Evidence that the quantity and quality of humanitarian partners is sufficient to deliver high quality CBPF projects |
Annex 4: CBPF Operational Impact model

This annex reproduces the model of CBPF Operational Impact outlined in the 2015 Policy Instruction. This was used by the evaluation team as a basis for the analytical framework and evaluation matrix (albeit with some modifications to avoid repetition and to best suit the specific needs of the evaluation).

**OPERATIONAL IMPACT**
The provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity

---

**OUTCOME 1**
Improved response
- Humanitarian operations more effectively address priority humanitarian needs
- Increased participation of national NGOs

**OUTCOME 2**
Strengthened leadership
- Ability of HC to exercise effective leadership is increased
- Strengthened direction by HC towards humanitarian operations

**OUTCOME 3**
Better coordination and more resources
- Improved coordination
- Increased resources
- More effective humanitarian planning framework (HRP/HPC)

---

**OUTPUTS**
Prioritized projects receive funding in a timely manner and deliver intended results

**ACTIVITIES**
- Fund strategies defined for each allocation window
- Project prioritization carried out
- Technical review conducted ensuring project quality
- Accountability framework established and implemented (risk management procedures, monitoring, reporting, evaluation, audit)
- Residual risk analyzed and communicated to HC and CBPF Advisory Board
- Funds efficiently disbursed
- Active coaching and support to NGOs

**INPUTS**
- Financial contributions
- Eligible partners (capacity/risk formally assessed)
- OCHA capacity to manage funds
- Partner/cluster capacity to support the process
- Transparent and well communicated allocation guidelines
Annex 5: Summary of stakeholder survey results

This annex presents the findings of the online survey that the evaluation team conducted to gather feedback on the CBPFs from stakeholders at country and global levels.

Purpose

The purpose of the online survey was to gather perspectives on CBPFs from a wide range of stakeholders based in all eighteen countries with CBPFs and at the global level. Analysis of survey data was used to complement information gathered during the document review, interviews and community-level consultations. It allowed the evaluation team to consider views from stakeholders beyond the five countries selected for case-studies.

Target audience and dissemination

The primary stakeholders consulted via the online survey at the country level were: OCHA staff; UN agencies; international and national NGOs receiving funding (and not receiving funding, although eligible); Red Cross/Red Crescent representatives; and donor representatives at country and global levels. A list of target individuals and groups to complete the survey was drawn up in close cooperation with OCHA. OCHA staff at country level were requested to disseminate the survey link and work with their networks to encourage a good response rate.

Survey parameters

The survey was circulated in English, French and Arabic. Responses were then consolidated to provide one overall summary of the results in English. All individual survey responses were kept confidential.

Survey responses

A total of 1387 individuals responded to the survey; 1276 of which provided completed responses. 96 per cent of those who completed the survey were based in countries with CBPFs (see table 1 below).

Table 1: Respondents to the CBPF online survey, by location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupied Palestinian territory</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The relatively low completion rate by participants in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) is due to a parallel and complementary survey that was circulated by the DRC Humanitarian Fund (DRC HF). Responses to the DRC survey were shared with the evaluation team and, where questions overlapped, were largely in line with responses to this online survey. Where responses to similar questions diverged, this is noted below.

Survey respondents represented a range of different stakeholder groups (as shown in table 2 below). The largest number of respondents represented NGOs (35 percent of total responses), followed by INGOs (33 percent). In terms of the roles and functions of people who responded to the survey, they included HCs; cluster coordinators; Advisory Board members; and organizations that were either current or former recipients or donors of CBPF funding.

Table 2: Respondents to the CBPF online survey, by stakeholder group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Donor</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International NGO</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National NGO</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other UN Agency</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Cross/Red Crescent</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN OCHA</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Survey findings

Questions on the overall contributions of CBPFs to an improved humanitarian response

The first set of survey questions aimed to understand the extent to which survey respondents considered that CBPFs have contributed to the timeliness, flexibility, reach and prioritization of humanitarian response. The results can be seen below in Table 3.

Table 3: Responses to CBPF online survey, Question 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness of the response</th>
<th>Significant contribution</th>
<th>Some positive contribution</th>
<th>Little positive contribution</th>
<th>No positive contribution</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility of the response e.g. to changing needs/priorities</td>
<td>Significant contribution</td>
<td>Some positive contribution</td>
<td>Little positive contribution</td>
<td>No positive contribution</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reach e.g. to hard to reach areas or groups</td>
<td>Significant contribution</td>
<td>Some positive contribution</td>
<td>Little positive contribution</td>
<td>No positive contribution</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritization e.g. links with the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)</td>
<td>Significant contribution</td>
<td>Some positive contribution</td>
<td>Little positive contribution</td>
<td>No positive contribution</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Responses to the question on the extent to which CBPFs have contributed to prioritization of humanitarian responses received a particularly positive response, with 87 percent of respondents selecting either “significant contribution” or “some positive contribution”. Responses were consistently positive across all stakeholder groups. Similarly, the largest group of respondents from most countries selected the “significant contribution” option; except in Afghanistan and Lebanon, where the largest group of respondents selected "some positive contribution". The overall breakdown of responses (by number) per option for the contribution of the CBPF to prioritization of the response can be seen below in figure 1.

Figure 1: Responses to CBPF online survey, question on contributions to PRIORITIZATION of the response

The contribution of CBPFs to the timeliness of the response also received very positive ratings – 85 percent of respondents selected either “significant contribution” or “some positive contribution” for this question. Respondents working with NGOs and OCHA were particularly positive in their responses, with the largest group selecting “significant contribution”; as were respondents from Colombia, Jordan, Pakistan, Somalia, South Sudan and Sudan. The overall breakdown of the number of responses per response option for the contribution of the CBPF to timeliness of the response can be seen below in figure 2.

Figure 2: Responses to CBPF online survey, question on contributions to TIMELINESS of the response

Questions on strengthening collaboration and coordination

This set of survey questions asked respondents to rate the effectiveness of CBPFs in strengthening collaboration between different members of the humanitarian system. The breakdown of responses can be seen below in table 4.
Table 4: Responses to CBPF online survey, Question 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CBPF strengthens coordination within clusters</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most positively rated aspect within this topic was the contribution of CBPFs in strengthening coordination within clusters. Eighty seven percent of survey participants selected “strongly agree” or “agree” in response to the statement that “the CBPF strengthens coordination within clusters”. Within the different stakeholder groups, participants working with OCHA, the Red Cross and NNGOs were particularly positive in their responses. The highest number of respondents in most countries selected “agree”; except in the Central African Republic (CAR), Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan and Yemen, where the highest number said “strongly agree”. The overall breakdown of the number of responses for the coordination statement can be seen below in figure 3.

**Figure 3: Responses to CBPF online survey, statement on strengthening coordination**

The CBPF/Humanitarian Fund strengthens coordination within clusters

Within the same set of statements, the least positively rated statement was that “donor decision-making is more coordinated because of CBPFs” (see figure 4 below). Only 68 percent of respondents rated the statement positively, with a significant proportion also disagreeing somewhat or strongly disagreeing (as well as a notable number and proportion selecting “don’t know”). Within the different stakeholder groups, donors and UN agencies were most likely to rate the statement negatively; as were respondents in Jordan, Lebanon, Nigeria and Somalia.
Figure 4: Responses to CBPF online survey, statement on coordination of donor decision-making

Donor decision making is more coordinated because of the CBPF/Humanitarian Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions on responding to the needs of people affected by crisis

This section of the survey asked respondents to rate the contribution of CBPFs to a response that meets the needs of people affected by crisis. The breakdown of responses can be seen below in table 5.

Table 5: Responses to CBPF online survey, Question 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF projects are informed by coordinated and participatory needs assessment/analysis</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBPF project selection and implementation processes take into account issues of gender, age, disability and other factors related to inclusiveness</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The way that CBPF projects are selected and implemented adheres to humanitarian principles</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affected populations are involved in the project management cycle of CBPF-funded project</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF partners ensure that adequate and accessible mechanisms are in place for information sharing with and feedback/complaints from affected populations</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The least positive ratings within this set of statement were allocated to the two questions on AAP: involving affected populations in CBPF-funded projects; and ensuring adequate and accessible mechanisms for information sharing and feedback/complaints mechanisms. Across the different stakeholder groups, donors rated these aspects most nega...
tively, and respondents from UN agencies were split, with an almost equal number of respondents rating AAP aspects somewhat positively as somewhat negatively. The breakdown of responses for both statements can be seen below in figures 5 and 6.

**Figure 5: Responses to CBPF online survey, statement on involving affected populations**

**Affected populations are involved in the project management cycle of CBPF/Humanitarian Fund-funded projects**

- Don’t know
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree somewhat
- Agree
- Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 6: Responses to CBPF online survey, statement on information/feedback & complaints mechanisms**

**CBPF/Humanitarian Fund partners ensure that adequate and accessible mechanisms are in place for information sharing with and feedback/complaints from affected populations**

- Don’t know
- Strongly disagree
- Disagree somewhat
- Agree
- Strongly agree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree somewhat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents to the DRC HF online survey – conducted in parallel to this survey (as noted above) – were notably more positive about the participation and involvement of the affected population. In response to the question, "Do the projects funded by the DRC HF have a clear strategy to promote the participation and involvement of people affected by the crisis? (complaint mechanism, consultation with beneficiaries, etc.)", 76 percent of survey participants responded positively, answering either “always” (31 per cent) or “often” (45 per cent).
Question on localization

The online survey included just one question on localization, asking to what extent the CBPFs encourage a localized response. Responses on this topic were among the most positive of all responses to survey questions. The breakdown of responses can be seen below in table 6.

Table 6: Responses to CBPF online survey, Question 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actively encourages localization</th>
<th>Somewhat encourages localization</th>
<th>Does not encourage localization</th>
<th>Hinders localization</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents working with NGOs, Red Cross, OCHA and UNDP were most likely to rate CBPFs positively in terms of their role in encouraging a localized response. In most countries, the majority of respondents selected the response “actively encourages localization”; except respondents in Ethiopia, Iraq, oPt and Yemen, where the majority selected “somewhat encourages localization”.

Participants in the DRC HF online survey were even more positive on this issue. In response to the question, “To what extent does the DRC HF promote a localised humanitarian response?”, 96 per cent of people responded positively, answering either “actively promotes localization” (59 per cent) or “slightly encourages localization” (37 per cent).

Questions on CBPF-related processes

This section of the survey asked participants to rate different CBPF-related processes and their effectiveness. The breakdown of responses can be seen below in table 7.

Table 7: Responses to CBPF online survey, Question 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timely review of proposals and disbursement of funding</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management procedures and processes (including partner capacity assessments and risk rating)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring, financial spot-checks and audits</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements and processes</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational guidelines, handbooks and other CBPF guidance/tools</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responses to process-related questions were mixed, with slightly higher numbers and proportions of survey participants selecting “adequate” rather than “excellent” and “good” compared with other survey questions.

Risk management procedures and processes received the most mixed ratings – both partner capacity assessments and risk ratings, and project monitoring, financial spot-checks and audits. OCHA respondents rated these aspects more positively than other stakeholder groups. For project monitoring, financial spot-checks and audits, only Somalia received the highest number of responses for “excellent”; and only Ethiopia received the highest number of “excellent” responses for partner capacity assessments and risk ratings. In general, responses from global-level survey participants were less positive than those from respondents working at country level. The breakdown of responses for both statements can be seen below in figures 7 and 8.
Questions on capacity in the humanitarian system

The survey asked participants to rate the capacity of different actors and groups within the humanitarian system in terms of their ability to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects. The breakdown of responses can be seen below in table 8.
Table 8: Responses to CBPF online survey, Question 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) for leadership and oversight of the CBPF</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF Advisory Board in its consultative role and support to the HC</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF Review Committees, both strategic and technical</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (or UNDP in cases where UNDP is the managing agent) for management of CBPF operations and policy advice</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clusters for providing strategic cohesion e.g. links between cluster strategies and the CBPF; and operational support e.g. technical review of projects</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-cutting advisors or networks e.g. on issues such as gender or modalities such as cash</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF-funded partners for implementing all aspects of the project management cycle</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The responses to questions on capacity were mixed. One of the least positively rated aspects was the capacity of cross-cutting advisors or networks e.g. on issues such as gender or modalities like cash. This received the highest proportion of “adequate” (20 percent of all ratings) and “poor” (10 percent of the ratings). Respondents representing donors and UN agencies rated this aspect most negatively; as did survey participants working at the global level and in Iraq, oPt and South Sudan. The breakdown of ratings for the capacity of cross-cutting advisors and networks can be seen below in figure 9.
The main strengths of CBPFs

Survey participants were asked to consider the main strengths of CBPFs. Answers were in the form of free text boxes, without any prompts or requirements to select particular options. The top five aspects most frequently listed as strengths were (in order):

1. Coordination – Respondents particularly appreciated the opportunity provided by CBPFs to bring all stakeholders together to identify and respond to priority needs. The important role played by clusters in CBPF processes was repeatedly highlighted, as was the contribution of CBPFs in strengthening existing coordination mechanisms. Coordination of donor priorities and approaches was also mentioned.

2. Timeliness – The speed and agility of CBPFs were frequently mentioned – both in terms of strategic decision-making and prioritization, as well as project review and approval processes. A number of respondents favourably compared the CBPFs to other sources of funding in terms of their timeliness and responsiveness.

3. Flexibility – The adaptability of CBPFs to respond to contextual changes and emerging needs came out strongly in comments from survey participants. Flexibility was also highlighted as an asset at project level, with enough elasticity in CBPF systems and processes to allow implementing partners to readjust project activities to respond to changing circumstances and priorities.

4. Localization – Accessibility of CBPF funding to local and national actors was a recurring theme within the comments. The inclusiveness nature of processes and decision-making – with NGOs represented on ABs, SRCs and TRCs – was also highlighted as good practice.

5. Needs-based responses – The contextualization of CBPF-funded responses and the clear link between the needs of affected populations and CBPF funding decisions clearly came out as a strength. The fact that the funds are country-driven was highlighted as an asset in this regard.
The main priorities for improving CBPFs

A similar question was posed to participants regarding the main challenges or priorities for improving CBPFs. The top five areas that came up repeatedly were:

1. **Localization** – Having also been highlighted as a strength, the topic of localization came up again as an area for improvement. Survey participants emphasised the need to make CBPFs more accessible to local implementing partners, direct more funding through NNGOs, and facilitate greater engagement of NNGOs in decision-making processes. A greater acceptance of risk was emphasised as a necessary part of making CBPFs more accessible to local and national responders.

2. **Capacity building** – Linked to localization, a number of survey participants highlighted the need for more capacity building on accessing CBPF funding, particularly for NNGOs. Respondents commented on the need for substantive capacity building that goes beyond basic orientation on CBPF processes and deadlines.

3. **Timeframes** – The speed of allocation processes was noted as a challenge by a number of survey participants, making it difficult to submit quality applications on time. Rushed timeframes were also mentioned in terms of project implementation – leaving limited opportunities to conduct quality needs assessments, consult with affected communities, and ensure quality follow-up and monitoring.

4. **Transparency** – A significant number of survey participants questioned the transparency of CBFP-related processes and decision-making. In particular, challenges were raised in relation to partner selection and project proposal review. Limited feedback from decision-makers appears to have contributed to perceptions of a lack of transparency.

5. **Complementarity** – Respondents highlighted the recurring gap between CBPFs and funding for recovery, transition and development. They also noted the need for greater complementarity between CBPFs and other humanitarian funding sources, including the CERF.
Annex 6: Interview participants

Listed below are persons consulted during the evaluation. A summary table has been prepared of the total number of informants disaggregated by gender.

Table 1: Summary of interview participants disaggregated by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total interviewees</th>
<th>% female</th>
<th>% male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>40 %</td>
<td>60 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Somalia country report</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South Sudan country report</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. oPt country report</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Iraq country report</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>44 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Afghanistan country report</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>26 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global synthesis report</strong></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>683</td>
<td>39 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inception phase

Aidan O’Leary, Head of Office, OCHA, Iraq
Amarins Gerlofsma, MINBUZA, Netherlands
Andrea De Domenico, Chief, CBPF Section, OCHA
Andrew Billo, Senior Humanitarian Advisor, USAID
Angela Schwarz, Desk Officer, German Federal Foreign Office
Anne-Sophie Le Beux, Fund Manager, OCHA Turkey
Antoine Gérard, Senior Humanitarian Advisor, Operations and Advocacy Division, OCHA
Ashutosh Kumar Jha, Head, Finance Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA
Assaf Naaman, Desk Officer, oPt, OCHA
Bavo Christiaens, Portfolio Manager, MPTFO
Begoña Birath-Barrientos, Senior Programme Manager, Sida
Bettina Woll, Chief of Directorate for the Global Policy Network, UNDP
Bruno Lemarquis, Director, ai, Crisis Response Unit, UNDP
Caro Krijger, Senior Policy Officer, MINBUZA, Netherlands
Celine Billat, Associate Donor Relations Officer, UNHCR
Charlene Woolley, Institutional Lead OCHA, CERF and CBPF, DFID
Cyril Ferrand, Team Leader, Resilience Team for Eastern Africa, FAO
Fernando Hesse, Head, Governance and Partnerships Team, CBPF Section, OCHA
George Petropoulos, former Head, Fund Management Support Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA
Hiroko Araki, Senior Policy Advisor, UNHCR
Ignacio Leon, OiC, Assessment, Planning and Monitoring Branch, OCHA
James Kunjumen, Head, IM Systems and Data Analysis Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA
Jelena Jovanovic, Public Partnerships Manager, UNICEF
Jeremy Rempel, Coordinator, Less Paper, More Aid, ICVA
Jock Paul, Head, Oversight, Compliance and Fraud Management Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA
John Ratcliffe, Desk Officer, Yemen, OCHA
Juan Chaves-Gonzalez, Humanitarian Financing Strategy and Analysis Section, OCHA
Karuna Herrmann, Desk Officer, Iraq, OCHA
Khalid Almulad, Chief, External Relations and Partnerships Section, OCHA
Kristele Younis, Section Chief, Central and Western Africa, Operations and Advocacy Division, OCHA
Lisa Doughten, Chief, Pooled Funds Branch, OCHA
Luca Peciarolo, Humanitarian Financing Project Manager, NRC
Meron Berhane, OIC, Fund Management Support Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA
Michael Jensen, Chief, CERF secretariat, OCHA
Nicolas Rost, Humanitarian Evaluation Officer, SPEGs, OCHA
Nigel Timmins, Humanitarian Director, Global Humanitarian Team, Oxfam
Romano Lasker, Programme Specialist, Crisis fragility engagement policy team, UNDP
Sa’ad Abdel Haq, Fund Manager, OCHA
Sam Vigersky, Global Programs Team Leader, USAID
Samar Muhareb, Chief Executive Officer, ARDD Legal Aid
Sara Baschetti, CERF CBPF focal point, UNHCR
Sheri Ritsema, Section Chief, Central Asia, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Latin America and the Caribbean, Operations and Advocacy Division, OCHA
Simon Butt, Senior Security Advisor, OCHA
Stephen O’Malley, Head of Office, OCHA
Thomas Hiegens, Officer for Humanitarian Affairs, Belgium
Tim Mander, Fund Manager, OCHA
Tomas de Mul, Head, Donor Visibility Unit, OCHA
Yousef N. Zeidan, Desk Officer, Yemen, OCHA
Country report 1: Somalia

Abdiaruz Goulyz, Admin & logistics, PENHA
Abdifatah Aden Abdallah, Project Officer, ADO
Abdihakim Noor, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, HFU, OCHA
Abdilahi Hassan, Country Director, HAVOYOCO
Abdilehie Ibrahim, Deputy Programme Manager, ADRA
Abdimalijid Ali, Project Manager, SVO
Abdirahman Jowhar, Engineer, ADRA
Abdishakur Julub, Executive Director, ASAL Youth
Abdullahi Muhammed Ali, Executive Director, New Ways Organisation
Adam A. Ali, Executive Director, BVO
Afifa Ismail, Deputy SHF Manager, OCHA
Ahmed Adan, Head of Resource Mobilisation, ActionAid
Ania Zolkiewska, Head of CMCoord and Access Unit, OCHA
Anna Maria Geller, Cluster Co-Coordinator, Danish Refugee Council
Awks Abdullahi Adan, ICCG Support, OCHA
Axmed Nuur, Senior Programme Coordinator, WVI
Barnabas Asora, Head of Programmes - Somalia, Norwegian Refugee Council
Bavo Christiaens, Fund Portfolio Manager, MPTFO
Bernard Mrewa, Food Security Cluster Coordinator (WFP)
Bilal Osman, Embassy of Sweden
Binyam Gebru, Head of Health, Nutrition and WASH, Save the Children
Charles St. George, Head of Office (a.i.), Office of the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General
Christine Uyoga, Programme Officer, Denmark Embassy
Christophe Beau, Protection Cluster Coordinator
Danie Kuria, CCCM Cluster Information Management Officer, IOM
Daud Jiran, Country Director, Mercy Corps
Degan Ali, Chief Executive Officer, ADESO
Deqa Saleh, Cash and social protection advisor, ADESO
Dr Essa Nur Liban, Project manager, Candlelight
Eva Kiti, National Humanitarian Affairs Associate. OCHA
Evalyne Lwemba, National Humanitarian Affairs Associate, OCHA
Faiza Mohamed, Admin/finance, BVO
Frederic Patigny, WASH Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF
George Conway, HC/RC/DSRSG (a.i.)
Guled Osman, Country Director, Action Against Disasters Somalia (AADSOM)
Halima Hassan Mohamed, Program Officer, AVORD
Hoodo Kayse, Health Officer, WVI
Huusein Ismail, Program Advisor, ADO
Iahli Patale, Head of Admin and Finance UNIT, OCHA
Isabella Garino, Head of Mission, CESVI
Ismail Ahmed, Programme Coordinator, BVO
Issack Maalim, Programme Manager, ADESO
Jade Cooper, DFAT, Australian High Commission
Jean-Baptiste Heral, Country Director, ACTED
Jeremy Shusterman, Emergency Coordinator (a.i.), UNICEF
Jesper Moeller, Somalia Representative (a.i.), UNICEF
Jopheth Ounga, Head of Projects, Welthungerhilfe
Justin Brady, Head of Office, OCHA Somalia
Kevin MacKay, SomRep, World Vision
Khadar Mahmud, Director, ANPPCAN
Kristina Svedberg, Program Manager, Somalia, Embassy of the Netherlands
Lara Simpson, Deputy Country Director, ACTED
Laura Jeppson, Deputy Country Director, Save the Children
Lauren Bukera, Representative, WFP Somalia
Lilian Kilwake, Embassy of Switzerland to Kenya, Burundi, Rwanda, Somalia and Uganda
Lisa Doherty, Deputy Head of Mission, Embassy of Ireland in Kenya
Luiz Camargo, Country Director, ADRA
Madhav Bhandar, Partner, Baker Tilly Merali’s
Marieke Denissen, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Horn of Africa, Embassy of the Netherlands
Marilyne Marshall, Risk Analyst, Risk Management Unit, RCO
Martin Cheruiyot, Finance Officer, OCHA
Mary-Bernadette Obadha, National Humanitarian Affairs Associate, OCHA
Matija Kovač, SHF Manager, OCHA
Merita Jorgo, Multi-Partner Trust Fund Risk Manager
Miriam Warui, PSEA Taskforce Coordinator, IOM
Mohamed Abdikadir Somo, Chief Executive, Ayuub
Mohamed Ali Yusuf, Project Manager, HAVOYOCO
Mohamed Dahir, Executive Director, HIJA Organisation for Welfare and Development
Mohamed Isak, WASH Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF
Mohamed M. Awil, Area Coordinator, Islamic Relief
Mohamed Mohamud Ali, Project Manager, AVORD
Mohamed Yarrow Ali, Chief Executive Officer, Centre for Peace and Democracy (CPD)
Mowild M. Yousuf, Project Coordinator, GARSOR
Mulugeta Shibru, Food Security Cluster Coordinator (WFP)
Nafisa Yusuf Mohamed, Director, NAGAAD Network
Nasra Ali Ismail, Deputy Director, Somali NGO Consortium
Nour Adan Shirdo, Executive Director, SAYS
Nurta Adan, Cluster Coordinator, Shelter
Ombretta Mazzaroni, Programme Specialist, UNICEF
Omer Jama, Director, TASCO
Patricia Agwaro, National Humanitarian Affairs Associate, OCHA
Peta Barns, Emergency Specialist, UNICEF
Peter De Clercq, HC/RC/DSRSG
Philippe Rougier, Head of Mission, Intersos
Richard Crothers, Country Director, International Rescue Committee
Robbert Van Der Steeg, Chief Executive Officer, Women and Child Care Organisation (WOCCA)
Sadia M. Ahmed, Country Representative, PENHA
Samuel Kihara, Accountability Officer, HFU, OCHA
Sarah Skovgard, Education Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF
Seb Fouquet, Humanitarian Health and Resilience Team Leader, DFID
Sigurd Rothe, Policy Officer, Somalia Unit Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany
Simon Nziokah, Country Director, Danish Refugee Council
Siyad Ahmed Mohamed, Program Officer, AVORD
Slessu Ooko, Finance Director, ADRA
Solomon Ngari, DFAT, Senior Programme Manager, Australian High Commission
Svein Olav Svoldal, First Secretary, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Umikalthum Shukri Noo, National Humanitarian Affairs Associate, OCHA
Wan Suen, Programme Development and Quality Assurance Director, World Vision International
Country report 2: South Sudan

Alain Noudehou, Humanitarian Coordinator, South Sudan
Alexandra Hilal Guhr, Head of Development Cooperation, Deputy Head of Mission
Alexandros Yiannopoulos, Humanitarian Advisor, DFID
Alfred Khamis, Executive Director, COER
Alistair Short, FSL Cluster Coordinator, WFP/FAO
Amaniyo Gloria, Executive Director, Community Initiatives for Peace and Development
Andrea Cullinan, GBV Sub-Cluster Coordinator, UNFPA
Andrea Noyes, Deputy Head of Office, OCHA
Angelo Kwoe, Hope Vision Organization
Asar ul Haq, Shelter/NFI Programme Manager, IOM
Atimakia Christine Madra, Project Manager, AWHO
Ayaka Amano, Programme Officer, UN Mine Action Service
Babette Schots, Protection Coordinator, Danish Refugee Council
Both Gatkwoth, Executive Director, HACO
Bufrus Afaneisio Mustafa, MSE Assistance, COER
Cornelius Weira, Shelter/NFI Cluster Coordinator, IOM
Cristina Mena, WASH Cluster Co-coordinator, NRC
David Throp, South Sudan Humanitarian Fund Manager
Denis Ogwal, Assistant Health Officer, IHO
Denis Okello, Project Development Coordinator, Real Medicine Foundation
Dina Aburmishan, Nutritionist, WFP
Dionne Gutierrez, Senior Resource Management Officer, IOM
Dr Argata Guracha Guyo, Emergency Coordinator, WHO
Dr Jeff Okello, Chief Executive, THESO
Dr Kamil Kamaluddeen, Resident Representative, UNDP
Dr Stephen Duk, Head of Programs, UNIDO
Dr. C. B. Uday Raj Naidu, Health Cluster Co-lead, Save the Children
Dr. David Chany Adok, Public Health Officer, WHO
Duop Joseph, Nutrition sub-national roving co-coordinator, Action Against Hunger
Edwin Marita, Senior Program Coordinator, CMD
Ekwsae Msoni, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA
Elina Summer-Galou, Israidd
Elizabeth Mayer, Shelter/NFI Cluster Co-coordinator, WVI
Elizabeth Otieno, Assistant Director, CINA
Emmi Antinoja, Information Management, OCHA
Evelyn Winkler, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA
Fabiana Lubetkin, UNHAS
Francesca Cazzato, Child Protection Sub-Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF
Francois Bellet, WASH Cluster Coordinator, UNICEF
Geoff Andrews, Country Director, Medair
Geoffrey Ojok, Program Director, Real Medicine Foundation
Getahun Amogne, External Relations Officer, WFP
Gifl Sibanada, World Vision South Sudan
Gordon Lam, Executive Director, Dialogue and Research Initiative, NGO Forum
Guilain Lwesso Mununga, International Medical Corps UK
Hanna Carlsson, First Secretary, Development Cooperation and Humanitarian Affairs, Embassy of Sweden
Heather Blackwell, Head of Office, ECHO
Heidi Dessecker, Programme Officer, World Relief International
Hellen Turkia Joseph, Director, LWDO
Henry Taban, Executive Director, Rural Action Against Hunger/Chairman, NGO Forum
Hermann Ouedraogo, Nutrition Cluster coordinator, UNICEF
Isaac Macha, IM Officer, WFP
Ismail Bashir, Hope Vision Organization
Jakani Driuni, Executive Director, LCED
James Avery, Operations Coordinator, Humanity & Inclusion
James Buolle Dimo, MSE, COER
James Haranja, Head of Wau Sub-Office, UNHCR
James K. Kamau, Finance Consultant, Rhoem Consulting Ltd
James Mat Gay, Programme Director, Nile Hope
Jasper Okodi, Education Specialist, NRC
Jennifer Shortt-Banda, Resource Mobilization Manager, UNICEF
Jessica Cochran, Logistics Cluster Coordinator, WFP
Jimmy Joseph Jamba, Programme Manager, NSDO
John Macharia, Country WASH Coordinator, Oxfam
John Ndiku, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA
John Rutaro, Grants Manager, NRC
Joseph Mogga, Education and Child Protection Specialist, CMD
Justus Vundi, IM Officer, WFP/Food Security Cluster
Kassa Negalign, Medical Logistics, WHO
Kata Geoffrey, Programme Manager, Rural Women for Development South Sudan
Kate Kakela, Protection Cluster Coordinator, UNHCR
Kavita Belani, Housing, Land and Property, UNHCR
Khamis Alfred, Executive Director, APT Succor Organisation
Kristin Pristupa, Humanitarian Affairs Officer/Access and CM Coord Unit, OCHA
Lea Mascaro, Project Development Manager, ACTED
Linnet Omwange-Oumar, Internews
Lonyik Emmanuel, Data Analyst, OCHA
Maker Ajack Alier, Impact Actions
Margaret Fozia, Coordinator, AWHO
Marieke Denissen, Regional Humanitarian Coordinator for the Horn of Africa, Embassy of the Netherlands
Maureen Oyeru, Administrative Associate, OCHA
Maya Mason, Programme Manager, Flying Team, Humanity & Inclusion
Megan Weaver, Programme Coordinator, International Medical Corps UK
Meredith Maynard, Relief International
Meron Berhane, CBPF Unit, OCHA NY
Milcah Langat, Donor Relations Officer, UNICEF
Misso Godfrey Alfred, Head of Programs, Hold the Child Organisation
Ntanto Mlopana, FSL INGO Cluster Coordinator, World Vision
Oliver Bakata Frazer, Head of Programmes, Abyei Development Association
Ontabile Dingert, M&E Officer, IOM
Paul Doctor, Information Officer, NGO Secretariat, NGO Forum South Sudan
Peter Opio, Public Health Engineering (PHE) Team Leader, Wau, Oxfam
Peter Wata, OCHA Sub-Office, Wau
Pierre Vauthier, Acting Representative, FAO
Rabeea Ahmed, Cash Expert, Inter-Agency Cash Working Group
Rashid Kheir, Programme Specialist, Head, UNDP SS Humanitarian Fund
Repent Taban David, Executive Director, NSDO
Richard Okello, CCCM Cluster Coordinator, IOM
Richard Taban, Field Coordinator, Islamic Relief
Ronald Raju Gomes, Administrative Coordinator, Humanity & Inclusion
Safari Djumapili, Head of Field Coordination, OCHA South Sudan
Samuel Julio Daba, Field Supervisor, COER
Sarah Alex, Cash and Grants Advisor, DanChurchAid
Sarah Alifonsina Peremona, Programme Manager, ABSA-CA
Sherrie Lilian R., Monitoring & Evaluation Officer, LCED
Signe Guro Gilen, Minister Counsellor, Deputy Head of Mission, Royal Norwegian Embassy
Simon Cammelbeeck, Deputy Country Director, Operations, WFP
Soro Mike Hakim, Chief Executive Officer, SPEDP
Stamatia Boskou, CCCM Cluster Co-coordinator, ACTED
Stella Night, Nutrition Coordinator, Islamic Relief
Stephen O'Malley, Head of Office, OCHA South Sudan
Thomas Tut Gany, Executive Director, CMD
Tom Mpangi, Senior Partner, TMK & Co.
Tya Maskun, Head of Operations, IOM
Victor Libiter White, WASH Coordinator, NSDO
Vincent Wanyama, Country M&E Coordinator, NRC
Yusuf Abdi Salah, Head of Sub-Office, Wau, OCHA

Zacharia Alexander, Data Clerk, COER
Country report 3: occupied Palestinian territory

Abdel Naser Soboh, Gaza Health Cluster Coordinator
Abdelrahman Abu Hassanien, Humanity and Inclusion
Abed Yasin, Project Manager, Economic and Social Development Centre of Palestine (ESDC)
Ahmed Al Helou, Executive Manager, Right to Live Society
Ahmed Madi, Future Association for Culture and Development (FACD)
Ala’ Abu-Ayyash, Hebron Team Supervisor, YMCA
Alicia Moore, Humanitarian Affairs Officer, OCHA
Amal Ayyad, Chief Accountant, Near East Council of Churches (NECC) Committee
Amjad Hamdan, Audit Manager, Talal Abu-Ghazaleh & Co.
Amjad Shawwa, Director, PNGO
Anas Musallam, Food Security Sector Coordinator, Gaza
Andrea de Domenico, Deputy Head of Office, OCHA oPt
Athar Hodali, Palestinian Agricultural Relief Committees
Ayadil Saparbekov, Health Emergencies Programme Team Lead, WHO
Baha El Shatali, Education Cluster Coordinator, Gaza
Carol Awad, WASH cluster coordinator, West Bank, UNICEF
Connie Bearderson, National Protection Cluster Coordinator, OHCHR
Deya Al Baba, Senior Project Officer for e-voucher programme in Gaza, CRS
Diab Masha’aleh, Chair, Jaba’a Local Council
Diana Anani, Head of Southern West Bank Sub-Office, OCHA
Dr Sara Halimah, National Health Cluster Coordinator, WHO
Emad Hamdan, Manager, Hebron Rehabilitation Committee (HRC)
Engineer Hiluli Maraqa, Engineering Consultant, Hebron Rehabilitation Committee (HRC)
Engineer Shadi Fawzi Al Janazreh, Project Manager, Hebron Rehabilitation Committee (HRC)
Eric De Muynck, Consul, Head of Development Cooperation, Consulate General of the Kingdom of Belgium
Faadi Shamamasti, Shelter Cluster Coordinator, NRC
Fatma Shaa, Project Coordinator, Wefaq Society for Women and Child Care
Filippo Ortolani, Technical Assistant - Gaza, ECHO
Fouz Ali Hasan, Finance and Monitoring Officer, oPt HF
Genevieve Boutin, Special Representative, UNICEF State of Palestine
Hala Qishawi Jaber, Executive Director, Al Dameer Association for Human Rights
Hamada Al-Bayari, Humanitarian Affairs Analyst, OCHA
Haya Arqoub, Field Officer, Rural Centre for Sustainable Development (RCSD)
Heba Numan Harara, Site Engineer, Palestinian Hydrology Group (PHG)
Hosni Barakat, Food Security Sector Coordinator
Isra Muzaffar, Head of Central West Bank Sub-Office, OCHA
Iyad Abu Hamam, Shelter Cluster Coordinator, Gaza
Iyad Shwaykeh, Head of Northern West Bank Sub-Office, OCHA
Jamal Milhem, Executive Director, Talal Abu-Ghazaleh & Co.
Jamie McGoldrick, Deputy Special Coordinator and Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator, Office of the UN Special Coordinator for the Middle East Peace Process (UNSCO)
Julie Crawford, Human Rights Officer, Protection Cluster, OHCHR
Khalid Elmassri, Project Coordinator, Al Dameer Association for Human Rights
Kholoud M. Jirefil, Project Coordinator, AISHA
Kristin Luther, German Representative Office
Laurianne Leca, Head of Programmes - West Bank, UNRWA
Lena Alsadah, Project Coordinator, Land and Resource Research Center (LRC)
Loai Halyaqa, Wadi Foken Council
Lubna Sabbah, Health Coordinator, Near East Council of Churches (NECC) Committee
Mageda Alawneh, WASH cluster co-coordinator, Palestinian Water Authority
Maher Daoudi, Senior Programme Manager, Humanitarian Assistance, Consulate General of Sweden
Mahmoud Shalabi, Manager of Emergency and Medical Training Programmes, Medical Aid for Palestinians
Mahmoud Zitawi, Assistant Audit Manager, Talal Abu-Ghazaleh & Co.
Malek Alasa, Ministry of Agriculture Engineer
Matthew Dalling, Chief Child Protection AoR Coordinator, UNICEF
Merna Alazzez, Monitoring and Reporting Assistant, oPt HF
Michelle Cicic, Head of Office, ECHO
Mohammad Amro, Programs Manager, ACF Spain
Mohammad Daoud, MEAL Manager, Save the Children International
Morten Aulund, Second Secretary, Political/Development, Norwegian Representative Office
Motasim Shaer, JSCP-B1 Engineer
Muhammad Abu Rajab, Head of Project, ACF Spain
Musa Salman, Audit Manager, Talal Abu-Ghazaleh & Co.
Nabeel Zeidan, Managing Partner, BDO
Naim Kabaja, Director, Atfaluna Society for Deaf Children (ASDC)
Nasir Naim, Association of International Development Agencies, Gaza
Niveen Abdel Latif, Protection Program Officer, Save the Children International
Ola Hilles, Zakher Society
Paula Herranz Garcia, Gender focal point, Protection Cluster (Alianza por la Solidaridad)
Reem Omar Frainah, Executive Manager, AlISHA
Riad N Junina, Gaza Office Director, Palestinian Hydrology Group (PHG)
Saad Abdel-Haq, oPt Humanitarian Fund Manager
Sabah El Saraj, Board Member, Zakher Society
Said Al-Madhoun, Protection Cluster Coordinator, Gaza
Salah Al-Lahham, Programme Officer (VAM)/Deputy Head of pSU Unit, WFP Palestine
Salma Mahmaued El Zaanen, Family Development Association
Sami Khader, Director General, Ma’an Development Center
Sarah Muscroft, Head of Office, OCHA
Stephen Kearney, Representative and Country Director, WFP Palestine
Tala Dawani, Programme Officer, DFID
Thomas Dallal, Director, AIDA
Toqa A Sammoudi, MEAL Officer, ACF Spain
Wala’ Kaloti, oPt Humanitarian Fund Assistant
Warren Hoye, Head of Cooperation and Deputy Head, Australian Representative
Country report 4: Iraq

Abdel Irdin, Islamic Relief
Abdulrahman Raheem, National Health Coordinator, Health Cluster
Adil D. Jebur, CEO, Tajdid Iraq Foundation for Economic Development (Tajdid)
Aiden O’Leary, Head of Office, OCHA Iraq
Al Jalal, Senior Project Engineer, BORDA Iraq
Alexandra Lazau-Ratz, Assessment Working Group
Ali Mahmood Ali, Chief Executive Officer, UIMS
Ammar Orakzai, WASH Cluster Co-Coordinator
Ammar Orakzai, Wash Cluster Co-Coordinator
Andres Gonzalez Rodriguez, Country Director, Oxfam
Aseel Al-Khattab, Programme Officer, Humanitarian Financing Unit, OCHA Iraq
Atupele Kapile, Inter-Cluster Coordination Group, OCHA Iraq
Blake Audsley, Deputy Leader, Field Planning, USAID Iraq
Bryor Jabor, Green Desert
Celia Dujan, MH Iraq
Claudia Nicoletti, Protection Cluster Co-Coordinator
Cleopatra Chipuriro, Education Cluster Coordinator
Craig Anderson, Deputy Head, Humanitarian Financing Unit, OCHA Iraq
Daniel Seckman, Managing Partner, SREO Consulting
David Joy, Head of Resident Coordinator’s Office, Iraq
David White, Head, Humanitarian Financing Unit, OCHA Iraq
Denis Wani, Monitoring and Evaluation Officer, IOM
Dr Ahmad, M Alheety, The United Iraqi Medical Society
Dr Fawad Khan, Health Cluster Coordinator
Dr. Ahmad M. Alheety, President, The United Iraqi Medical Society
Dr. Orfan A. Al-Nuaemi General Advisor, RNVDO
Drew Craig, CCCM Cluster Co-Coordinator
Elsa Daham, Public Aid Organisation
Fatma Said, Returns Working Group
Fekadu Tafa Humanitarian Affairs Officer (Monitoring), Humanitarian Financing Unit, OCHA Iraq
Filip Cerng, Relief International
Forkan Thakao, RNVDO
Francesca Colon, Shelter/NFI Cluster Coordinator
Gabrielle Fox, Cash Consortium for Iraq
Geoffrey Baeumlin, Head of Programme, DRC
George Petropoulos, Deputy Head of Office, OCHA Iraq
Giovanni Cassani, Head of Erbil Office, IOM
Haider Alithawi Rapid Response Mechanism Focal Point, UNICEF
Hamid Mulhem, Auditor, BDO
Hamida Ramadhani, Deputy Representative, UNICEF
Hassanein Naif, Arche Nova
Heleen Berends, ZOA International
Himyar Abdulkoghi, Deputy Representative, UNFPA
Ihsan M. Hasan Director, Sorouh For Sustainable Development Foundation (SSDF)
Jalal Kana, HEIP Iraq
Jeff Silverman, WASH Cluster Co-Coordinator
Karan Gajo, MEAL Manager, RNVDO
Karan Gogo, RNVDO
Kareem Elgibali, Ayadi Al-Salam for Relief and Development (AARD)
Kenneth Grant, Technical assistant, ECHO
Knud Andersen, People in Need
Kuda Mhwandagara, Information Management Working Group
Lama Al Shreia, Almortaga
Las Rashid, Food Security Cluster Coordinator
Lawrence Menthana, International Medical Corps
Liny Suharlim, ACTED
Liza Zahanina, Cash Working Group Coordinator
Luigi Pandolfi, Head of Erbil Office, ECHO
Luma Younus, Finance Officer, Humanitarian Financing Unit, OCHA Iraq
Maha Ibrahim Samoni, Mamuzain
Makiba Yamano, Child Protection Sub-Cluster Coordinator
Marguerite Nowak, CCCM Cluster Coordinator
Marta Ruedas, Humanitarian Coordinator/ Resident Coordinator/ Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General
Maruo Clerici, Cash Working Group Coordinator
Meron Berhane, Country-Based Pooled Fund Unit, OCHA New York
Mirte Bosch, Regional Humanitarian Policy Officer, Yemen, Syria and Iraq, Government of the Netherlands
Misheck Chitanda, Fundraising Officer, RNVDO
Mitchell McTough, Emergency Livelihoods-Social Cohesion Cluster Co-Coordinator (Acting)
Mohammad Al-Masr, Humanitarian Affairs Officer (Finance Officer), Humanitarian Financing Unit, OCHA Iraq
Mohammad Salah, Sahara Economic Development Organisation (SEDO)
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<tr>
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<tr>
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</tbody>
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Annex 8: Team itinerary and work plan

This annex presents the work plan for the three phases of the evaluation (the inception, data collection and analysis, and synthesis and final reporting phases).
Annex 9: Case study selection criteria

OCHA provided the evaluation team with the analysis of CBPFs presented below. In 2018, there were 18 CBPFs that received $953 million in contributions. The data has been drawn from the OCHA CBPF Grant Management System (GMS). Data is shown for 17 CBPFs. The table does not include Colombia, which closed at the end of 2018. The countries are grouped by geographical region, and then alphabetically. During the 2015 CHF evaluation, country visits took place to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan, Somalia, Central African Republic and South Sudan.

Table 1: Analysis of CBPFs by country

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF (by region)</th>
<th>Managed/ administered by</th>
<th>Year Established</th>
<th>Funding received 2015-2018 ($ M)</th>
<th>Trend 2015-2018</th>
<th>CERF Funding 2015-2018 ($ M)</th>
<th>2017 % CBPF out of HRP requirements</th>
<th>2017 # of millions targeted by CBPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan ‡</td>
<td>OCHA +</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>184.7</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>No HRP</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>June 2015</td>
<td>302.2</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>July 2014</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oPt</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>148.1</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>295.23</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.5*</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>548.9</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>134.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>UNDP +</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>119.7</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>UNDP +</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>246.4</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>277.0</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>22.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria**</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>New fund</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>OCHA +</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>168.0</td>
<td>Increasing</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>UNDP +</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>324.7</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>UNDP +</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>175.0</td>
<td>Decreasing</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: CBPFs by region: Types of emergency addressed by CBPF 2015-2017, Ease of Access to Affected Populations, 2017 % of CBPF funds to NGOs***, Audits 2015-2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF (by region)</th>
<th>Types of emergency addressed by CBPF 2015-2017</th>
<th>Ease of Access to Affected Populations</th>
<th>2017 % of CBPF funds to NGOs***</th>
<th>Audits 2015-2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan ‡</td>
<td>Conflict, recurrent small-scale disasters, drought (2017)</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2015 OIOS, 2017 BOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>Conflict-related IDPs &amp; natural disasters</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Displaced populations &amp; recurrent small-scale disasters</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>Conflict-related displacement</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2019 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>Syrian refugees in Jordan &amp; IDPs in Southern Syria</td>
<td>Easy (Jordan), Very Difficult (Syria)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>Syrian and Palestinian refugees</td>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oPt</td>
<td>Protracted conflict</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2018 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>2015 OIOS, 2017 BOA, 2021 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>Conflict in Syria (cross-border operation)</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Very Difficult</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>2017 BOA, 2019 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2016 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Conflict, epidemic outbreaks, including Ebola</td>
<td>Medium-Difficult</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2019 BOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Drought and conflict-related displacement</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2016 &amp; 2017 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria**</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2017, 2019 BOA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Conflict and natural disasters (drought in 2017)</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>2020 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Conflict</td>
<td>Medium-Difficult</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2015 OIOS, 2017 BOA, 2021 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Conflict-related displacement and AWD outbreaks</td>
<td>Medium-Difficult</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2016 OIOS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 2017 percentage of HRP actual funding for the countries of Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Turkey are given as one figure, in response to the overall response to the Syrian conflict. Planned audits are in italics.

** The Nigeria CBPF opened in 2017 and was set up in line with the CBPF manual and guidelines.

*** This refers to direct funding to NGOs and does not include funding received as implementing partners of international organizations.

‡ Country has requested to be visited.

+ CBPF is administered by MPTFO.
Annex 10: Issues raised in recent evaluations and audits

The evaluation team received recent evaluation and audit reports during the inception phase and established a repository of lessons learned from individual funds and fund allocations in order to document and distil practice. A summary of key findings for CBPF-wide evaluations and audits is presented below.

2.4.1 The 2015 Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) evaluation

The global synthesis report from the 2015 CHF evaluation concluded that overall the value of CHFs as CBPFs remains their ability to be country driven, adapt to the humanitarian needs of their country contexts and retain flexibility. The challenging contexts of countries where CHFs operate placed additional pressure on CHFs to meet different needs and further contribute to strengthening collective response. Processes run the risk, however, of being too heavy and bureaucratic and should remain simple. In this there is also a recognized trade-off between inclusiveness and rapidity associated with flexibility (often described as quality of process vs. timeliness). Additional findings that are relevant to this evaluation are outlined in the table below.

Table 1: Main findings from the 2015 CHF evaluation Global Synthesis Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Evaluation findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The value of the CHF lies in its ability to provide un-earmarked funding in response to priority humanitarian needs through joint planning and an inclusive and field-driven decision-making process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The reduced size of CHFs has prevented the CHF mechanism from performing as foreseen and covering many urgent programming needs and critical gaps as anticipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Diversification of funding sources for CHFs presents a real challenge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Communication on CHFs outside the countries involved has been limited when compared with other funds like the CERF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>There is a need for coordination on funding and greater flexibility on the part of actors – including development agencies, donors and financial institutions – to work more closely to increase complementarity between interventions favoring more comprehensive collective response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>The CHF follows a time- and process-heavy approach particularly for standard allocations where the process can take between five and seven months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The chief attraction of the CHF for the main donors is its ability to leverage other donor funding and allocate funds to locally identified and prioritized needs and help deliver humanitarian response at scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Despite the interest in direct support by CHFs to NNGOs, CHF criteria and NNGO existing structures and capacities have often limited CHFs’ ability to increase the share of allocations passed to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>For standard allocations, there remains a clear link between projects approved under the SRP and possible CHF support to them that is considered positive, helping to deliver a coherent approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Evaluation field visits concluded that the extensive discussion and prioritization process followed for the development of the SRP and the use of CHF funding to support its projects supports coordination and greater coherence in response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>However, the current number of small projects funded across numerous sectors through an annual decision process, with changing priorities each year, do not reflect a strategic approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Other administrative issues are being improved, such as processes for determining the proportion of funding designated for standard allocations as opposed to emergency reserve and lack of field levels of authority (financially, where OCHA is the MA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>The system has to work with considerable variation in the quality and capacity of clusters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other staffing issues have continued to have an impact on CHFs’ effectiveness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Across the CHFs, it will be important to have both a common standard for risk appraisal and management and an integration of risk management with other key functions such as monitoring and evaluation to make it fully operational.

Given humanitarian funding constraints, the focus of CHFs should remain on life-saving humanitarian response, when feasible integrating resilience as an approach. More robust efforts to link and refer longer-term projects to development funding mechanisms are needed.

Gender is the most consistently considered cross-cutting dimension, although many indicated that gender indicators required for the project design and approval stages (using the IASC Gender Marker) were seldom followed through robustly enough into actual project implementation.

There is room for further prioritization of AAP in CHF guidelines, encouraging and enabling partners to incorporate accountability mechanisms into their work plans, monitoring AAP commitments and tracking performance against beneficiary perspectives.

CHFs have improved their M&R processes over recent years through the use of the global Framework, including an emphasis on timely reporting for eligibility for continued funding and the development of online databases.

### 2.4.2 Research on NGO perspectives on CBPFs, 2019

The study on CBPFs focuses on the operational perspective of NGOs (both national and international) regarding their access to and use of CBPF funding. It extends existing research on pooled funds undertaken by the Norwegian Refugee Council\[1\] and complemented a study undertaken on behalf of German NGOs.[2] The study focused on four countries in depth and received input from over 600 online survey respondents as well as key informants. It focused on a discrete range of issues, which were broadly linked to the Grand Bargain, in addition to wider fund management. Key findings are outlined in the table below.

Table 2: Findings of the NGO study on CBPFs[3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Summary of findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Earmarking             | Finding 1: Almost a quarter of CBPF funding is available for flexible use, but budget revision rules are too rigid.  
Finding 2: A cap on sub-granting has allowed more national NGOs to access funds directly, reducing earmarking. |
| Recommendations        | 1. Increase the flexibility of CBPFs by extending the 15 per cent budget flexibility to staff costs, and introduce the possibility of creating new budget lines within the 15 per cent parameter without prior approval.  
2. Sub-granting agreements should be limited to projects where they add discernible value. Examples include activities that promote capacity-building to improve the subgrantee's ability to access funding directly, and those that promote integrated programming or allow operating at scale. |
| Multi-year funding     | Finding 3: Multi-year funding has not been systematically included in CBPF planning. Only two donors provide such commitments, and the average project duration remains below 12 months. |

---


| Recommendations | 3.1 Project duration should be increased by up to 30 per cent within the existing funding landscape to reach an average of 12 months.  
3.2 Policies should be adjusted to allow cost extensions and project durations of longer than 12 months.  
3.3 Donors, OCHA and NGOs should advocate where relevant for multiyear Humanitarian Response Plans and matching donor commitments to allow CBPFs to provide multi-year funding. |
| Localization | **Finding 4:** Most CBPFs have increased the funding share going to local actors, by two-thirds on average, since 2015. |
| Recommendations | 4.1 Advisory board seats for non-donors should be shared equally between UN agencies, national, and international NGOs. This would effectively introduce a new category on the boards, increasing NGO participation and ensuring national NGOs are adequately represented.  
4.2 Build on positive examples of capacity-building initiatives, such as walk-in clinics in Nigeria, to provide such opportunities both in-country and at the global level and contribute to national NGOs’ greater participation. |
| Harmonization | **Finding 5:** The vast majority of international NGOs access CBPFs in more than one country. |
| Recommendations | 5.1 CBPFs should stay abreast of and contribute to harmonisation efforts in the humanitarian financing arena, particularly within the Grand Bargain.  
5.2 Centralise part of the data collection for due diligence and risk rating to optimise multi-country assessments.  
5.3 Create a set of offline templates to allow for the direct uploading of project documents. |
| Governance | **Finding 6:** Funding allocations are not always perceived as fair and transparent. |
| Recommendations | 6.1 Establish a central repository for CBPF data and ensure the timely and accurate dissemination of information, including country-specific guidelines, advisory board composition and minutes, allocation papers and list of proposals and partners that have been accepted or rejected.  
6.2 To reduce perceived bias, select non-applicants to the round of allocation as members of the review committees, as in the case of Myanmar.  
6.3 NGOs are an integral part of decision making, and their coordination systems should be strengthened to allow for peer-to-peer feedback and learning, including on the allocation process. This could be achieved by allocating specific sessions in formal coordination bodies such as in-country NGO Fora.  
6.4 Foster global-local NGO coordination and dialogue to ensure that field realities are considered in global policy discussions and vice versa. This would mutually strengthen the role of NGOs in CBPF governance systems at the country and at global level, including advisory boards, review committees, the OCHANGO dialogue platform and the Pooled Fund Working Group. |

### 2.4.3 Internal audit reports, 2015-2018

During the period under evaluation, there have been six internal audits[1] that have included recommendations for the CBPFs. While the focus of these has been on control, compliance and risk management, the recommendations have some overlap with the ToR for this evaluation and have been included for the purpose of reference and triangulation against the evaluation findings.

---

[1] Two of the audits were focused on South Sudan.
Table 3: Recommendations relevant to CBPFs from internal audits conducted between 2015 and 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Internal Audit report recommendations (Y denotes that the recommendation applies to the country/N denotes that it does not apply)</th>
<th>Somalia</th>
<th>Afghanistan</th>
<th>CAR</th>
<th>South Sudan</th>
<th>oPt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year audit undertaken</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate regular project oversight dialogue with Participating UN Organizations (PUNOs)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen capacity assessments and monitoring</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formalize feedback on the implementation of partner audit recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familiarize PUNOs with GMS and reporting requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA should review the Managing Agent role to identify any gaps in services rendered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodically update the risks and risk management tools</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodically review the operational handbook to clarify the discretionary authority of the HC to increase project costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure partners maintain adequate insurance coverage as required by grant agreements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly review implementation work plans to identify remedial actions to address impediments to delivery</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safeguard the operational independence of CHF monitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop disbursement guidelines for implementing partners</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verify that NGO financial reports are appropriately certified to ensure their reliability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt a risk-based audit approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 11: The context of the evaluation: An overview of CBPFs, 2015-2018

This annex provides a brief history of pooled funding, the 2015 Policy Instruction and development of CBPFs and an analysis of results and key issues for the evaluation.

2.1 Background to Country-Based Pooled Funding

CBPFs are financing instruments that allow donors to combine un-earmarked contributions. The HC leads the CBPF at country level on behalf of the ERC. The CBPF-Section at OCHA headquarters supports OCHA country offices to manage CBPFs on behalf of the HC. As indicated by the three strategic objectives of CBPFs (see the CBPF Operational Impact model in Annex 4), the funds aim to improve humanitarian responses by focusing funding on priority needs as defined within the framework of the HRP, supporting coordination, strengthening the HC’s leadership role and mobilizing resources. These objectives are expected to result in ‘the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity’.

2.1.1 A brief history of pooled funding

The first OCHA-managed country-level pooled fund was established in 1997 in Angola and referred to as an Emergency Response Fund (ERF). [1]

In 2005, as part of broader reforms of the international humanitarian system following the Humanitarian Response Review [2] and in accordance with the principles of Good Humanitarian Donorship (GHD), donors initiated the establishment of country-based pooled funds known as the Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs). CHFs aimed to reinforce joint planning and coordination at country level under the HC’s leadership by providing timely, predictable and strategic funding to UN agencies and NGOs to respond to critical humanitarian needs identified through the Consolidated Appeal Process. [3] The pilot funds were established in Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in 2006. [4] Subsequently, CHFs replaced existing ERFs in the Central African Republic (CAR) (July 2008), [5] Somalia (June 2010) [6] and Afghanistan (early 2014). [7]

Efforts to develop a common vision for CBPFs in 2014 resulted in a decision in December 2014 to remove the differences between ERFs and CHFs and to refer to them by the common term CBPFs. In February 2015, OCHA issued a Policy Instruction that outlined the objectives, management and governance arrangements for CBPFs and an Operational Handbook that aims to ‘ensure a coherent approach to the strategic and operational management of all CBPFs’. [8] These provided a common overarching framework for ERFs and CHFs in order to standardize the funds. The efforts at standardization also resulted in the establishment of a global Grant Management System (GMS).

A further shift occurred in the focus of CBPFs following the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) when they were aligned with a number of commitments outlined in the Grand Bargain (GB), which comprises a set of reforms to improve the humanitarian financing system including an increase in un-earmarked funding, the provision of greater volumes of funding to local and national NGOs (localization), a focus on strengthening the participation of affected populations in the project management cycle, an increase in cash and voucher assistance, and an increase in the provision of multi-year funding. [9]

[4] The DRC mechanism was known as the Pooled Fund.
More recently, in 2017, the management of pooled funds within OCHA was rolled into the change process which followed a Functional Review of the agency.[1] This resulted in the creation of a Humanitarian Financing and Resource Mobilization Division which is mandated to drive OCHA’s resource mobilization strategy and activities and supervises the mechanisms for the humanitarian funds (both CERF and CBPF), ensuring that all standards and requirements for operation of these entities are met. Within the Division, the Pooled Fund Management Branch oversees the CERF secretariat and CBPF Section. 2018 also marked the start of OCHA’s Strategic Plan which had as one of its five objectives, an effective, innovative humanitarian financing system that meets the needs of crisis-affected people.

2.2 Analysis of CBPF funding flows, 2015-2018

Between 2015 and 2018, international humanitarian assistance from private donors, governments and European Union Institutions grew from $25.2 billion to $28.9 billion, an increase of 16 per cent, with a noticeable decline in the pace of growth towards the end of this period.[2] In comparison, CBPFs have been growing, both in terms of the number of donors and in the volume of contributions, throughout the evaluation period, increasing in size by 64 per cent (see Figure 3 below). In 2018, the funds received a total of $950 million from 34 donors.

Table 3 below shows the ten largest donors to the CBPFs during the evaluation period. The United Kingdom was by far the biggest contributor, providing $982 million from 2015-2018, followed by Germany, which provided approximately $463 million. However, while the UK’s contribution level has remained relatively stable, Germany’s has increased significantly.

Table 1: Top 10 donors to CBPFs 2015-2018 (US$ million)[5]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>241.6</td>
<td>271.9</td>
<td>217.6</td>
<td>250.8</td>
<td>982.0</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>175.6</td>
<td>462.6</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>340.9</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td>312.0</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[4] Source: https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-contributions
During the evaluation period, the Yemen had the largest fund, receiving a total of $549 million. South Sudan was the second largest CBPF in terms of funding. Figure 4 below shows the funding that individual CBPFs received between 2015 and 2018.

Figure 2: Total contributions to each CBPF 2015 – 2018[1]

While one objective of the CBPFs is to mobilize resources and strengthen coordination in support of HRPs, in reality CBPFs account for a modest proportion of total HRP funding (generally less than 10 per cent), as demonstrated by Figure 5 below. As part of WHS discussions, the Secretary-General recommended that the portion of HRP funding channeled through CBPFs should increase to 15 per cent, including through new and additional sources. This was recognized as an important way for donors to meet their commitment to reduce the earmarking of humanitarian contributions.[2]

Figure 3: CBPF contributions as a share of total contributions in HRPs in CBPF countries, 2015-2018[3]

International NGOs received the largest share of CBPF funding (44 per cent of total allocations between 2015 and 2018), followed by UN agencies (33 per cent). Allocations to national NGOs (NNGOs) have increased substantially during the review period, from $74 million (15 per cent) in 2015 to $208 million (25 per cent) in 2018. However, the level of funding to NNGOs varied considerably by context. For example, in 2018, almost 46 per cent of funding from the Somalia CBPF ($24.3 million) was channeled through NNGOs whereas only 3.6 per cent of funding from the Ethiopia CBPF ($2.7 million) was allocated to NNGOs.[1]

Figure 4: Funding allocations from CBPFs by partner type 2015 – 2018[2]

2.3 Key shifts in humanitarian needs, policies and practices, 2015-2018

2.3.1 Trends in humanitarian need and response

In December 2018, the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), Mark Lowcock, launched the 2019 Global Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO), which requested $21.9 billion in humanitarian assistance to meet the needs of 93.6 million people affected by disasters and crises, from a total population in need of 131.7 million.[3] The report documents a number of trends in how people have been affected by crises during the period under evaluation which includes (i) An increase in the number of people displaced by conflict from 59.5 million people in 2014 to 68.5 million in 2017; a significant rise in food insecurity, and; the quantity of humanitarian resources committed to large protracted crises.[4]

Figure 5: Number of inter-agency appeals and average length of crises, 2007 - 2017

[1] https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-allocations.
The World Humanitarian Data and Trends report was launched in tandem with the 2019 HNO. It provides an evidence-based assessment of global humanitarian needs over the last decade. While the global increase in humanitarian need is well documented, the link between the growth in the number of crises and their duration was one of the key messages of the report (see Figure 7 below). Between 2005 and 2017, the average length of crises with an active inter-agency appeal rose from four to seven years, while the number of active crises receiving an internationally-led response almost doubled from 16 to 30.[1]

A second important shift in humanitarianism has been a growing focus on moving from a response-based approach to an anticipatory approach. The perceived benefits of this include cost-effectiveness and efficiency but, most importantly, a reduction in human suffering as a consequence of early action. In his March 2019 Casement Lecture, the ERC outlined a six-part agenda for the humanitarian community to shift to an ‘anticipatory approach where we plan in advance for the next crises, putting the response plans and the money for them in place before they arrive, and releasing the money and mobilizing the response agencies as soon as they are needed.’[2]

Consistent with this view, steps have been taken to better understand the contribution that anticipatory action could make to the CERF, with acknowledgement that, ‘funding of early action interventions in advance of likely imminent humanitarian shocks can be considered in line with CERF’s original intention and mandate. Therefore, CERF could adopt an anticipatory approach within the existing framework and mandate at the discretion of the Secretary-General and ERC without seeking formal General Assembly endorsement as long as it is true to its life-saving mandate and humanitarian objectives as set out by the General Assembly.’[3] While this has not been formally extended to the CBPFs, as described in the findings section, the changes have coincided with a number of CBPF allocations that have focused on preparedness and early action.

Annex 12: Limitations and proposed mitigation measures

This annex outlines limitations linked to the quantity and quality of the evidence that were encountered during the evaluation in addition to mitigation measures that were proposed during the evaluation inception phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Limitation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mitigation measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. There is a lack of baseline data and variability in the monitoring data at the outcome and impact level</td>
<td>The model of Operational Impact outlined in the ToR anticipates that the CBPF contributes to a diverse set of humanitarian outcomes – including the humanitarian response, leadership and coordination - in addition to having operational impact on the lives of affected people. However, the monitoring data available for these aspects of the response is limited, and in situations where it does exist, it is likely to vary in quality and quantity. Moreover, at the country-levels, it will be difficult to construct a baseline which will make it difficult to evidence and attribute changes at the outcome or impact-level.</td>
<td>• A literature review was undertaken prior to embarking on the country visit in order to identify all potential sources of information including IAHEs, OPRs and other research and evaluation. • Contribution analysis does not require a baseline or control group to have been established at the start of an intervention. The CBPF model of Operational Impact offers a causal pathway which was used during the evaluation as a means of identifying whether and the extent to which the CBPF contributed to outputs, outcomes and impact (to the extent possible).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. It will be complex to attribute specific changes to the CBPF</td>
<td>The CBPF plays a relatively modest role in funding humanitarian programs (in 2018, for countries that have an HRP, CBPF funding accounted for 8.6% of the total received). It is most frequently used either to fund gaps in interventions, to provide funding in contexts where other sources of financing are not available or are not timely, or to offer seed funding for humanitarian priorities when alternatives are not available. As a consequence, it will be difficult to attribute specific changes to CBPF funding.</td>
<td>• To the extent possible, the approach taken to project sampling for the case studies identified and targeted projects that had a comparatively high proportion of CBPF funding in order to offer the greatest opportunity to isolate changes that are attributable to the CBPF. • Contribution analysis is particularly useful for complex interventions where assessment of sole attribution is difficult. It was undertaken in an iterative manner so that evidence was repeatedly collected and analyzed across the case studies in order to refine contribution narratives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Given the limited scope for community engagement and the limitations outlined above, it will be difficult to evidence operational impact</td>
<td>While the ToR for the evaluation highlights the importance of engaging with affected people in order to evidence the contribution made by the CBPF to making change in the lives of affected people (operational impact), there will be limitations in the extent to which the findings in one country can be extrapolated to demonstrate broader impact across all countries. CBPF-funded projects are sectorally diverse and are spread across a range of contexts, countries and conditions. Even with five case studies, the sample size will be modest and at best will provide a series of snapshots of the effect that the CBPF has had on the lives of affected people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The literature review sought to mine data from secondary sources (previous CBPF evaluations, HRP reports, IAHEs, OPRs and relevant research) in order to supplement primary data collected during the evaluation to strengthen the pool of evidence.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The consistent use of a common approach offered the best quality results and the selection of case study countries that permitted direct access to communities assisted the evaluation team in developing a narrative about how they had been affected by the CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significant output data available for the CBPFs is contained in GMS and CBPF annual reports, which was analyzed and synthesized in order to provide a consolidated overview of the results achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 13: Summary table of findings, conclusions & recommendations

The table below provides a summary of findings and conclusions with links to relevant recommendations by evaluation question and sub-question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions/ Sub-questions</th>
<th>Summary findings</th>
<th>Conclusions and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OPERATIONAL IMPACT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ1: To what extent do CBPFs strengthen response outcomes and make a difference in the lives of affected people?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1/2.1 To what extent do CBPFs contribute to the provision of timely and principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Overall, the evaluation has gathered significant evidence of the value of CBPFs to response albeit in a range of roles which include: (i) gap filling, (ii) a catalyst to prompt response (e.g. Afghanistan drought) (iii) rapid response to displacement (e.g. Iraq), (iv) responding in a timely way to forecast-based threat of famine (e.g. Somalia).</td>
<td>CBPFs have contributed to providing timely, coordinated and principled assistance. They have also contributed to saving lives, alleviating suffering and maintaining dignity though this is harder to measure due to a lack of outcome and impact-level data. There is a need for a logic model that is realistically measurable, otherwise it will remain challenging to meet donor expectations (REC#2: Guidance and good practice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Seen as system changers, CBPFs are often in the vanguard and are already promoting operating models seen as the future, such as integrated and cash transfer programming</td>
<td>▪ HCs and partners have used CBPFs to fill gaps and provide life-saving assistance. CBPFs have improved response to a variety of types of crises and made a difference to people's lives.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ While there is strong anecdotal evidence, current approaches to monitoring humanitarian outcomes is weak and so it is complex to rigorously analyze contribution.</td>
<td>▪ Due to lack of progress in reforming broader aid architecture, successful funds have come under pressure to stretch to funding resilience and transition. There is general agreement that CBPFs should not have to make up for failures of wider system but remain focused on humanitarian response.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ CBPFs have a strong basis in the principles of humanity and impartiality which is built into allocation and prioritisation processes. Independence and neutrality are influenced by the broader humanitarian community and so practice is more variable.</td>
<td>▪ However, there is scope for funds to finance early action and preparedness as part of improving humanitarian response (REC#2: Guidance and good practice).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Recipients of CBPF-funded assistance were generally positive about its timeliness and relevance.</td>
<td>▪ Overall, while there is always room for improvement, CBPFs are ahead of the rest of the humanitarian system, which needs to catch up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ While pooled funding is not new, CBPFs are making an important contribution to the future of humanitarian response – they have played an important role in delivering the aspirations of the Grand Bargain (localization, earmarking, reporting).</td>
<td>▪ CBPFs have also been used to support preparedness/early action (e.g. Iraq, Yemen, South Sudan), although this has been a contentious issue.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### EQ2: To what extent and in what ways do CBPFs contribute to strengthening humanitarian leadership and coordination?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-question(s)</th>
<th>Summary findings</th>
<th>Conclusions and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.2 Better coordination: How do CBPFs contribute to a coordinated humanitarian response? | - The CBPFs have promoted collaboration in a range of ways (AB representation, integrated programs, review committees).  
  - There was an appetite from AB members to play a more strategic role in guiding the fund which seems prudent given the demands that are placed on them.  
  - The clusters felt that the funds strengthened their convening power and also offered a practical means of operationalizing cluster strategies. | - CBPFs help to strengthen cluster coordination (including by funding it in some cases) and collaboration between different actors  
  - CBPFs strengthen HC leadership. HCs have sometimes made decisions with which donors or ABs disagreed or which were not transparent.  
  - CBPF performance is dependent on the performance of humanitarian leaders. When there are capable HCs, OCHA HoOs and fund managers in place, CBPFs perform well.  
  - HCs have limited information about development funding, which restricts their ability to use CBPFs strategically.  
  - There is a lack of systematic complementarity in how the CBPF & CERF are used (REC#1: Strategic leadership of pooled fund management). |
| 2.3 Strengthened leadership: Do RC/HCs use CBPFs strategically and to complement other mechanisms? | - The CBPFs can enhance the credibility of an HC as they strengthen operational engagement and provide a response-focused forum.  
  - Some concerns were raised about HC accountability for decision-making about the use of the funds, but there were a limited number of examples, and HCs have formal responsibility to take decisions on behalf of the fund.  
  - There were some good examples of CERF-CBPF complementarity through joint allocation strategies but there is scope to further strengthen this.  
  - The was a consistent gap in the aid architecture for recovery/transition/nexus financing. Where these funds did exist, they were frequently outside of the scope of an HC/RC's ability to influence. |
### ACTIVITIES AND OUTPUTS

**EQ3: To what extent are CBPFs supporting partners to meet the most urgent humanitarian needs in a way that is timely and is consistent with Grand Bargain priorities?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-question(s)</th>
<th>Summary findings</th>
<th>Conclusions and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1 To what extent are CBPFs aligned with Humanitarian Response Plans or other relevant strategies? | • CBPFs are generally aligned to HRPs (although HRPs have very broad objectives). RAs are responsive to new needs.  
  • CBPFs making important contributions to GB commitments to reduce earmarking, harmonize reporting, and strengthening the delivery of assistance through cash and vouchers.  
  • Protracted nature of crises challenges short-term timeframes                                                                 | • CBPFs are aligned to HRPs and also responsive to new needs. They promote inclusive and transparent allocations to priority needs  
  • Allocations through siloed cluster systems are a barrier to multi-sector programming, which is more relevant to community needs ([REC#2: Guidance and good practice](#)).  
  • CBPFs are seen as successful in shaping humanitarian system and so are called upon to promote growing range of cross-cutting issues but there is need greater expertise/support for this and wider system has to improve implementation ([REC#2: Guidance and good practice](#)).  
  • Questions about whether short project timeframes are relevant in protracted crises ([REC#2: Guidance and good practice](#)).  
  • CBPFs have also promoted localization through greater NNGO representation in governance and decision-making forums.  
  • There is a lack of clarity about OCHA’s role in strengthening capacity but there is a lack of clarity about OCHA’s role in this ([REC#2: Guidance and good practice](#)).                                                                                   |
| 3.2 To what extent do CBPFs employ effective disbursement mechanisms and minimize transaction costs? | • CBPF processes are generally considered to be fair (to the extent possible given the competitive humanitarian funding environment).  
  • There is a trade-off between speed and ability of partners to prepare quality proposals.  
  • Timeliness of fund processes has improved over the evaluation period and CBPFs seen as faster than other donors (particularly for RAs).                                                                 |                                                                                                                |
| 3.3 To what extent and in what ways do CBPFs promote the use of the best-placed partners and strengthen localization? | • CBPFs have generally achieved a balance between increasing funding to NNGOs while maintaining focus on funding best-placed partners but practice varies considerably between funds (e.g. Somalia, Afghanistan, Iraq).  
  • The shift towards funding NNGOs can result in smaller project sizes, technical capacity limitations, an increase in high risk partners (South Sudan).  
  • CBPFs also promote localization through greater NNGO representation in governance and decision-making forums.  
  • There is a lack of clarity about OCHA’s role in capacity strengthening – although agreement that it is necessary to focus on the basics in order to ensure project delivery.  
  • There was positive feedback from longer-term NNGO partners on the link between CBPF and strengthened institutional capacity (e.g. Somalia and South Sudan).                                                                 |                                                                                                                |
### 3.4 To what extent do CBPFs respond to the needs of people and communities affected by crisis and deliver quality programs

- CBPFs are called upon to promote growing range of cross-cutting issues but need greater expertise for this and wider system also needs to shift practice.
- Field research highlighted challenges with women’s participation in program design and a lack of knowledge of complaints mechanisms.
- Disability data not currently captured by GMS (although this will change). Some stand-alone practice noted, but limited evidence of a cross-cutting focus.
- There was some evidence of integrated programs but this was confined to a couple of countries (and tends to reflect pre-existing practices within the humanitarian system).
- CBPFs have played a role in promoting cash and vouchers.

### INPUTS

**EQ4: Is the management of CBPFs ‘fit for purpose’ and ‘fit for the future’ and do they operate efficiently?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-question(s)</th>
<th>Summary findings</th>
<th>Conclusions and recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 To what extent do CBPFs support overall resource mobilization for HRPs?</td>
<td>CBPFs have grown considerably over the last four years (by 64%). This is partly a consequence of the contribution they can make to meeting GB commitments (particularly localization), and more broadly to strengthening the humanitarian system, but also donor confidence in decision-making and risk management. The aspiration for CBPFs to reach 15% of HRP funding has been met infrequently and there is a lack of clarity about the rationale and means of achieving this. Despite a broadening of the donor-base, CBPFs remain reliant on traditional donors, albeit with greater burden-sharing.</td>
<td>CBPF growth is a reflection of their contribution to strengthening humanitarian system and meeting GB commitments (to reduce earmarking, harmonize reporting, strengthen delivery of assistance through cash and vouchers and localization in particular) but practice varies between CBPFs (REC#2: Guidance and good practice). The aspiration for CBPFs to account for 15% of HRP funding makes sense but lacks clarity. While CBPFs have grown, they remain reliant on traditional donors (REC#4: Resource mobilization). Consistently positive feedback on risk management, with donors comparing OCHA favorably to other UN agencies. Need to ensure adequate risk management capacity (i) for taking over NGO grant management responsibilities in 4 countries and (ii) If CBPFs keep growing (REC#5: Risk management and monitoring).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 4.2 Are CBPFs managing risks appropriately, and is there sufficient oversight and accountability, including monitoring and reporting systems?

- CBPFs received consistently positive feedback on risk management, with OCHA compared favorably to other UN agencies.
  - The case studies revealed a pattern of high incidence of compliance issues in early years, but reduction with time as risk management strengthened (e.g. Iraq & Somalia).
  - The protracted procurement for the LTA for global audit services and lack of clarity about how to fill the gaps has resulted in a significant backlog of audits (e.g. Iraq and Afghanistan).

- CBPFs have a symbiotic relationship with the humanitarian aid architecture, contributing to strengthening it but also relying on it to operate effectively.

- CBPFs have representative ABs that focus on day-to-day management but could provide more strategic direction (REC#6: Fund leadership).

- HFUs have had adequate capacity but CBPF-Section is currently stretched. Concerns about length of recruitment and need to consider implications of 15% aspiration. Need to strengthen talent and knowledge management (Rec#3: Global support).

- Global guidance been largely fit for purpose and standardisation has increased transparency. There is a need for additional guidance in a number of areas (REC#2: Guidance and good practice).

- GMS is delivering a good service and donors appreciate the BI portal.

- Steps taken to standardize NGO grant management responsibilities have potential to offer greater efficiency.

### 4.3 Has the global standardization of CBPFs (as per the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework) increased efficiency?

- Global guidance been largely fit for purpose and standardization has increased transparency. It has taken time for the guidance to be translated to fund-level.
  - There is a question about whether the guidance is adequate to cover small CBPFs ($10-12 million) as well as large funds ($200+ million)?
  - There is scope to strengthen guidance in a number of areas and the Policy Instruction is due a refresh.
  - There is significant support for the transition of the MA role from UNDP to OCHA. There are efficiencies to the use of a single AA rather than sharing the responsibility between OCHA and MPTFO.

- Global guidance been largely fit for purpose and standardisation has increased transparency. There is a need for additional guidance in a number of areas (REC#2: Guidance and good practice).

- GMS is delivering a good service and donors appreciate the BI portal.

### 4.4 Is there sufficient capacity in the humanitarian system to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects?

- Generally positive findings about fund-level capacity, particularly of HFUs and OCHA (improvement over time). Recruitment can be slow. Some concern about the adequacy of global support capacity for surge and at headquarters.
  - ABs have become more representative of the humanitarian ecosystem. They are more involved in process than strategic issues (and are rarely requested to play a role).
  - There was generally positive feedback on GMS from partners and donors.

- Generally positive feedback on GMS from partners and donors.