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 USA. An evaluation team from KonTerra is conducting the evaluation.

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation team would like to thank the staff of OCHA in New York, the Advisory Group members and others that participated in the inception phase for the time and support they provided, and for the information and documentation they shared that has formed a key part of the analysis.

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
KonTerra Managing Director Menno Wiebe
Quality Assurance Belén Diaz [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: A water distribution point in a project funded by the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund in Juba, South Sudan. Credit: OCHA
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acronyms</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossary of terms</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Introduction and evaluation background</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Purpose of the inception report</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Evaluation purpose and scope</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluation context</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Background to Country-Based Pooled Funding</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 The Policy Instruction and the Operational Handbook</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Assessing CBPF results and performance</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Key issues for the evaluation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluation design and analytical framework</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Evaluation design</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Analytical framework</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Evaluation matrix and questions</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Stakeholder analysis</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Review of evaluability, limitations and mitigation measures</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Ethical considerations</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluation approach, methodology and tools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Data collection methods and sources</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Approach to sampling</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Data collection, synthesis and analysis</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Dissemination of findings</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluation process and work plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Phases of the evaluation</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Evaluation outputs and work plan</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Support required from OCHA</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Quality assurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 KonTerra’s quality assurance approach</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 The role of OCHA</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.3 The role of country-based Reference Groups</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.4 The role of the Advisory Group</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annexes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 1: ToR for the evaluation</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 2: Inception phase consultations</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 3: Advisory group members</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 5: Case study country selection criteria</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 6: Interview questions</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 7: Report formats</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 8: Community engagement methodology</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 9: Online Survey</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 10: Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 11: Bibliography</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annex 12: CBPF Operational Impact model</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Boxes

Box 1: Evidence used to inform the inception report ................................................................. 8
Box 2: The 5 CBPF principles ........................................................................................................ 9
Box 3: Evaluability questions ....................................................................................................... 27
Box 4: Approach to confidentiality ............................................................................................. 30
Box 5: Key documents for the evaluation .................................................................................. 31
Box 6: Data collection tools – community engagement approach ............................................. 33
Box 7: Country visit process ...................................................................................................... 34

List of Figures

Figure 1: Map of CBPFs .............................................................................................................. 10
Figure 2: Total donor paid pledges to CBPFs 2015-2018 ............................................................ 12
Figure 3: Total contributions to each CBPF 2015 – 2018 ............................................................ 13
Figure 4: CBPF contributions as a share of total contributions in HRPs in CBPF countries, 2015-2018 ........................................................................................................ 13
Figure 5: Funding allocations from CBPFs by partner type 2015 – 2018 .................................... 14
Figure 6: Evaluation building blocks .......................................................................................... 19
Figure 7: An overview of contribution analysis ......................................................................... 20
Figure 8: Analytical framework for the evaluation ................................................................... 21
Figure 9: Evaluation Matrix ....................................................................................................... 23
Figure 10: Three-step process for systematic evidence gathering and analysis ....................... 36
Figure 11: Approach to data analysis ......................................................................................... 37
Figure 12: Illustration of the spokes exercise ............................................................................ 76

List of Tables

Table 1: Top 10 donors to CBPFs 2015-2018 ............................................................................ 12
Table 2: Proposed case study countries (with back-ups) ............................................................ 35
Table 3: Practical considerations for consideration by the evaluation team and Advisory Group ........................................................................................................ 35
Table 4: Key outputs and delivery dates for phase 1 ................................................................ 40
Table 5: Work plan for the three phases of the CBPF evaluation .............................................. 41
Acronyms

AA  Administrative Agent  IAHE  Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation
AAP  Accountability to Affected Populations  IASC  Inter-Agency Standing Committee
AB  Advisory Board  INGO  International Non-Governmental Organization
CAR  Central African Republic  KII  Key Informant Interviews
CPF  Common Performance Framework  MA  Managing Agent
CBPF  Country-Based Pooled Fund  MPTFO  Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office
CERF  Central Emergency Response Fund  NGO  Non-Governmental Organization
CHF  Common Humanitarian Fund  NNGO  National Non-Governmental Organization
DAC  Development Assistance Committee  OCHA  Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
DRC  Democratic Republic of the Congo  ODSG  OCHA Donor Support Group
ERF  Emergency Response Fund  OECD  Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
ERC  Emergency Relief Coordinator  OIOS  Office for Internal Oversight Services
FGD  Focus Group Discussions  OPR  Operational Peer Review
FTS  Financial Tracking Service  oPt  occupied Palestine territory
GAM  Gender with Age Marker  PFWG  Pooled Fund Working Group
GHD  Good Humanitarian Donorship  PSEA  Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
GMS  Grant Management System  PwD  Persons with Disabilities
HC  Humanitarian Coordinator  SPEGS  Strategy, Planning, Evaluation and Guidance Section
HCT  Humanitarian Country Team  ToR  Terms of Reference
HFU  Humanitarian Financing Unit  UN  United Nations
HNO  Humanitarian Needs Overview  UNDP  United Nations Development Programme
HPC  Humanitarian Program Cycle
## Glossary of Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>The Operational Handbook highlights that there are two types of accountabilities in relation to CBPFs. The first relates to the ability of CBPFs to achieve their objectives (as illustrated by the operational impact model) as humanitarian financing mechanisms. The second is of recipient organizations to deliver project results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability to affected populations</td>
<td>Accountability to affected populations (AAP) is an active commitment to use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to, and being held to account by the people humanitarian organizations seek to assist. The Inter-Agency Standing Committee has endorsed four commitments on AAP and Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA). These are to: <strong>Leadership:</strong> Demonstrate their commitment to AAP and PSEA by enforcing, institutionalising and integrating AAP approaches in the Humanitarian Program Cycle (HPC) and strategic planning processes, at country level and by establishing appropriate management systems to solicit, hear and act upon the voices and priorities of affected people in a coordinated manner, including for SEA, before, during and after an emergency. <strong>Participation and Partnership:</strong> Adopt agency mechanisms that feed into and support collective/coordinated people-centred approaches that enable women, girls, boys, men, including the most marginalised and at-risk people among affected communities, to participate in and play an active role in decisions that will impact their lives, well-being, dignity and protection. Adopt and sustain equitable partnerships with local actors to build upon their long-term relationships and trust with communities. <strong>Information, Feedback and Action:</strong> Adopt agency mechanisms that feed into and support collective and participatory approaches that inform and listen to communities, address feedback and lead to corrective action. Establish and support the implementation of appropriate mechanisms for reporting and handling of SEA-related complaints. Plan, design and manage protection and assistance programmes that are responsive to the diversity and expressed views of affected communities. <strong>Results:</strong> Measure AAP and PSEA related results at the agency and collective level, including through standards such as the Core Humanitarian Standard and the Minimum Operating Standards on PSEA; the Best Practice Guide to establish Inter-Agency Community-Based Complaint Mechanisms and its accompanying Standard Operating Procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution analysis</td>
<td>Contribution analysis is a methodology used to identify the contribution an intervention has made to a change or set of changes. The aim is to produce a credible, evidence-based narrative of contribution that a reasonable person would be likely to agree with, rather than to produce conclusive proof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country-Based Pooled Funds</td>
<td>Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPF) allow donors to pool their contributions into single, unearmarked funds to support local humanitarian efforts. This enables humanitarian partners in crisis-affected countries to deliver timely, coordinated and principled assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian action</td>
<td>Humanitarian action comprises assistance, protection and advocacy in response to humanitarian needs resulting from natural hazards, armed conflict or other causes, or emergency response preparedness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| **Humanitarian principles** | Underlining all humanitarian action are the principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. These principles, derived from international humanitarian law, have been taken up by the United Nations in General Assembly Resolutions 46/182 and 58/114. Their global recognition and relevance are furthermore underscored by the Code of Conduct for the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement and Non-Governmental Organizations in Disaster Relief and the Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability. The General Assembly has repeatedly reaffirmed the importance of promoting and respecting these principles within the framework of humanitarian assistance.⁶ |
| **Grand Bargain** | The Grand Bargain is an agreement between more than 30 of the biggest donors and aid providers, which aims to get more means into the hands of people in need. It includes a series of changes in the working practices of donors and aid organizations that would deliver an extra billion dollars over five years for people in need of humanitarian aid. These changes include gearing up cash programming, greater funding for national and local responders and cutting bureaucracy through harmonized reporting requirements.⁷ |
| **Localization** | Localizing humanitarian response is a process of recognizing, respecting and strengthening the leadership by local authorities and the capacity of local civil society in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of affected populations and to prepare national actors for future humanitarian responses.⁸ |
| **Operational impact** | The 2015 CBPF Policy Instruction defines operational impact as the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity.⁹ |
| **Risk Management** | According to the Operational Handbook, risk management aims to provide a specific set of decision-making tools to support the achievement of strategic outcomes in a transparent manner. Risk management includes risk identification, risk analysis and the development of mitigation strategies to manage residual risks. Partner risk management focuses on tailoring grant management procedures according to the capacity and performance of partners. Funding decisions should take into account risk analyses at both levels suggesting the appropriate assurance mechanisms. CBPF risk management procedures do not generally apply to UN agencies, only to other types of partners. |

---

1. Introduction and Evaluation Background

This section outlines the purpose of this report and describes the purpose, objectives and scope of the evaluation.

1.1 Purpose of the Inception Report

1. This inception report describes how the evaluation team will fulfil the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the evaluation of Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPF). This is the first output from the evaluation and lays the foundation for the remainder of the evaluation by providing a contextual analysis and key information about KonTerra’s proposed approach including tools, methods and timelines.

Box 1: Evidence used to inform the inception report

To build the inception report, several steps and exercises were carried out. Following a virtual meeting with the OCHA evaluation manager and Chief of Strategy, Planning, Evaluation and Guidance Section (SPEGs), the evaluation team carried out a document review and a series of interviews with a range of stakeholders remotely and during the inception visit to New York. In total, 28 documents are cited in this text and a further 262 documents were made available to the evaluation team to review (see annex 11). Interviews were conducted with 52 persons (see annex 2). The evaluation team also held a number of internal team meetings to fine-tune the analytical framework and evaluation matrix to adequately encapsulate the scope of the evaluation.

- Section 1 of the report provides an introduction and background to the evaluation. It summarizes the purpose and objectives of the evaluation and outlines the scope.
- Section 2 of the report outlines the context in which the evaluation is being undertaken.
- Section 3 of the report outlines the team’s overall approach to the evaluation including the design of the evaluation and analytical framework. It explores evaluability issues and proposes mitigation measures.
- Section 4 of the report provides an overview of the evaluation methodology including the data collection, synthesis and analysis tools that will be employed.
- Section 5 of the report highlights the evaluation process and work plan. It provides details of the different phases of the evaluation and provides a detailed timeline for the inception phase.
- Section 6 of the report outlines the approach that the evaluation will take towards quality assurance and will provide details of KonTerra’s role in addition to the roles of SPEGs and Advisory and Reference Groups.

1.2 Evaluation Purpose and Scope

2. OCHA has commissioned this evaluation of the 18 CBPFs that it managed as of 2018, in partnership with six CBPF donors. It is committed to evaluating the CBPFs every three years and this is the first evaluation since they were standardized globally in a 2015 Policy Instruction and Operational Handbook. Interviews during the inception phase highlighted that the evaluation provides an opportunity to take stock of standardization processes and consider how the CBPFs should now move forward, particularly in a fast changing humanitarian landscape.

1.2.1 Evaluation purpose

3. The evaluation has two main purposes – to improve accountability and learning. Therefore, it will examine the results of the humanitarian action supported by CBPFs with the purpose of drawing lessons on what has worked well. It will also identify challenges to the effective functioning 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. It is anticipated that the evaluation will contribute to greater transparency and accountability for all stakeholders involved.

[10] During the evaluation period, CBPFs were operational in the following countries: Afghanistan, Central African Republic, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ethiopia, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Nigeria, Myanmar, Pakistan, occupied Palestinian territory, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Turkey and Yemen. The Colombia fund closed at the end of 2018. The Haiti fund closed in 2015 and is not part of this evaluation.

1.2.2 Thematic scope

4. 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:

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

5. As stated in the ToR, the evaluation will also assess how CBPFs have performed against these three expected outcomes and the five principles of inclusiveness, flexibility, timeliness, efficiency, and accountability and risk management (see Box 2 below) in order to lead to the overall operational impact of CBPFs, the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity.

Box 2: The 5 CBPF principles

- **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.
- **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.

6. 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. This will include an assessment of the number of people reached by CBPF-supported humanitarian action. To the extent possible, it will seek to provide a series of snapshots of the contribution made by the assistance to meeting humanitarian needs of affected people in the countries visited.

1.2.3 Temporal scope

7. 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 previous evaluation of Common Humanitarian Funds (CHFs) took place in 2015 while the previous evaluation of Emergency Response Funds (ERFs) took place in 2013.

1.2.4 Geographic scope

8. The scope of the evaluation is global; it will provide an assessment of all CBPFs. In addition, case studies will review the funds in five specific country contexts – Somalia, South Sudan, Iraq, occupied Palestinian territory (oPt) and Afghanistan. The selection of countries is based on a number of criteria (identified by OCHA and the Evaluation Team, in consultation with the Advisory Group) as described in section 4.2.1 below. The case studies 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 (see map in figure 1).

---


Figure 1: Map of CBPFs

Country-Based Pooled Funds
- Countries Included as Evaluation Case Studies
- Countries Engaged Remotely

Please note: The evaluation case study countries include Afghanistan, Iraq, occupied Palestinian territory (oPt), Somalia and South Sudan (please note that oPt is highlighted in Dark Blue but because of its small size, is not easily identifiable on the map).

2. Evaluation Context

This section 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 Humanitarian Coordinator (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 section 1.3.1 above), 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’ (see section 3.2 below).

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). The HC was the overall custodian of the ERF. Other ERFs were established in contexts of critical humanitarian needs where one or more donors were willing to provide funding. ERFs tended to be small, providing grants of less than US$250,000 mainly (though not exclusively) to NGOs. The ERFs were not standardized initially, since OCHA country offices tended to draw on experience from other countries when establishing the funds rather than on a central body of knowledge at headquarters. In some countries, the ERFs evolved from or alongside other pooled funding mechanisms.

In 2005, as part of broader reforms of the international humanitarian system following the Humanitarian Response Review 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. The pilot funds were established in Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in 2006. Subsequently, CHFs replaced existing ERFs in the Central African Republic (CAR) (July 2008), Somalia (June 2010) and Afghanistan (early 2014). While the Sudan CHF initially covered South Sudan, when the country became independent, OCHA established a separate CHF in 2012.

Since CHFs evolved separately from ERFs, the Sudan and DRC funds had a separate management structure with UNDP’s Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTFO) acting as the Administrative Agent (AA) and UNDP acting as the Managing Agent (MA). The AA role is responsible for receiving, administering, disbursing donor funds to UN agencies (including OCHA and UNDP as MA). As MA, UNDP administers grants to international and national NGOs. The MPTFO remains the AA for the six former CHFs while UNDP is the MA for the former CHFs in CAR, DRC, South Sudan and Sudan. OCHA manages grants to NGOs in the former CHFs in Somalia and Afghanistan as well as in the former ERFs. In August 2018, the ERC decided that OCHA should consolidate both the MA and AA functions internally for all the CBPFs. In subsequent negotiations, UNDP, the MPTFO and OCHA decided to have separate discussions about the

[16] Ibid.
[20] The DRC mechanism was known as the Pooled Fund.
two roles. At a meeting in January 2019, OCHA and UNDP agreed that OCHA would take responsibility for NGO grant management in the countries where UNDP is MA by January 2020. At the same meeting, UNDP, the MPTFO and OCHA agreed to initiate a discussion on the best design for future funds.

13. 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’. 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).

2.1.2 CBPF Funding

14. CBPFs have been growing, both in terms of the number of donors and in the volume of contributions, throughout the evaluation period (see figure 2 below). In 2018, the funds received a total of $953 million from 33 donors.

Figure 2: Total donor paid pledges to CBPFs 2015-2018

Table 1 below shows the ten largest donors to the CBPFs during the evaluation period. The United Kingdom is by far the biggest contributor, providing $982 million from 2015-2018, followed by Germany, which provided approximately $463 million.

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

<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>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>140.1</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>137.9</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>137.1</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other donors</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>235.9</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


[26] Source: https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-contributions

16. During the evaluation period, the Yemen CBPF was the largest recipient of donor funding, receiving a total of $549 million. South Sudan was the second largest CBPF in terms of funding. Figure 3 below shows the funding that individual CBPFs received between 2015 and 2018.

**Figure 3: Total contributions to each CBPF 2015 – 2018**

17. While one objective of the CBPFs is to mobilize resources and strengthen coordination in support of HRPs, in reality CBPFs channel a modest level of the funding (generally less than 10 per cent) directed towards HRPs, as demonstrated by figure 4 below. This level varies across contexts, with CBPFs playing a greater role in some contexts than others. For example, in 2017, the Afghanistan CBPF made the highest contribution of 9.5 per cent to HRP funding while the oPt CBPF made a modest 1.8 per cent contribution. CBPF contributions also vary within the same context over time so, for example, the oPt CBPF’s contribution to HRP funding in that context increased to almost 6 per cent in 2018. As part of WHS discussions, the Secretary-General recommended that the portion of HRP funding channeled through CBPFs should increase 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.

**Figure 4: CBPF contributions as a share of total contributions in HRPs in CBPF countries, 2015-2018**

18. 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 of the total between 2015 and 2018). Allocations to national NGOs (NNGOs) have increased substantially during the review period, from $74 million (15 per cent of total allocations) in 2015.

[29] Source: https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-vs-hrp.
to $208 million (25 per cent of total allocations) in 2018. However, the level of funding to NNGOs varies considerably by context. For example, in 2018, almost 46 per cent of funding from the Somalia CBPF (representing $24.3 million) was channeled through NNGOs whereas only 3.6 per cent of funding from the Ethiopia CBPF (totaling $2.7 million) was allocated to NNGOs.\[32\]

**Figure 5: Funding allocations from CBPFs by partner type 2015 – 2018**\[33\]

### 2.1.3 The influence of humanitarian reform and the Grand Bargain on pooled funding

19. As described in section 2.1.1, the 2005 UN humanitarian reform process was a catalyst for the establishment of CHFs. The 2012 Transformative Agenda emphasized the need for financing principled humanitarian action in a predictable and consistent way. It also focused on improving the timeliness and effectiveness of collective humanitarian responses through stronger leadership, more effective coordination structures, and improved accountability (both for performance and to affected populations).\[34\] CBPFs were clearly one mechanism for delivering these objectives. The CBPFs are also aligned with commitments in the Grand Bargain that emerged from the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit. They have the potential to contribute to implementing the commitments in the following areas:

- **Un-earmarked funding:** CBPFs enable donors to provide un-earmarked funding that is then allocated to priority humanitarian needs at country level.
- **Localization:** Unlike most bilateral humanitarian donors, CBPFs are able to provide direct funding to national NGOs. They also have the potential to strengthen NGO capacity and increase NGO participation in clusters and CBPF decision-making and governance structures.
- **Participation revolution:** CBPF partners are required to involve affected populations in the project management cycle and should be able to demonstrate how feedback and complaints fed into management decisions. Partner capacity assessments should also check whether partners have a policy on AAP.\[35\]
- **Transparency:** OCHA provides public access to data on CBPFs through its GMS Business Intelligence portal, particularly contribution and allocation data and data on funding against HRPs.
- **Cash and voucher assistance:** CBPFs have mechanisms in place to finance cash-based programmes and OCHA developed guidance on this in 2017.
- **Reporting requirements:** OCHA developed a Common Performance Framework in 2017 and also piloted the ‘Common 8+3’ harmonized reporting template in the CBPFs in Iraq, Somalia and Myanmar.\[36\] Since then, it has rolled out the reporting template to all CBPFs through the GMS and the CBPF proposal format has been adjusted in 2019 to reflect the 8+3 format.
- **Management costs:** OCHA has reduced the programme support costs associated with CBPFs and also focused on

---

\[32\] https://gms.unocha.org/content/cbpf-allocations.
\[33\] Source: OCHA GMS. Data downloaded 26th May 2019.
harmonizing and simplifying its partner capacity assessment methodology.\textsuperscript{37}

- **Multi-year planning and funding**: Since CBPFs aim to support resource mobilization for HRPs, as the latter move towards multi-year planning, CBPFs have the potential to support multi-year financing.

### 2.2 The Policy Instruction and the Operational Handbook

20. *This section summarises the Policy Instruction and Operational Handbook for CBPFs that, taken together, are referred to as the global guidelines for the funds.*

#### 2.2.1 The Policy Instruction

21. Based on the recommendations of audits conducted by the UN Board of Auditors and the Office for Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) as well as the 2013 global evaluation of ERFs, the Policy Instruction issued in February 2015 sought to harmonize CBPFs and consolidate guidelines on their functioning and management.

22. The Policy Instruction underlined that the humanitarian principles as well as the GHD humanitarian financing principles guide the CBPFs. In addition, it stated that the CBPFs are based on the principles of inclusiveness, flexibility, timeliness and efficiency (see figure 2 in section 1.3.4). OCHA later added accountability and risk management as a guiding principle of the CBPFs. It also outlined the model for operational impact of CBPFs presented in the ToR and which underpins the analytical framework for this evaluation (see section 3.2).

23. The Policy Instruction committed CBPFs to strengthening partnerships with national NGOs and referred to governance structures that are elaborated on in the Operational Handbook. It provided a brief description of CBPF management structures at headquarters and the field (with OCHA heads of office responsible at field level for advising the HC on strategic issues and resource mobilization, ensuring that the Humanitarian Financing Unit has sufficient capacity to manage the CBPF and ensuring the CBPF adheres to standard procedures). It also made it clear that ‘the process for allocating funding requires cluster and sector leads to engage in the identification of humanitarian needs, support project prioritization and undertake the technical review of projects.’\textsuperscript{38} Finally, the Policy Instruction provides an overview of OCHA’s approach to managing risk.

#### 2.2.2 The Operational Handbook

24. The Operational Handbook, issued in October 2015 and updated in October 2017, details the management procedures for CBPFs. It provides technical guidance, tools and templates for day-to-day fund management. The following areas of the Handbook are relevant for the evaluation questions:

- **Governance** (including the HC’s responsibilities).
- **Resource Mobilization** (the section notes that, in accordance with the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Humanity, by 2018, the target funding level for a CBPF should be set at 15 per cent of the corresponding HRP).
- **Allocation modalities** (which are pertinent for prioritization, quality and timeliness) and the Grant Management System.
- **Accountability**: CBPFs are expected to develop a fund-specific accountability framework that incorporates the following six components. Taken together, these contribute to the prevention and detection of fraud.
  - Risk management
  - Partner capacity and performance assessment and partner risk rating
  - Reporting (financial and programmatic)
  - Project monitoring and financial spot-checks
  - Audits (project level).
  - Evaluation of CBPFs (global level)
- **Risk Management**: Each CBPF needs to develop a Risk Management Framework that identifies the key risks that could prevent the fund from achieving its objectives and/or lead to reputational risks. At partner level, each fund is required to assess NGOs applying for funds to develop a risk rating that determines the operational modality/level of assurance that is applicable (the Handbook describes detailed methods for conducting the capacity assessments). CBPFs are advised to review the framework annually and the Handbook outlines an overview for the process.

\textsuperscript{37} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{38} OCHA (2015) Policy Instruction: Country-Based Pooled Funds, Ref.2015/01, pg. 7.
based on the ISO31000 international risk management standard. In addition, OCHA has developed a Performance Index to help each CBPF to score partner performance throughout a project’s lifetime. This, together with the initial capacity assessment, leads to the determination and revision of partner risk levels.

- **Crosscutting issues**: The Handbook focuses on gender and AAP as crosscutting issues.
  - CBPF partners should ensure that project design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation take account of the specific needs, capacities and constraints of women, girls, boys and men. CBPFs encourage the use of available tools for sound gender analysis and gender integration in projects. As part of this, partners should ensure the routine collection, collation and utilization of sex and age disaggregated data and information in the whole project cycle. Partners are also expected to use the IASC gender marker in proposals and reporting.
  - CBPFs encourage partners to incorporate existing AAP modalities into project design, implementation, management and monitoring. Project proposals are required to describe how partners have involved, and will continue to involve, affected populations while CBPF monitoring and reporting processes seek to verify that this has been done. All CBPFs are required to establish a formal complaints mechanism to receive feedback from stakeholders who believe they have been treated incorrectly or unfairly during any of the Fund’s processes. OCHA commits to compiling, reviewing, addressing, and – if necessary - raising the issues with the HC for a decision on necessary action.

2.3 Assessing CBPF results and performance

25. In their annual reports, CBPFs report data on achievement, including the number of beneficiaries targeted and reached (disaggregated into women, men, girls and boys at a minimum and sometimes by type of beneficiary, e.g., host communities and refugees). They also report on output indicators by sector and indicate what percentage of the funds requested and received by each sector came from the CBPF. This can support a proportional attribution of outputs to CBPF funding. The annual reports have evolved over the evaluation period with efforts to improve reporting on results as well as fund performance. While the reporting on the output indicators is helpful in each context, due to variations in context, needs and assistance provided, the results are not comparable across CBPFs.

26. OCHA’s Grant Management System (GMS) collects detailed beneficiary results against targets for each CBPF funded-project, which is often disaggregated to the level of specific activities within the project, and should include sex- and age-disaggregated data. The project-level data also includes the IASC gender marker. OCHA is constantly in the process of updating and improving the GMS so, from 2019 onwards, it will capture project level data on cash-based programming and assistance to persons with disabilities (PwD) that can be aggregated. It has also started using the IASC Gender with Age Marker.

27. The GMS also captures a wealth of data on fund performance, including the number of days taken to complete various stages of project review, decision-making process and disbursement. The GMS also captures detailed information on the risk profile of fund recipients (including capacity assessments), monitoring reports and audits, and risk adjusted management measures. This information provides useful evidence on the risk environment and CBPF responses to managing risk.

28. In 2017, OCHA developed a Common Performance Framework (CPF) for CBPFs. This comprises a set of indicators to assess the performance of individual funds against the global guidelines. The CPF document, defines a well-performing CBPF as one that adds the greatest possible value to the collective humanitarian response (in relation to its proportion of the total funding). The CPF outlines management and outcome indicators against the five CBPF principles.

2.4 Key Issues for the Evaluation

This section identifies key issues raised in previous evaluations of CHFs and ERFs as well as issues identified in inception phase interviews as areas on which the evaluation team should focus. These will assist the team with ensuring that the data collection phase pays attention to these issues.

2.4.1 Issues raised in evaluations of pooled funds

29. OCHA commissions periodic evaluations of CBPFs about every three years which provide an important accountability framework and which permit improvements to be made. There have been evaluations of the two precursors

of CBPFs: of the CHFs in 2015 and 2011, and of the ERFs in 2013 and 2007. A 2018 UNDP evaluation of Inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services contains relevant findings, and the OIOS has undertaken audits of individual funds. The Board of Auditors audits the CBPF Section and the CBPFs each year (making two in-country visits to CBPFs annually but reviewing data from all CBPFs). The recommendations from these audits are global and public. In addition, there are numerous studies and reports on humanitarian financing mechanisms more broadly.

30. Table 6 in Annex 10 lists the questions from the evaluation matrix alongside relevant recommendations from previous evaluations. This will enable the team to identify ongoing challenges and to explore whether there are outstanding issues to consider during this evaluation. The table highlights that previous evaluations have not made recommendations relating to the outcome and impact level of the CBPF operational impact model (other than around the issue of timeliness). This is not surprising since these were clarified in the 2015 Policy Instruction that was published during the last CHF evaluation (which referenced the Policy Instruction but did not develop recommendations relating the new outcomes and impact). This will be the first pooled fund evaluation to pay specific attention to these topics. The table does not include recommendations from OIOS and Board of Auditors reports since these apply to individual CBPFs rather than the funds globally. However, the team will take these into consideration for the case studies.

2.4.2 Issues raised during the inception phase

31. This section summarises the priority issues that emerged from consultations with stakeholders during the inception phase (see Annex 2 for a list of inception phase consultations). It focuses on key areas where the evaluation team will encounter tensions, potentially contradictory priorities and different interpretations. The issues are focused across the different levels of the Policy Instruction’s Operational Impact Framework and are summarised below.

32. **Evidencing impact (operational impact):** Interviews highlighted the appetite that exists among some stakeholders to better understand the ‘operational impact’ of the CBPFs but there are different interpretations of the term: (i) the impact of the CBPF on peoples’ lives or (ii) strategic use of the funds in support of the HRP. The evaluation will examine both of these issues as well as seeking to build consensus around a single definition. It is noteworthy that others considered that there was a risk that this would be a distraction from the more important issue of evaluating the efficiency and effectiveness of the fund given the ToR’s breadth.

33. There was also recognition from among a number of those interviewed about the methodological challenges inherent in seeking to evidence impact which is a concern that is shared by the evaluation team and which the approach outlined in this inception report seeks to address to the extent possible (section 3.5 outlines evaluability issues and mitigation measures).

34. **Strong and accountable humanitarian leadership (outcomes):** There was general agreement that the evidence base for the three CBPF outcomes was relatively weak as there are no indicators for the outcomes which, as a consequence, are not routinely monitored or measured. One of the outcomes in particular, that of strengthened leadership attracted significant discussion, particularly from the Advisory Group members who endorsed the importance of the CBPF empowering HCs, but noted also a corresponding need to ensure accountability for decision-making. The evaluation team will use the case study visits to find evidence of the ways in which the CBPF has strengthened humanitarian leadership and, to the extent possible, will explore issues of accountability.

35. **Risk management (activities and outputs):** Discussions with key informants highlighted a number of trade-offs in key aspects of the CBPF: (i) the need for due diligence and capacity assessments to mitigate risk versus the timeliness of funding, (ii) risk appetite of donors versus the ability of (higher risk) local NGOs to gain access to affected populations. Where these tensions exist, the evaluation will examine each of the factors (noting the importance of context) and will seek to make a judgment about the extent to which a satisfactory balance has been achieved.

36. **Localization (activities and outputs):** Discussions highlighted a lack of agreement about what localization means in the context of the CBPF with two areas of tension:

---


• The first is linked to how the CBPF should interpret the commitment that has been made to localization; is it an end in itself (i.e. greater engagement of local NGOs) or whether it is a means to an end (greater engagement of local NGOs in order to strengthen the impact of the CBPF i.e. the provision of timely, coordinated and principled assistance to affected people).

• The second localization issue is definitional and is linked to how localization is interpreted in CBPFs; the issue here is the extent to which the CBPF is able to engage at a strategic level with NGOs ‘as part of a process of recognizing, respecting and strengthening the leadership by local authorities and the capacity of local civil society in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of affected populations and to prepare national actors for future humanitarian responses.’ The evaluation will liaise extensively with local and national NGOs in addition to other humanitarian partners and will be well-placed to make a judgment on the nature of the relationship.

37. Humanitarian-development nexus: There is interest in incorporating the CBPF into a harmonized architecture to fund across the triple (humanitarian-peace-development) nexus. However, in preparing the ToR, the Advisory Group determined that this is outside the scope of the evaluation. If the team gathers evidence relating to this issue under the evaluation question about the strategic use of funds and the complementarity between CBPF and other funding mechanisms in a country, this will be presented in the case study and global level reports as appropriate.

3. Evaluation Design and Analytical Framework

This section outlines the team’s overall approach to the evaluation including the design of the evaluation and analytical framework. It explores evaluability issues and proposes mitigation measures.

3.1 Evaluation Design

38. Figure 6 presents the building blocks of the evaluation design and methodology.

**Figure 6: Evaluation building blocks**

- **Learning and utilization-focused, field-based, participatory approach**
- **Analytical framework, evaluation matrix and questions**
  Evaluation questions that explore the contribution that inputs and activities make to achieving CBPF outputs, outcomes and impact including enablers and barriers and good practices
- **Synthesis**
  Analysis of data across 5 field-based country case studies using a robust and transparent process to compare and synthesize evidence against the evaluations questions, and applying an inductive approach to contribution analysis
- **Assessment of global-level practice and support**
  Literature review
  Online survey
  Global interviews
  Data analysis
- **Assessment of field-level practice and support**
  5 field-based country reviews
  Broader analysis across other CBPFs
  (In-depth assessment of evaluation questions through key informant interviews, beneficiary consultation, observation and document review, data analysis)
- **Data sources**
  Existing policy, strategy, programme documentation, previous reviews and evaluations, existing monitoring data
  (Financial Tracking Service and CBPF Grant Management System)
  Key informant interviews at global and country level with key stakeholders; focus group discussions and consultations with beneficiaries

39. The overarching approach to this evaluation consists of four prongs:

- Firstly, a naturalistic evaluation approach. This type of evaluation focuses on articulating the operational realities and adjustments made in the field and often involves inductive approaches. Theory-based evaluation from a naturalistic perspective focuses on context and the highlighting of contributory causal mechanisms which help evaluators, and the readers of evaluation reports, to understand why things happened the way that they did.
- Secondly, a case study approach will be used. Case study approaches are used to generate an in-depth multi-faceted understanding of complex issues with a specific focus on a particular situation. This approach emphasizes detailed contextual analysis of a limited number of events or conditions.
- Thirdly, utilization-focused evaluation. This stresses that evaluations should be judged by their utility and actual use of evaluation products (and process), implying careful consideration of how the components of the process will affect the use of the evaluation. This will be particularly important to the development of the recommendations and the approach taken to disseminating the report and its findings.
- Finally, contribution analysis will be used, which recognizes that attributing results to interventions is complex and not always feasible. This analysis helps map pathways from interventions to results, particularly in changing contexts. It will explore to what extent the CBPFs have been effective and contributed to outcomes and impact (see Figure 7).
40. The advantages of these approaches are that, in combination, they: are not prescriptive, but allow for a combination of methods to be used; recognize that assistance is embedded within political economies, social systems and cultures, and is implemented by various stakeholders in different ways over time; and they take context as a starting point, so are suited to the sorts of diverse settings across the mix of contexts where CBPFs are implemented. Given the fact that the evaluation is for the purpose of accountability and learning, the above principles will emphasize facilitated learning techniques during field visits and interviews with OCHA staff and partners.

3.2 Analytical Framework

41. Given the primary focus of this evaluation on practical solutions rather than theory, the use of an analytical framework (Figure 8) is proposed that articulates the critical building blocks and enablers of success for CBPFs to deliver their intended impact. This approach will i) lend itself well to applying an inductive approach to exploring which of these building blocks have been present in particular case study contexts, the extent to which these have enabled or hindered success, and where there exists good practice and innovation that could be applied elsewhere; and ii) provide a framework for organising the evaluation questions around critical issues rather than the OECD-DAC criteria, and will facilitate the development of a line of questioning for the country case studies.

42. Based on the CBPF Operational Impact model outlined in the 2015 Policy Instruction (see annex 12), the analytical framework presents a number of different factors and building blocks for CBPFs that will combine at country-level to contribute to the delivery of timely, coordinated and principled humanitarian response for affected people. The evaluation will examine these under four evaluation questions which are indicated in the framework; inputs (EQ4), activities and outputs (EQ3), outcomes (EQ2) and impact (EQ1). Cutting across these are a series of humanitarian reforms and principles.

- EQ1: Impact - To what extent do CBPFs make a difference in the lives of affected people by addressing the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups?
- EQ2: Outcomes - 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?
- EQ3: Activities and outputs - To what extent are CBPF 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?
- EQ4: Inputs - Is the management of CBPFs fit for purpose and do they operate efficiently?

The evaluation team’s approach to examining each of these questions is outlined below.

---

[47] Adapted from Intrac (2017) Contribution analysis
3.2.1 Inputs
44. At the input-level, the evaluation will examine three key aspects of the CBPF: financial contributions, management actions and implementation capacity.
45. Donor funding provides the foundation for the CBPF to deliver timely, coordinated and principled assistance and the evaluation will examine resource mobilization strategies alongside the ability and success of HCs to fundraise. The willingness and motivations of donors to allocate funding to the CBPFs will also be assessed, together with the timeliness of donor contributions.
46. The effectiveness and efficiency of CBPFs is in large part dependent on its management and organization at global and county-level. The evaluation will seek to assess key aspects of the management of the Fund in addition to ground-truthing the measures that have been put in place to guide its use. An important aspect of this will be its performance in identifying and managing risk which will be a specific focus of the evaluation.
47. The capacity of clusters and implementing partners to support the organization and delivery of the CBPF will be assessed in order to determine their adequacy to meet aspirations for the delivery of CBPF activities and outputs during the period under evaluation as well as being fit for purpose for the future.

3.2.2 Activities and outputs
48. For the activities and outputs, the evaluation will focus on the performance of the CBPF during key aspects of the humanitarian program cycle which includes needs assessment, programme delivery and monitoring progress and reporting on results.
49. Emphasis will be placed on the means by which the clusters (including members), Advisory Boards and CBPFs...
work in a coordinated and coherent manner to identify needs, develop proposals and put in place efficient mechanisms to efficiently and transparently prioritize programmes.

50. The evaluation will examine the approaches used to deliver quality projects and manage both programmatic and financial risks. An important aspect of this will be the approaches used by partners to ensure accountability to communities for the purposes of strengthening programme quality but also for purposes of raising concerns and complaints.

51. The CBPF has clearly-defined procedures for monitoring which includes field visits, spot-checks and (where necessary) third party monitoring and remote call monitoring. The evaluation will seek to assess the extent to which these provide a level of assurance that activities are on track and can trigger course corrections where this is not the case.

52. CBPFs use standardized output indicators and reporting templates as a means of documenting results in a way that can be aggregated to assist in understanding its contribution to the achievement of HRP results within a given context. The reporting procedures will be examined in addition to the results that have been achieved by CBPFs at country-level with a view to building a picture of the contribution that it makes to meeting humanitarian needs.

3.2.3 Outcomes

53. The Policy Instruction anticipates that CBPF outputs will contribute to the achievement of three higher order outcomes of improved response, strengthened leadership, and better coordination and more resources. The evaluation will explore the extent to which CBPFs contribute to these outcomes and assess whether these outcomes remain the most relevant for CBPFs.

54. By linking a participatory process of prioritization to resource allocation, the assumption is that the CBPF improves the effectiveness of humanitarian response. The evaluation will seek to determine whether this assumption is valid and explore the causal link that exists. It will also examine work that is ongoing to maintain its relevance in the future.

55. The HC has overall responsibility ‘for leading and coordinating humanitarian action of relevant organizations in country with a view to ensuring that it is principled, timely, effective and efficient.’ It is this function that the CBPF seeks to strengthen. The evaluation will seek to explore the means by which and the extent to which the CBPF contributes to strengthening the role of the HC.

56. By placing decision-making in the hands of the HC, by using the HRP to guide allocation decisions and by using the humanitarian coordination architecture for prioritization and selection of programmes, the CBPF has the potential to support and strengthen coordination and planning. The evaluation will seek to assess the extent to which this is achieved in practice.

3.2.4 Operational Impact

57. The Operational Impact model outlined in the Policy Instruction anticipated that the outcomes listed above lead to the overall operational impact of CBPFs: the provision of timely, coordinated, principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity. To the extent possible, the evaluation will examine the linkages between outcomes and impact and will seek to assess the contribution made by the CBPF.

3.2.5 Cross-cutting issues

58. An explicit link is made between the CBPF and the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, independence and neutrality. Other crosscutting issues include gender and AAP, the five principles, and humanitarian reforms including the Transformative Agenda, Agenda for Humanity and the Grand Bargain. These cross-cutting issues have been included in the analytical framework and woven into relevant parts of the evaluation matrix.

3.2.6 Assumptions and risks

59. In order to strengthen the relevance and utility of the analytical framework to the evaluation, a small number of key assumptions have been included which are linked to the realization of operational impact. These will be tested during the research. A small number of agency-specific and context-specific risks to achieving outputs, outcomes and impact are also listed. The effect that these have on the effectiveness of the CBPF will be assessed where they are

encountered. Financial risks will be examined in far greater detail as outlined in the ToR.

### 3.3 Evaluation Matrix and Questions

60. Based on the analytical framework set out above, the evaluation team has developed an evaluation matrix consisting of 4 headline evaluation questions and 13 evaluation sub-questions, which will enable the evaluation to explore how the operation of CBPFs is contributing to achieving their intended outcomes and impact.

61. The draft evaluation matrix is included in annex 4, and includes proposed key evaluation questions and sub-questions, indicators, methods and tools for data collection and analysis.

#### Figure 9: Evaluation Matrix

<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>Evidence that CBPF-funded projects have contributed to saving lives&lt;br&gt;Evidence that CBPF-funded projects have contributed to alleviating suffering and maintaining human dignity regardless of gender, age, disability, ethnicity or other factors.&lt;br&gt;Evidence that the selection and implementation of CBPF-funded projects adhere to the humanitarian principles&lt;br&gt;Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement&lt;br&gt;Evidence of the timeliness of project implementation (in relation to the starting point of the crisis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 of mechanisms for identifying newly emerging needs in ongoing crises and in new contexts<br>• Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement in response to new emergencies<br>• Evidence of the flexibility of CBPFs to adapt to changes in context<br>• Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate<br>• Evidence of CBPF management capacity to scan the horizon and of flexibility to adapt to changes<br>• 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)<br>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<br>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<br>Evidence of strategic decision-making processes<br>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<br>Evidence that HC decisions are based on the comparative advantage of CBPFs and other funding mechanisms<br>Evidence that CBPFs are meeting urgent, prioritized needs<br>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 fulfill 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

62. It should be noted that the evaluation matrix has been structured against the analytical framework, rather than the OECD-DAC evaluation criteria, to ensure that the evaluation’s questioning addresses each element of the analytical framework in a systematic way. However, the evaluation team has ensured that the key evaluation criteria for this evaluation as stated in annex 1 of the ToR (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, connectedness and impact) are all covered by the evaluation questions and sub-questions. The full evaluation matrix in annex 4 below makes these linkages clear.

3.4 Stakeholder Analysis

63. Multiple stakeholders across the humanitarian community have interests in the results of the evaluation and will have influence on the outcomes of the evaluation. Meaningful engagement with, and participation of, the end users will be critical to the usability and value of this evaluation. Described below are the different categories of stakeholders and their interests in this evaluation.

3.4.1 Global-level

64. **Stakeholders with a governance or oversight role**: The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) 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, reorganization and closure.

65. **Stakeholders with a managerial role**: 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. The MPTFO acts as the Administrative Agent for the CBPF in six countries and in these contexts, plays a key management role.

66. **Others**: the Pooled Fund Working Group, the CBPF/NGO platform, UN and NGO partner organizations, members of the OCHA Donor Support Group (ODSG) and contributing donors more broadly.

3.4.2 Country-level

67. **Stakeholders with a governance or oversight role**: The Advisory Board (AB) supports the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) in steering the strategy and oversees the performance of the CBPF. The AB consults on four key areas of the CBPF: strategic focus, risk management, transparency and operational reviews. The AB also advises the HC on the allocation of funds and other strategic issues. 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.

68. **Stakeholders with a managerial role**: The HC acts as the custodian of the CBPF on behalf of the ERC. 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 HC is supported in the day-to-day management of the fund by the OCHA Head of Office and Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU).

69. 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, both of which are key stakeholders. In countries
where UNDP acts as managing agent, it will be a key stakeholder.

70. **Stakeholders that make use of the CBPF**: This group includes UN agencies, international, national and local NGOs that use CBPF funding to deliver humanitarian programmes. As users of the CBPF, the views of these organizations will be elicited across the case studies and, to the extent possible, in countries that do not directly participate in the evaluation.

71. **Populations targeted by the CBPF**: This group of stakeholders are the most important as they comprise those who are targeted for assistance. While the evaluation will engage with representatives from affected communities for purpose of eliciting feedback, engagement will be limited to the case study countries.

72. **Others**: Donor representatives at country-level play a key role, both in the role of contributors to the CBPFs, but also as members of the AB.

### 3.4.3 How the evaluation report will be used

73. Different stakeholders will use the findings of the evaluation in different ways. Details for core users are provided below.

- **OCHA**: It is anticipated that OCHA will use the findings of the evaluation for purposes of accountability, learning and planning for the future. Where recommendations relate to the section, these will be considered and a Management Response Plan will be prepared which outlines action to be taken.
- **Pooled Fund Working Groups**: The recommendations targeted at OCHA's partners may be discussed at the Pooled Fund Working Group to develop action plans for their implementation.
- **OCHA Donor Support Group**: The recommendations that have implications for donors that contribute to the CBPFs will be presented and discussed at the ODSG.
- **Country-based Advisory Boards**, HFUs and technical/strategic review members: For case study countries, relevant Advisory Boards, HFUs and technical/strategic review members will use the findings of the evaluation reports to better understand the effectiveness of the Fund and will use the recommendations to strengthen the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the CBPF. It is anticipated that some of the conclusions and recommendations from the Global Synthesis Report will be of direct relevance to all CBPFs and will outline actions to be taken. Follow-up to country-level recommendations will be determined by CBPF Advisory Boards.
- **CBPF-funded organizations**: CBPF-funded organizations will use the data to understand the effectiveness of the fund at country- and global-level. They will benefit from the lessons that have been captured and recommendations to strengthen the leadership and management of the Funds.
- **Targeted populations**: To the extent possible, given the limitations of the exercise, the evaluation reports will provide an account of how effectively the funds have been used to address needs in a timely, coordinated and principled manner.

### 3.5 Review of Evaluability, Limitations and Mitigation Measures

74. The evaluation team conducted a light-touch review of evaluability. The purpose of this was to ensure that the evaluation design and tools take account of limitations identified in, for example, the availability and quality of data, and to ensure that the scope of the evaluation is appropriate to address the needs and views of key evaluation stakeholders. Key questions used by the evaluation team to assess evaluability are listed in the box below (see Box 3).[50]
3.5.1 Clarity about the purpose and scope of the evaluation

75. The purpose of the evaluation is clearly outlined in the ToR and is reinforced by the use of the model of CBPF operational impact taken from the CBPF Policy Instruction which outlines the anticipated causal link between inputs and activities to outputs, outcomes and impact. The geographic and temporal scope of the evaluation (reproduced in section 1.3 of this report) are similarly clearly articulated. Interviews undertaken during the inception phase suggest that there is broad understanding of the purpose and scope and the use of a two-page communication on this for global and country-based stakeholders further strengthens this.

3.5.2 Data quality and availability

76. Good quality written data exists for many of the inputs and activities. The evaluation team already has the core documentation and there is significantly more detailed information held at country-level (on activities such as technical review, project prioritization and risk management). While there may be some variation in the quality of these documents, the presence of written documentation supplemented by interviews should provide a relatively strong foundation for the evaluation. At the output level, and with a small number of caveats, data should be available for many aspects of the evaluation and should be sufficient to draw clear conclusions – on issues such as prioritization of projects and timeliness of funding. The process of standardizing CBPFs should make it possible to compare project prioritization and timeliness across countries. Also, with the development of Common Performance Framework indicators in 2017, the team should be able to draw on this data to review fund management and efficiency questions across the CBPFs to address relevant evaluation questions.

77. The team will also be able to use data available from the GMS for the evaluation period to provide insights on the achievement of results within different contexts, by different partners, and other potential variables. However, as noted in section 2.3, due to variations in context, needs and assistance provided, these results are not comparable across CBPFs. The evaluation matrix in Annex 4 identifies the GMS as a data source for relevant evaluation questions.

78. Where it is anticipated that the quality and availability of evidence will be reduced is at outcome and impact levels. High-quality evidence that can causally relate changes in the effectiveness of humanitarian response, leadership and coordination (outcomes 1-3) and the conditions of people (operational impact) to specific CBPF projects is likely to be scarce although project reports and reviews is likely to be highly variable and is expected to be largely qualitative. It is anticipated that it will offer ‘snapshots’ rather than a coherent narrative. It is also unlikely that there will be a baseline with which to measure change. As a consequence, capturing changes attributable to CBPF-funded projects will be largely reliant on data obtained from interviews and focus group discussions. Limitations in the quantity and quality of data at the outcome and impact-level was raised by a number of interview participants.

79. In a similar way, the quality and availability of data on a number of cross-cutting issues including gender, AAP, some of the principles, the Grand Bargain Commitments and the application of humanitarian principles to CBPF projects will also be variable. While data on some of these will be available in the form of project reports or monitoring data (e.g.
the application of the CBPF principles has a common performance framework developed in 2017, and it is anticipated that some of the principles, such as timeliness, accountability and inclusiveness should have a good data set, albeit for part of the period under evaluation), other cross-cutting issues are less-well defined and as a consequence, will not be documented, or where they are, the quality and availability of the information will be far lower (e.g. the Grand Bargain commitment of localization or the application of humanitarian principles).

3.5.3 Monitoring and evaluation tools and systems

80. The CBPF benefits from a clear set of guidance documents for all aspects of implementation of the fund at a global-level. At a country-level, initial interviews suggest that there is a fairly consistent approach taken towards implementing the CBPF and in documenting key aspects of its planning, implementation and results.

81. There are well-established monitoring processes and tools for CBPFs which will offer a consistent data set, particularly at the output and activity levels. The Operational Handbook outlines a clear set of parameters for field site monitoring, financial spot-checks including in volatile environments and third-party or remote monitoring. Linked to these processes are clear expectations for narrative and financial reporting. These processes taken together help CBPF managers to prevent and deal with fraud or losses. An outline of evaluation and audit requirements is also provided. Relevant reports have been shared with the evaluation team and will provide an important source of evidence, including on financial risk and fraud management.

82. Despite the presence of clear guidance on monitoring and reporting, it must be borne in mind that a significant number of projects are implemented in contexts which are not conducive to rigorous monitoring approaches, which in some cases necessitate the use of third-party monitoring mechanisms and other novel approaches to gathering data. While this is inevitable given the nature of humanitarian assistance, it does have an impact on both the quantity and quality of project monitoring. While the evaluation will seek to supplement this by conducting its own research on the outputs and outcomes of CBPF-funded projects, this will be extremely limited in scope.

83. Since the last CHF/ERF evaluations were conducted, the contribution made by the CBPF to its anticipated outcome and impact-level changes have not been examined coherently or consistently. Data may be gathered through a review of relevant Operational Peer Reviews (OPR) and Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluations (IAHE), where these have been conducted. A second important data set are the HRP monitoring reports (where they exist) which may provide a commentary on some of the higher-order outcomes and impact, in addition to cluster-level outputs.

3.5.4 Conduciveness of the context to the evaluation

84. 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 CHFs, and of the Emergency Relief Funds (ERFs) in 2013 and 2007. Three years have passed since OCHA conducted the last evaluation, making it appropriate to undertake another evaluation of the funding mechanism at this time. As a consequence, the evaluation benefits from a clear mandate and significant interest. A member of OCHA’s SPEG section will work closely with the evaluation team to facilitate stakeholder engagement and

---

[52] OCHA (2017) Operational Handbook for Country-Based Pooled Funds (version 1.2), October 2017. This is an update of the original handbook which was produced in February 2015.
[53] Operational Peer Review (OPR) is an internal, inter-agency management tool, introduced as part of the IASC Transformative Agenda, which serves as a course corrector and to identify areas for immediate corrective action. OPR is designed to help Humanitarian Coordinators (HCs) and humanitarian country teams (HCTs) determine whether adjustments or improvements are necessary, and focusses on: (i) leadership arrangements, (ii) implementation of the other phases of the HPC, (iii) coordination, and (iv) mechanisms for accountability to affected people. See https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/programme-cycle/space/page/operational-peer-review.
[54] The Inter-Agency Humanitarian Evaluation is an independent assessment of whether collective results achieved in response to an emergency meet the objectives stated in the Strategic Response Plan and the needs of affected people. IAHEs are triggered automatically by a Humanitarian System-Wide Scale-Up Activation, and are conducted within 9-12 months from the initial Scale-Up activation taking into consideration the findings of the Operational Peer Review. See https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/evaluations.
[55] IAHEs were conducted in the Philippines, South Sudan and CAR between 2014 and 2016. A ‘Coordinated Accountability and Lessons Learning Exercise’ was conducted of the Syria response in May 2016.
The evaluability review has highlighted some aspects of the ToR that will be challenging to evaluate. In order to address some of the most significant evaluability issues, a number of mitigating measures are proposed.

**Limitation 1: There is a lack of baseline data and variability in the monitoring data at the outcome and impact level.** 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 explain changes at the outcome or impact-level.

**Proposed mitigation measures:**

- A literature review will be 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. Where relevant data exists from sources external to the CBPF which can support the construction of a baseline, or which can fill in gaps in monitoring data, this will be used.
- Contribution analysis does not need 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 will be used during the evaluation as a means of identifying whether and the extent to which the CBPF contributes to outputs, outcomes and impact (to the extent possible).

**Limitation 2: It will be complex to attribute specific changes to the CBPF.** The CBPF plays a relatively modest role in funding humanitarian programmes (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 when 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.

**Proposed mitigation measures:**

- The approach taken to project sampling for the case studies will identify and target projects that have a comparatively high proportion of CBPF funding in order to offer the greatest opportunity to isolate changes that are attributable to the CBPF (see section 4.2). This will include sectors, themes or vulnerable groups which were prioritized in the HRP but which attracted insufficient funding from elsewhere, in order to demonstrate the added value of the CBPF.
- Contribution analysis encourages a rigorous and transparent approach to assessing contribution to change. It is particularly useful for complex interventions where assessment of sole attribution is difficult. It is most effective when it is undertaken in an iterative manner so that evidence is repeatedly collected and analyzed in order to refine contribution narratives. While few evaluations have potential to make repeated iterations, there is scope to do this during the five case studies of the CBPF evaluation.

[56] See figure 4.
89. **Limitation 3: Given the limited scope for community engagement and the limitations outlined above, it will be difficult to evidence operational impact.** 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.

Proposed mitigation measures:

- The literature review will seek 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 which will strengthen the pool of impact evidence.
- Irrespective of the anticipated challenges, seeking to establish a causal link between the CBPF and the lives of those it seeks to assist is an important aspect of the evaluation and will be prioritized. The consistent use of a common approach will offer the best quality results and for this reason the evaluation team advocates the importance of seeking to select countries that permit at least some direct access to communities. While it is anticipated that the methodology could be used remotely by third party consultants, the quality of data obtained in this way will be of lower quality.
- Significant output data available for the CBPFs is contained in GMS and CBPF annual reports. This will be analyzed and synthesized in order to provide a consolidated indication of the results achieved.

3.6 Ethical Considerations

90. Consideration of ethical standards is fundamental to any research or evaluation conducted in humanitarian and emergency settings. It is essential that those engaged in and informed by the evaluation are treated appropriately, and decisions about their treatment will influence the evaluation’s design. The main ethical issues that are anticipated in this evaluation relate to the stakeholders that the evaluation team engage with, particularly affected communities, and involve considerations of confidentiality (see Box 4), data protection, protecting vulnerable respondents, and ensuring that the evaluation team avoids causing harm.

**Box 4: Approach to confidentiality**

The stakeholder analysis undertaken by the team highlighted the potential for some issues to be sensitive. In order to mitigate participants concerns and to maximize the opportunities to elicit relevant information, interviews will be undertaken based on agreement that details will not be attributed to a specific person or agency. This approach will also be adopted for community focus group discussions. Notes from the interviews and focus group discussions will be kept digitally in secure online storage.

91. The evaluation team is familiar with procedures, guidelines and tools to ensure the human dignity of affected people is honoured and that their rights and well-being are respected in all research, irrespective of context. Interviews, focus groups and other data collection and sharing will be conducted in accordance with these guidelines and principles, and in particular, UNEG’s code of conduct for evaluations.\(^\text{[57]}\) The evaluation team is familiar with the World Health Organization’s Ethical and Safety Recommendations for researching, documenting and monitoring sexual violence in emergencies,\(^\text{[58]}\) principles of human rights-based programming, and the ‘Do No Harm’ approach to programming and evaluations. All interviews, focus groups and other data collection and sharing will be conducted in accordance with survivor-centred approaches with strict adherence to the WHO recommendations.


4. Evaluation Approach, Methodology and Tools

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

4.1 Data Collection Methods and Sources

92. 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.

93. 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.

94. 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.

4.1.1 Document and literature review

95. 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 5).

Box 5: 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

4.1.2 Quantitative data and trend analysis

96. 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.

4.1.3 Online survey

97. 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.  

98. 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.

99. 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.

4.1.4 Semi-structured key informant interviews  

100. 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.

101. 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.

102. 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.

4.1.5 Community engagement  

103. 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.

104. 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.

105. 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 4.1.6 below for further details on project timelines as a data collection tool.

106. 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.

107. 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 6: Data collection tools – community engagement approach**

The project team will use three complementary data collection tools during community consultations.

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.

108. 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.

4.1.6 **Project timelines**

109. 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.

4.1.7 **Country visits**

110. 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 7 presents
the approach to the field-based country case studies.

**Box 7: 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.

**4.1.8 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.

**4.2 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.

**4.2.1 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 2). OCHA subsequently communicated this list to the Advisory Group before finalising the selection.
Table 2: 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 Protracted conflict</td>
<td>No/2019 OIOS Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oPt</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Conflict in Syria (cross-border operation)</td>
<td>2013 ERF Evaluation/2018 OIOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Protracted conflict and natural disasters (drought in 2017)</td>
<td>2015 CHF Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back-up)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protracted conflict and drought</td>
<td>2015 CHF Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>OCHA/ MPTFO</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td>2015 CHF Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Pilot)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>UNDP/ MPTFO</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

114. 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 3).

Table 3: 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. Community engagement will require support in order to address challenges.</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</td>
<td>Large fund but focus on cross-border will make community engagement extremely difficult.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back-up)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>Diverse programme portfolio. Access will be difficult in South Central.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pilot)</td>
<td></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>

4.2.2 CBPF projects

115. 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 purposive 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).

116. 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.

4.3 Data Collection, Synthesis and Analysis

Figure 10: Three-step process for systematic evidence gathering and analysis

117. 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 10).

4.3.1 Preliminary assessment
118. 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.

4.3.2 Field-level assessment
119. 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.
120. 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.

4.3.3 Triangulation of data
121. 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.

### 4.3.4 Data synthesis and analysis

122. 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 11).

- **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.

### 4.3.5 Recommendations

123. 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.
4.4 Dissemination of Findings

4.4.1 Dissemination

124. 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.

125. **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.

126. **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.

127. 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.
5. Evaluation Process and Work Plan

This section highlights the evaluation process and work plan. It provides details of the different phases of the evaluation and provides a detailed timeline for the inception and pilot phase.

5.1 Phases of the Evaluation

The evaluation has been designed around three distinct phases, an inception phase, a data collection and analysis phase and a reporting phase. Details of the activities and outputs from each phase are given below.

5.1.1 Inception Phase

Immediately after award of the contract, the evaluation Team Leader and KonTerra Project Director undertook an initial telephone/videoconference call to formally kick off the evaluation and next steps in beginning the key activities of the inception phase. The evaluation team commenced the evaluation design and data collection methods and tools for the inception report. During this phase, an initial review of documentation was undertaken in addition to telephone-based key informant interviews for scoping purposes and to provide input into the design of the methodology.

Two members of the evaluation team participated in a series of face-to-face inception meetings in New York during the week commencing 18th March 2019. These were for the purpose of in-depth discussion concerning the evaluation design, sampling strategy and methodology. This gave the team the opportunity to discuss challenges and limitations alongside practical considerations for the evaluation. Country selection for case studies was completed during the visit. The team completed the draft Inception Report following the inception meetings in New York.

5.1.2 Data-collection and analysis phase

Two-person teams will undertake each country visit, with one team member nominated as the visit leader with support from the second team member for conducting interviews, presenting findings in country and preparing the case study report. In each country, the evaluation team members will be supported by male/female national support staff to assist with gathering beneficiary feedback and understanding of the local context. As outlined in the ToR, the team will prepare and submit interim updates shortly after the country visit. The team will prepare and submit country reports in line with the ToR and based on the approach outlined above. Draft reports will be shared with country-based Advisory Board and global Advisory Group for review and comment. OCHA will consolidate the feedback and submit this to the evaluation team to allow the latter to prepare and submit final reports.

In addition to the country cases, the team will expand on the initial literature review and conduct data analyses and an online survey. During this phase, the team will conduct additional interviews with key global stakeholders to gather missing data and triangulate evaluation findings. The remote interviews will be drawn from an initial list of stakeholders provided by OCHA. The Team Leader and Senior Evaluator will undertake the two headquarters visits to New York and Geneva planned for the data gathering phase in September, after the field missions. The full team will meet in London after the completion of all data gathering visits in order to conduct data analysis.

5.1.3 Reporting phase

The start of the reporting phase will coincide with the final weeks of the data gathering phase in order to ensure adequate time for the preparation of high-quality reports. The team will draft the global synthesis report on the basis of the findings of the country visits and the comparative analysis and submit it for the Advisory Group’s comments. The team will discuss this with the Advisory Group in a validation workshop after which it will prepare for submission a final report incorporating the feedback received. The evaluation reports will be complemented by a series of Evaluation Briefs of no more than two pages for the global synthesis report and of no more than one page each for the country reports.
5.2 Evaluation Outputs and Work Plan

Table 4 sets out the key outputs of the evaluation and proposed delivery dates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Proposed delivery date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inception phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country/fund selection for case studies</td>
<td>Due by end of week commencing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft inception report</td>
<td>11 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim update 1 (Somalia country visit)</td>
<td>15 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revised inception report</td>
<td>15 April 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final inception report</td>
<td>20 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study 1 report (Somalia country visit)</td>
<td>27 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data collection and analysis phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim update 2 (South Sudan Country visit)</td>
<td>20 May 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study 2 report</td>
<td>08 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim update 3 (Iraq country visit)</td>
<td>24 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study 3 report</td>
<td>26 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim update 4 (oPt country visit)</td>
<td>24 June 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study 4 report</td>
<td>29 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim update 5 (Afghanistan country visit)</td>
<td>08 July 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study 5 report</td>
<td>26 August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthesis and final reporting phase</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft synthesis report</td>
<td>14 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final case study reports</td>
<td>28 October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft case study report briefs</td>
<td>04 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First revised synthesis report</td>
<td>04 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final synthesis report</td>
<td>02 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case study and synthesis report briefs</td>
<td>02 December 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 below presents the full work plan for the three phases of the evaluation (the inception, data collection and analysis, and synthesis and final reporting phases).

Table 5: Work plan for the three phases of the CBPF evaluation
5.3 Support Required from OCHA

136. While the success of the evaluation will, to a large extent, depend on the professionalism of the evaluation team and the relevance of the approach, it is recognized that the ToR is both broad and complex and that OCHA and country-based stakeholders will have a key role in facilitating the success of the evaluation. There are a number of specific areas where guidance and practical support will be required.

5.3.1 Headquarters/strategic-level

- 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. His assistance will be particularly important in the preparation and planning of headquarters visits and associated interviews. He will also play a gatekeeping role by supporting the evaluation team in gaining access to country-based stakeholders.
- The CBPF Section has appointed a focal point for the evaluation to facilitate access to pertinent information, documents and contacts relating to CBPFs.
- The Advisory Group will provide advice and technical guidance to the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team on key evaluation questions and additional areas of investigation.

5.3.2 Country/operational-level

- 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.
- The country-based Advisory Boards, supported by OCHA will provide background information and contextual knowledge for their specific country context.
- They will provide advice and technical guidance to the Evaluation Manager and Evaluation Team on key evaluation questions and additional areas of investigation in their country.

137. The evaluation team will seek to make contact with CBPF managers and OCHA country offices well in advance of visiting case study countries in order to determine what support will be necessary and in what ways OCHA may be able to facilitate the work of the team.

138. In support of this, the evaluation team will prepare and update a planning document which outlines the evaluation approach and support needs in more detail. It will be circulated to countries in advance of case study visits.
6. Quality Assurance

This section outlines means to quality assure the evaluation and associated outputs.

6.1 KonTerra’s Quality Assurance Approach

139. KonTerra uses an internal quality assurance expert to provide an additional layer of support to the Evaluation Team in their work. KonTerra’s focal point for quality assurance in this evaluation will be our QA Expert, Belén Díaz, who has 18 years of work experience in the aid sector with specialization in organizational development, capacity building, and evaluation in the fields of humanitarian assistance, gender equality and women’s empowerment, sustainable livelihoods, disaster risk management, and humanitarian assistance – including education and child protection policies and programmes.

6.1.2 Process quality considerations

140. KonTerra’s internal quality assurance checks that evidence is strengthened through systematic triangulation. To ensure impartiality and reduce the risk of bias, the methods will promote participation of different groups of stakeholders, including women and men and, if feasible, persons with disabilities. To ensure data integrity and factual accuracy throughout the review process, team members will periodically compare, triangulate, and analyze data collected.

141. The internal QA process will include the following steps:

- Cross-check of the Report with the ToR requirements;
- UNEG quality checklist to assess completeness;
- Assessment of the internal flow and clarity of the report.

6.2 The Role of OCHA

142. 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 and will support the preparation of the management response and follow-up to recommendations. OCHA will organize and supervise the different phases of the evaluation process and ensure the quality of all deliverables submitted by the Evaluation Team.

6.3 The Role of Country-based Reference Groups

143. 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. 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. The Reference Groups will strengthen the quality of the evaluation by providing feedback, advice and comments on preliminary findings, conclusions and recommendations and will provide inputs to the development of, review and provide appropriate and timely feedback on the draft country report.

6.4 The Role of the Advisory Group

144. At a global level, the Advisory Group’s contribution to quality assurance will be through review and feedback on draft outputs throughout the evaluation process including the inception report and final report. The Group will assist the Evaluation Manager to ensure quality control according to relevant standards including those of the United Nations Evaluation Group and ALNAP. It will assist in strengthening 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.

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.

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.”

- **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.
- **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.

[60] Page 4

[61] 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.
• **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 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.

As one of the initiatives under the Agenda for Humanity, the Grand Bargain 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. 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). 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. 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. The CBPFs’ share of HRPs varies, with the proportion in 2017 ranging from 9.5 per cent in Afghanistan to 1.8 per cent in Colombia.

---

[63] https://agendaforhumanity.org/explore-commitments/indv-commitments
[64] www.agendaforhumanity.org/initiatives/3861
[65] https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/%5BHL%20Report%5D%20important%20to%20fail%20addressing%20humanitarian%20financing%20gap.pdf
[69] Figure taken from the OCHA CBPF Grant Management System (GMS) – Business Intelligence (7 November 2018). The percentage is CPBF funding over HRP funding requirements (not HRP received funding).
CBPFs embody the fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and function according to a set of specific principles:[70]

**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

[70] These principles are taken from the OCHA 2015 Policy Instruction for Country-Based Pooled Funds, page 4, available at https://www.unocha.org/sites/dms/Documents/Policy%20Instruction%20on%20OCHA%20CBPFs.pdf. Accountability and Risk Management was added as principle in March 2017 in the Common Performance Framework considering it is a central theme in the Global Guidelines.
an evaluation of the ERF in Haiti was published in 2011. 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 learning. 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

---

[71] The evaluation reports are available on the OCHA website, at www.unocha.org/themes/evaluations-and-reviews/reports

[72] The data on CBPF recommendations is as of 19 November 2018, as recorded in OCHA’s Recommendations Tracking System (RTS).
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 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.”

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, 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.

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. 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).

[73] UNDP (August 2018): Evaluation of UNDP Inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services. Available at:
[75] www.uneval.org/papersandpubs/documentdetail.jsp?doc_id=1401
[76] Disability, for example, will only be disaggregated in the number of people targeted starting in January 2019.
[77] 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 an NGO perspective, and does not create duplication.”
Evaluation Criteria and Questions
The evaluation will assess these issues under the following selected and agreed standard evaluation criteria:

- **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 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.


[79] Such as, for example, the Humanitarian and Disaster Resilience Plan in Ethiopia
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 representatives 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. 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

[80] Operational Handbook for Country-Based Pooled Funds, version 1.2 (October 2017), paragraph 42.
(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. All 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: Inception Phase Consultations

Presented below is a list of persons consulted during the inception phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Designation and Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aidan O’Leary</td>
<td>Head of Office, OCHA, Iraq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarns Gerlofsma</td>
<td>MINBUZA, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrea De Domenico</td>
<td>Chief, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Billo</td>
<td>Senior Humanitarian Advisor, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Schwarz</td>
<td>Desk Officer, German Federal Foreign Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anne-Sophie Le Beux</td>
<td>Fund Manager, OCHA Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antoine Gérard</td>
<td>Senior Humanitarian Advisor, Operations and Advocacy Division, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashutosh Kumar Jha</td>
<td>Head, Finance Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assaf Naaman</td>
<td>Desk Officer, oPt, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bavo Christiaens</td>
<td>Portfolio Manager, MPTFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Begona Birath-Barrientos</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager, Sida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bettina Woll</td>
<td>Chief of Directorate for the Global Policy Network, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruno Lemarquis</td>
<td>Director, ai, Crisis Response Unit, UNDP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caro Kriger</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer, MINBUZA, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celine Billat</td>
<td>Associate Donor Relations Officer, UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlene Woolley</td>
<td>Institutional Lead OCHA, CERF and CBPF, DFID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyril Ferrand</td>
<td>Team Leader, Resilience Team for Eastern Africa, FAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernando Hesse</td>
<td>Head, Governance and Partnerships Team, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Petropoulos</td>
<td>former Head, Fund Management Support Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiroko Araki</td>
<td>Senior Policy Advisor, UNHCR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignacio Leon</td>
<td>OIC, Assessment, Planning and Monitoring Branch, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Kunjumen</td>
<td>Head, IM Systems and Data Analysis Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jelena Jovanovic</td>
<td>Public Partnerships Manager, UNICEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Rempel</td>
<td>Coordinator, Less Paper, More Aid, ICVA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jock Paul</td>
<td>Head, Oversight, Compliance and Fraud Management Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Ratcliffe</td>
<td>Desk Officer, Yemen, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan Chaves-Gonzalez</td>
<td>Humanitarian Financing Strategy and Analysis Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karuna Herrmann</td>
<td>Desk Officer, Iraq, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khalid Almulad</td>
<td>Chief, External Relations and Partnerships Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristele Younis</td>
<td>Section Chief, Central and Western Africa, Operations and Advocacy Division, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Doughten</td>
<td>Chief, Pooled Funds Branch, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca Peciarolo</td>
<td>Humanitarian Financing Project Manager, NRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meron Berhane</td>
<td>OIC, Fund Management Support Unit, CBPF Section, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Jensen</td>
<td>Chief, CERF secretariat, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicolas Rost</td>
<td>Humanitarian Evaluation Officer, SPEGS, OCHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigel Timmins</td>
<td>Humanitarian Director, Global Humanitarian Team, Oxfam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romano Lasker</td>
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## Annex 3: Advisory Group Members

*Presented below is a list of Advisory Group members for the evaluation.*

<table>
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## Annex 4: Evaluation Matrix

*Presented overleaf 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>
<th>Data collection methods &amp; sources</th>
<th>Analytical methods</th>
<th>DAC Criteria/ Crosscutting Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<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>Evidence that CBPF-funded projects have contributed to saving lives</td>
<td>Document and literature review including evaluations/reviews/reports from UN agencies and I/NGOs receiving funds, CBPF annual reports (including reporting on gender and inclusiveness), documents relating to project selection and fund disbursement</td>
<td>Project timelines</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>Evidence that CBPF-funded projects have contributed to alleviating suffering and maintaining human dignity regardless of gender, age, disability, ethnicity or other factors.</td>
<td>Interviews with HC, CBPF Advisory Board and managers, UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, cluster leads (at national/local level) and government representatives (where relevant).</td>
<td>Analysis of survey data</td>
<td>Humanitarian principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that the selection and implementation of CBPF-funded projects adhere to the humanitarian principles</td>
<td>Community consultation tools</td>
<td>Cross-country case study analysis</td>
<td>Agenda for Humanity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement</td>
<td>Online survey of key stakeholders</td>
<td>Community engagement approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the timeliness of project implementation (in relation to the starting point of the crisis).</td>
<td>Grant Management System (GMS) monitoring and reporting data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OUTCOMES</th>
<th>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?</th>
<th>2.2 Evidence of mechanisms for identifying newly emerging needs in ongoing crises and in new contexts</th>
<th>2.3 Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement in response to new emergencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>• Evidence of mechanisms for identifying newly emerging needs in ongoing crises and in new contexts</td>
<td>• Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement in response to new emergencies</td>
<td>• Evidence of the extent to which CBPFs have enabled donors to improve the flexibility and reach of unearmarked humanitarian funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Evidence of mechanisms for identifying newly emerging needs in ongoing crises and in new contexts</td>
<td>• Evidence of the extent to which CBPFs have enabled donors to improve the flexibility and reach of unearmarked humanitarian funding</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF management capacity to scan the horizon and of flexibility to adapt to changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Evidence of the timeliness of proposal review and disbursement in response to new emergencies</td>
<td>• Evidence of the flexibility of CBPFs to adapt to changes in context</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF management capacity to scan the horizon and of flexibility to adapt to changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate</td>
<td>• Evidence of the extent to which CBPFs have enabled donors to improve the flexibility and reach of unearmarked humanitarian funding</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF management capacity to scan the horizon and of flexibility to adapt to changes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Evidence of CBPF management capacity to scan the horizon and of flexibility to adapt to changes</td>
<td>• Evidence of the extent to which CBPFs have enabled donors to improve the flexibility and reach of unearmarked humanitarian funding</td>
<td>• Evidence of the flexibility of CBPFs to adapt to changes in context</td>
<td>• Evidence of CBPF ability to adopt new technology and innovate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Document and literature review including**

- Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO)/HRPs, CBPF allocation strategies, reports from UN agencies and I/NGOs receiving funds
- Interviews with OCHA HQ staff, Pooled Fund Working Group (PFWG), CBPF Advisory Board and managers, UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, cluster leads (at national/local level), donors and government representatives.
- Online survey of key stakeholders
- Community consultation tools
- GMS data

**Effectiveness**

- Analysis of survey data
- Cross-country case study analysis
- Community engagement approach

**Relevance**

- Project timelines
- Analysis of survey data
- Cross-country case study analysis
- Community engagement approach

**Principles of flexibility and timeliness**

- Grand Bargain commitment on unearmarked 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
- Document and literature review including HNO/HRPs, cluster response plans, CBPF allocation strategies, Advisory Board meeting minutes, CBPF annual reports and reports from UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds
- Interviews with HCs, HCT members, CBPF Advisory Board and managers, UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, cluster leads (at national/local level), government representatives, donors and PFWG
- Online survey of key stakeholders
- GMS and Financial Tracking Service (FTS) data
- Cross-country case study analysis
- Analysis of survey data
- Financial data analysis

### 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.
- Document and literature review, including minutes of Advisory Board and HCT meetings
- Interviews with HC, HCT members, CBPF Advisory Board and managers, donors and PFWG
- Cross-country case study analysis
- Effectiveness
| 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? |
| | Document and literature review, including CBPF allocation strategies and OCHA documents on pooled funds |
| | Financial data from GMS and FTS |
| | Interviews with OCHA senior management, PFWG, HCs, HCTs, CBPF Advisory Boards and managers, Pooled Fund Working Group members, CERF Advisory Group members and donors |
| | Financial data analysis |
| | Cross-country case study analysis |
| | Connectedness |
| | Relevance |
### 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?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 To what extent do CBPFs respond to the most urgent needs of people and communities affected by crisis?</th>
<th>Evidence that CBPF projects are informed by coordinated and participatory needs assessments.</th>
<th>Document and literature review including HNOs/HRPs, CBPF allocation strategies, Advisory Group meeting minutes, cluster prioritization process documents, CBPF annual reports, reports from UN agencies and INGOs receiving funds (including reporting on gender and inclusiveness) and OCHA/NRC pooled funds study.</th>
<th>Community engagement approach.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that CBPF prioritization processes identify the greatest humanitarian needs including those of marginalized groups.</td>
<td>Interviews with HC, HCT members, CBPF Advisory Board and managers and donors.</td>
<td>Analysis of survey data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that CBPF selection and implementation processes take account of gender, age and disability issues, as well as broader inclusiveness issues.</td>
<td>Community consultation tools.</td>
<td>Effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that CBPF partners involve affected populations in the project management cycle.</td>
<td>Online survey of key stakeholders.</td>
<td>Relevance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that accessible mechanisms are in place for information sharing and for feedback and complaints.</td>
<td>GMS data.</td>
<td>Agenda for Humanity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community engagement approach.</td>
<td>IASC Gender with age marker (GAM) data.</td>
<td>Grand Bargain commitments on the participation revolution.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 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
- Document and literature review including HRPs, allocation strategies, Advisory Board/Inter-Cluster Coordination Group meeting minutes and other documents relating to project selection, CBPF project proposals
- Interviews with HCs, CBPF Advisory Board and managers, cluster leads, UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds
- GMS data and FTS financial data
- Data analysis
- Cross-country case study analysis
- Relevance
- Grand bargain commitments on cash programming

### 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
- Review of CBPF documentation on standard and reserve allocations, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework
- Interviews with UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, CBPF Advisory Board and managers, cluster leads
- Online survey of key stakeholders
- GMS data
- Cross-country case study analysis
- Project timelines
- Analysis of survey data
- Data analysis
- Efficiency
- Grand Bargain commitments on transparency, management costs and reporting
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 |
| Review of CBPF documents, including allocation strategies, Advisory Board meeting minutes, cluster prioritization processes, annual reports and reports from UN agencies and NGO receiving funds, partner survey data |
| GMS data |
| Interviews with HCs, Advisory Boards and managers, local NGO representatives (including those not receiving CBPF funds) |
| Online survey of key stakeholders |
| Funding data analysis |
| Cross-country case study analysis |
| Analysis of survey data |
| Connectedness |
| Effectiveness |
| Grand Bargain commitments on localization |
| Principle of inclusiveness |
### 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 HRP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence of HC/HCT efforts to raise funds for CBPFs</td>
<td>• Financial data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Level of CBPF funding to HRP projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence on whether CBPFs are able to mobilize multi-year contributions from donors against multi-year HRP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews with HCs, CBPF Advisory Board and managers and donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GMS data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document and literature review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews with HCs, CBPF Advisory Board and managers and donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GMS data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document and literature review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4.2 Are CBPFs managing risks appropriately, and is there sufficient oversight and accountability, including monitoring and reporting systems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INPUTS</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence that CBPFs have risk management systems in place</td>
<td>• Cross-country case study analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence that CBPF accountability and oversight mechanisms operate effectively</td>
<td>• Analysis of survey data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence that CBPF managers are adequately resourced to ensure oversight and accountability, including monitoring and fraud case management</td>
<td>• GMS data analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Evidence that CBPF reporting systems strike a balance between accountability and minimising transaction costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Document review of CBPF accountability frameworks and risk management documentation, OIOS and Board of Auditor reports, CBPF annual reports, reports from UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interviews with UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, CBPF Advisory Boards and managers and donors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Online survey of key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GMS monitoring and audit data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Input Sources:**
- Interviews with HCs, CBPF Advisory Board and managers and donors
- GMS data
- Document and literature review
- Financial data analysis
- Effectiveness
- Principles of accountability and risk management
- Grand Bargain commitments on transparency, management costs and reporting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3 Has the global standardization of CBPFs (as per the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework) increased efficiency?</th>
<th>Evidence of added value of harmonization resulting from the global standardization of CBPFs</th>
<th>Document review, including Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook, Common Performance Framework and other CBPF documentation, and UNDP inter-agency pooled financing services evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the added value of the GMS</td>
<td>Interviews with stakeholders at HQ (including PFWG), UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, CBPF Advisory Board and managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence of the functionality and transparency of Umoja</td>
<td>Online survey of key stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that global standardization has reduced management costs of CBPFs</td>
<td>GMS and Umoja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that global standardization has reduced transaction costs for fund recipients over the evaluation timeframe</td>
<td>• Evidence that harmonization of CBPFs is balanced with flexibility to adapt to local contexts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Efficiency implications of different fund management structures</td>
<td>Efficiency implications of different fund management structures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4 Is there sufficient capacity in the humanitarian system to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects?</th>
<th>Evidence that capacity at a global level is adequate to lead, manage and retain oversight of the CBPFs</th>
<th>Interviews with stakeholders at HQ, UN agencies and NGOs receiving funds, CBPF Advisory Board and managers, and donors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Document review, including HRP and cluster prioritization processes, Human Resources evaluation and other evaluation and study reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that the clusters are able to meet their strategic and technical review responsibilities</td>
<td>GMS data on monitoring and project completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence that the quantity and quality of humanitarian partners is sufficient to deliver high quality CBPF projects</td>
<td>Cross-country case study analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>• Evidence of added value of harmonization resulting from the global standardization of CBPFs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the added value of the GMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the functionality and transparency of Umoja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced management costs of CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced transaction costs for fund recipients over the evaluation timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that harmonization of CBPFs is balanced with flexibility to adapt to local contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficiency implications of different fund management structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that capacity at a global level is adequate to lead, manage and retain oversight of the CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the clusters are able to meet their strategic and technical review responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the quantity and quality of humanitarian partners is sufficient to deliver high quality CBPF projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>• Evidence of added value of harmonization resulting from the global standardization of CBPFs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the added value of the GMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the functionality and transparency of Umoja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced management costs of CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced transaction costs for fund recipients over the evaluation timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that harmonization of CBPFs is balanced with flexibility to adapt to local contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficiency implications of different fund management structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that capacity at a global level is adequate to lead, manage and retain oversight of the CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the clusters are able to meet their strategic and technical review responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the quantity and quality of humanitarian partners is sufficient to deliver high quality CBPF projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principle of efficiency</th>
<th>• Evidence of added value of harmonization resulting from the global standardization of CBPFs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the added value of the GMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the functionality and transparency of Umoja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced management costs of CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced transaction costs for fund recipients over the evaluation timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that harmonization of CBPFs is balanced with flexibility to adapt to local contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficiency implications of different fund management structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that capacity at a global level is adequate to lead, manage and retain oversight of the CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the clusters are able to meet their strategic and technical review responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the quantity and quality of humanitarian partners is sufficient to deliver high quality CBPF projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Grand Bargain commitments on management costs and reporting</th>
<th>• Evidence of added value of harmonization resulting from the global standardization of CBPFs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the added value of the GMS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the functionality and transparency of Umoja</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced management costs of CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that global standardization has reduced transaction costs for fund recipients over the evaluation timeframe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that harmonization of CBPFs is balanced with flexibility to adapt to local contexts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Efficiency implications of different fund management structures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that capacity at a global level is adequate to lead, manage and retain oversight of the CBPFs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 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</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the clusters are able to meet their strategic and technical review responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence that the quantity and quality of humanitarian partners is sufficient to deliver high quality CBPF projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Case Study Country 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) at https://gms.unocha.org, CBPF annual reports, the CERF website, the Inform Index, OCHA’s Recommendations Tracking System, the OIOS and BOA websites and audit reports. Data is shown for 17 CBPFs as of late 2018. 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>
<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>
<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 NNGOs***</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 Description</td>
<td>Complexity</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Year(s) of Audit</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, 2019 OIOS</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 NNGOs and does not include funding received as implementing partners of international organizations.

‡ Country has requested to be visited.

+ CBPF is administered by MPTFO.
Annex 6: Interview Questions

The template below has been designed by the evaluation team to address the questions and sub-questions presented in the evaluation matrix. These will be adapted for the global and field-level interviews so that they are relevant to the key informants.

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

4.1 Input – financial contributions: To what extent do CBPFs support overall resource mobilization for HRPs?

- What proportion of the total HRP is funded through the CBPF (15% ambition)?
- In what ways and with what success have HC/HCTs fundraised for CBPFs? Are there particular donors that typically contribute or don’t contribute to CBPFs? Why? What steps have you taken to try to diversify the funding base for CBPFs? What are the key successes/challenges and what innovative approaches have been used?
- How successful has the CBPF been in mobilizing multi-year contributions from donors? What are the difficulties associated with mobilizing MY contributions? Have you found ways to overcome the difficulties? Do MY contributions create any challenges for CBPF management and reporting? How have you overcome them?

4.2 Input/activity – fund management/risk analysis: Are CBPFs managing risks appropriately, and is there sufficient oversight and accountability, including monitoring and reporting systems?

- What risk management systems have been put in place for the CBPFs and what issues have been reported and addressed through them? What are its strengths and weaknesses and how could it be improved? [How would you describe the system for determining eligibility and risk rating of NGO partners? Is the system clear, transparent and fair? Are there mechanisms in place for you to challenge the risk rating outcome?]
- What accountability and reporting mechanisms exist? What outputs do they yield and how are they used?
- What resources does OCHA/CBPF/HFU have for risk management, monitoring and accountability? Are these sufficient? If not, what additional resources/support are required?
- How successful is the CBPF in striking a balance between risk management and accountability and transaction costs? How does it compare with other donors (time required vs. funding received)?

4.3 Input – Allocation guidelines/efficiency: Has the global standardization of CBPFs (as per the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework) increased efficiency?

- Between 2015-18, what have been the costs of managing and disbursing the funds (in terms of time, staff etc.)?
- Between 2015-18, what changes have occurred in the quantity of funding disbursed to different types of partners (i.e. UN, INGOs, NNGOs)?
- Are the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework fit for purpose? What scope exists for strengthening key aspects of the guidance?
- Has the introduction of the GMS increased the efficiency of CBPF management? In what ways? Are there further improvements that could be made to the GMS?

4.4 Input – OCHA fund management, cluster capacity and eligible partners: Is there sufficient capacity in the humanitarian system to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects?

- To what extent is a) global capacity and b) country capacity adequate to manage and oversee the effectiveness of the CBPF? How do you know? What changes (if any) are required to strengthen this?
- To what extent do clusters have sufficient capacity to play their strategic and technical review roles? How do you know? What changes (if any) are required to strengthen this?
- Are the number, diversity and capacity of actors adequate to deliver CBPF projects that meet quality standards? How do you know? What changes (if any) are required to strengthen this?
This document has been redacted due to its sensitivity.
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 Outcome - 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

- What results have been achieved by CBPF projects between 2015 and 2018? What global or country-based trends exist (sectors of response, targeted groups, phase of response)? How have these contributed to humanitarian response outcomes?
- What contribution has the CBPF made to strengthening the timeliness of response [quantitative data analysis plus comparative analysis plus stakeholder perceptions]
- What contribution has the CBPF made to strengthening the flexibility (i.e. responsive to changing needs) of humanitarian response [comparative analysis and stakeholder perceptions]
- What contribution has the CBPF made to strengthening the quality of response (identification of support to neglected sectors (e.g. protection), target groups (e.g. gender, age, disability), or specific themes (e.g. AAP), [comparative analysis and stakeholder perception]
- What contribution has the CBPF made to the reach of humanitarian response and/or inclusion of marginalized groups [analysis of funding to hard-to-reach areas, comparative analysis, stakeholder perceptions]
- How have CBPFs managed to maintain their relevance through the use of new technology and innovation?

2.2 Outcome - Better coordination: How do CBPFs contribute to a coordinated humanitarian response?

- In what ways and how effectively do CBPFs strengthen collaboration between different members of the humanitarian system? What contribution does this make to strengthening humanitarian response?
- In what ways and how effectively do CBPFs strengthen the engagement of agencies in the cluster system? What contribution does this make to strengthening humanitarian response?
- In what ways do HCs and HCTs leverage the linkages between the CBPF and the HRP to strengthen coordination? How does this strengthen humanitarian response?
- What evidence is there that donors take account of CBPF funding when making their own funding decisions?

2.3 & 2.4 Outcome - Strengthened leadership (EQ 2.3) and strategic use (EQ2.4): To what extent do CBPFs strengthen the leadership of the HC?

- Do HCs and ABs use the CBPF in a strategic way and if so, for what purpose?
- Do what extent do HCs and ABs take account of other funding when making decisions about how to use the CBPF? What data do they use for this and how reliable is it? Is there scope for improvements to be made?
- To what extent and in what ways does the CBPF strengthen the leadership, authority and influence of the HC? What benefits does this offer to the humanitarian response?

EQ1: To what extent do CBPFs make a difference in the lives of affected people by addressing the differentiated needs of vulnerable groups?

1.1 Impact: To what extent do CBPFs contribute to the provision of timely and principled assistance to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity?

- Given the effect of the CBPF on humanitarian response (2.1), coordination (2.2) and leadership (2.3), what conclusions can be drawn (if any) about the contribution of the CBPF in the lives of affected people?
- What evidence exists that humanitarian principles are taken into account by CBPF partners during the design and delivery of projects? How is this monitored?
- From the engagement of the evaluation team with community members, what patterns emerge (if any) about the contribution that the CBPF makes in the lives of affected people?
- From the data analysis, are there specific results or trends that have been identified that provide evidence of the difference that CBPFs make in the lives of affected people?

Please also refer to the community engagement methodology in annex 8.
Annex 7: Report Formats

This annex provides an outline of the formats for the country case study reports and the global synthesis report.

Country case study report format
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 will have a uniform structure and present analysis of issues specific to each fund and context. They will seek to identify improvements to assist in strengthening the functioning of the respective funds and identify best practices that might be systematized and applied in other CBPF contexts. 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. The report structure is outlined below:

- Table of contents
- Acronyms
- Executive summary
- Summary table linking findings, conclusions and recommendations
- Context analysis
- Methodology summary
- Main body of the report disaggregated by the evaluation questions and sub-questions
- Conclusions
- Recommendations

Annexes: (1) Analysis of CBPF funding flows, (2) List of persons met, (3) details of quantitative analysis, (4) bibliography

Global synthesis report format
The Evaluation Team will produce a global synthesis report, written in a clear and accessible manner, which will document the evaluation findings and their inter-relationships. While relying on the five case studies, the report will provide a global assessment of all 18 CBPFs. The report will not exceed 15,000 words (excluding the executive summary and annexes). The report structure is outlined below:

- 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
- Context analysis in which CBPFs were implemented and operating
- 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 different categories of agency, 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
- Recommendations

Annexes: (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
Annex 8: Community Engagement Methodology

This annex outlines the methodology that the evaluation team will employ to obtain community feedback on CBPF-funded projects.

1. Purpose
The purpose of consulting communities during this evaluation is to validate or challenge findings from other sources (such as partner reports, CBPF monitoring data and project timelines) about the timeliness, relevance and quality of CBPF-funded projects and the extent to which they have made a difference to the lives of affected populations. The consultation process will also help to confirm the extent to which some CBPF partners consult and involve communities throughout the project cycle.

1.1 Evaluation questions to be addressed
The evaluation team will use data collected through community consultations as evidence against the following evaluation questions and indicators:

**EQ 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.

**EQ 2.1 Improved response: To what extent are CBPFs able to meet newly emerging needs in a timely and flexible manner?**
- Analysis of the ways in which the CPBF contributes to improving the quality of the response

**EQ 3.1 To what extent do CBPFs respond to the needs of people and communities affected by crisis?**
- Evidence that CBPF prioritization processes identify the greatest humanitarian needs including those of marginalized groups
- 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.

**EQ 3.2 To what extent are CBPFs aligned with Humanitarian Response Plans, prioritized against needs and relevant to the context?**
- Evidence that CBPFs promote the use of cash and vouchers where relevant

The evaluation team will use complementary tools during gender-disaggregated focus group discussions (FGDs) in order to collect data to respond to relevant evaluation questions. Section 2 outlines the guiding principles for the FGDs while section 3 describes the tools.

2. Guiding principles for focus group discussions
This section lays out the principles that will guide the evaluation team in its selection of FGD participants and its conduct of the FGDs.

2.1 Selection of FGD participants
At each project site, the evaluation team will seek to conduct FGDs with men and women. It is not anticipated that the team will engage directly with children due to the additional challenges associated with this. Older people (generally understood to be those over 60) are often one of the most marginalized groups, often with a disproportionately high
number of persons with disabilities. While the team will not have time to conduct separate FGDs for men and women over 60, it will aim to include older individuals in adult FGDs and take note of any recurrent opinions/themes raised by older people within those groups.

2.2 General guidelines for conduct of FGDs

- FGDs are ‘semi-structured’: the team will not read the questions as a list but use them as a guide to allow conversation to flow naturally. This is a discussion, not an interview, so evaluators need to be flexible and ask questions out of sequence if this aids the flow of the discussion.
- The FGD should be conducted in the language with which people are most comfortable;
- The translator will translate everything that everyone says (even if it is a repetition of other comments);
- Only one person should be running the FGD even if there are other people there translating or taking notes – this should be clear before the FGD starts;
- Evaluation team members and translators should not give information about which they are not clear;
- If some people are not comfortable with the ranking section of the spokes exercise described below, or do not understand it, evaluators should not force it but average those that do participate and note the number who have abstained.

2.3 Ethical Considerations

The quality of the data collected by the evaluation team will depend on:

What questions we ask

Who we ask – we will engage with asking women and men separately – we should also note the views of other key vulnerable groups such as persons with disabilities (PwD), different ethnic, religious, caste, linguistic or tribal groups82

How we ask – are we asking questions in a compassionate/respectful manner?

How we record, collate, analyze and interpret the information collected

- Do no Harm
- Children – Child Protection in Emergencies (CPiE) Minimum Standards and other ethical guidelines strongly dissuade interviewing younger children unless there is no other way that particular information can be obtained due to the very high risk of doing harm. Therefore, the evaluation team will ensure that boys and girls participating in the FGDs are aged 15 or over.
- What if recent or ongoing abuse is reported during the FGD? The Facilitator/Translator should know in advance at what point they would suspend the discussions if issues of abuse or misuse of aid are raised during the discussion – evaluation team members should know how to report these.

2.4 Recording considerations

Everyone takes notes in different ways. However, all FGDs should be written up against the agreed template of FGD questions.

---

[82] The evaluation team cannot ask for separate FGDs with these demographics but it should ask CBPF partner staff who are setting up the FGDs to a) try and make them as inclusive as possible and b) ensure we are able to speak 1-on-1 with any representative of distinct groups such as a representative of a local PwD group.
3. Community consultation tools
The evaluation team will use three complementary tools to consult with communities, as described below.

3.1 Project timelines
In advance of the visit to the project site, evaluation team members will work with the CBPF unit at country level and the relevant CBPF partner(s) to develop a project timeline with the following key dates:

- Launch of Standard or Reserve Allocation
- Confirmation of project selection
- Signature of grant agreement
- Disbursement of funding
- Start of project implementation
- First distribution/service delivery to community
- Date of most recent interaction with the community

The timeline will be useful background information for the team when discussing issues of timeliness with communities, using the spokes exercise described below.

3.2 ‘Spokes’ exercise on community perceptions of quality assistance
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?’ The question is at the centre of a wheel and each spoke represents one characteristic. It is then possible to measure each characteristic. For example, if timeliness is a characteristic that makes humanitarian aid useful for an affected community, it is possible to measure the timeliness of the assistance on a scale of 0-5 or 0-10 and mark this on the spoke (with the centre of the wheel representing 0 and the outer edge of the spoke representing the high score).

Figure 12: Illustration of the Spokes Exercise

In order to ensure that the spokes exercise addresses the evaluation questions listed in section 1.1, the team will use the following set of prompts:

- Has assistance arrived on time? When did the assistance start? Check the project timeline prepared in advance with the participants, including date of most recent interaction.
- Has the assistance been useful? If yes, in what ways?
- Would other types of assistance have been more appropriate/relevant to your needs (e.g., cash)?
- How did the agencies select those who should receive assistance? Was the community involved in setting the
3.3 Individual stories
CBPF partners sometimes report the stories of how their assistance has helped particular individuals. During the project site visit and spokes exercise, 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 aim is to highlight how CBPF-funded projects have contributed to making a difference to people’s lives. The stories will be presented in the case study reports but without including the name, age or other identifiable details of the individual.

4. Approach and methodology

4.1 Logistical considerations
The evaluation team will require the help of the HFU in country and the country-based reference group to identify one or two project sites at sub-national level for visits. It will also need to work with them and KonTerra’s local consultant to organize travel, find a location for conducting the FGDs, provide water/hot drinks and/or snacks if deemed appropriate, and identify FGD participants in advance. The HFU should make it clear to the partner(s) that the team is not evaluating individual partners but seeking to collect data on community perceptions of the assistance that the CBPF has funded. The evaluation team will be willing to share the findings from the consultation with the project partner(s) for their learning.

4.2 Requirements for the FGDs
- Maximum 10 people of the same demographics (sex and age as per above) per group
- Materials – flip chart paper and coloured pens
- A quiet, private area where the group is comfortable and where other people don’t wander in or out or interrupt
- Same polite rules as in a workshop - evaluation staff and translators to turn off mobile phone and give full attention to the group for the duration of the FGD
- The evaluation team and the translators to be fully conversant and comfortable with the FGD questions before the FGD starts.

4.3 Conduct of the FGDs
At the beginning of the FGD, the evaluation team member and translator should explain:

- Who we are (introduce everyone), and we greatly appreciate everyone’s time – the exercise will take approximately one hour (but we should plan for 90 minutes; if less than 45-minutes is available, the approach will not be viable and this approach will not be used).
- What we are doing and why
- That no one has to participate if they don’t want to, and no one has to answer any questions they don’t want
- That this exercise will not lead to further assistance but is intended to inform the delivery of any future programming

---
[83] Generally, FGD participants appreciate the provision of small snacks and drinks. OCHA/the partner should be able to advise whether this is appropriate.
[84] Note that these rules apply to the evaluation team and the translators, NOT to the participants. An FGD is not a workshop and we treat FGD participants with respect as community members who are freely giving their time to talk with us, not as staff members.
• That we will be taking notes only because we want to remember what people are telling us, but everything is anonymous and we are not recording peoples’ names. The information gathered will all be anonymous and will only go to OCHA or its partners to help them improve their assistance in the future.

For the exercise, the team should explain how the spokes technique works. Then:

• Start by asking participants what they consider to be the characteristics of quality assistance
• Write each aspect of ‘quality’ on a piece of flip chart paper as the ‘spokes’ of a wheel (the translator can do this in the local language unless the participants are comfortable with the evaluator writing this in English – check with them)
• For each of the ‘spokes’, ask the community how they would rate that aspect of quality for the assistance they receive
• Allow the group plenty of time to discuss and propose each different aspect of quality
• Make a mark on each ‘spoke’ to indicate the groups opinion (the higher the quality, the closer the mark should be made to the ‘wheel’; conversely, the lower the quality, the closer the mark should be to the hub.
• If the group is divided, indicate this by making several marks on the spoke.
• Discuss and note why the group gives each characteristic a particular mark
• Use the prompt questions listed in section 3.2 to elicit a comprehensive list of characteristics.
• After all the different aspects of quality have been discussed, summarize the results to the group so they can confirm that their views have been captured correctly.
• Take a picture of each flipchart for the purposes of collation between the gender-disaggregated groups and cross-country analysis during the reporting stage of the evaluation

At the end of the FGD:

• Thank people for their time
• Ask if anyone has any questions for us [allow those questions to be answered if even they are questions asking for more services, more help, but do not respond with any promises]
• Once the FGD is finished, ensure that the CBPF unit and/or the partner will follow up with any specific issues raised by any individual.

5. Use of data from community consultations

The data from the community consultations is likely to be most useful for the country case study reports, which can be more specific about projects in response to the evaluation questions. Since the community consultations will focus on a very limited number of projects per country, they can only provide 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 is less likely to be relevant, beyond highlighting examples of good practice/need for lessons or some stories of how CBPF-funded assistance has made a difference to people’s lives.
Annex 9: Online Survey

This annex outlines the approach that will be taken by the evaluation team to engaging stakeholders from across the CBPFs in the evaluation process through the use of an online survey.

Purpose

The purpose of the online survey is 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.

Target audience and dissemination

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

Survey parameters

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 20 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.

Draft Survey

Introduction: This survey is directed towards key stakeholders involved in the country-based pooled funds (CBPFs). It is part of an independent, global evaluation of the CBPFs from 2015 – 2018. The aim of the evaluation is to draw lessons on what has worked well and to identify challenges to the effective functioning of CBPFs. The ultimate aim of the evaluation is to improve the performance of CBPFs and their overall contribution to humanitarian response. Please answer the questions in relation to the CBPF that you are currently involved with. If you work at the global level, you should respond in relation to your knowledge of CBPFs in general. The survey should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Please aim to answer all of the questions. Responses are confidential and will only be seen by members of the evaluation team. If you wish to contact the evaluation team directly, please send an email to: [Email].

Thank you for your participation.

Introductory questions

1. Please indicate from the dropdown list which CBPF your responses refer to:
   (dropdown menu of 18 countries with CBPFs)

2. Type of organization:
   - International NGO
   - National NGO
   - Red Cross/Red Crescent
   - Donor
   - Government
• UN OCHA (HFU)
• UN OCHA (other)
• UNDP
• Other UN Agency
• Other, please specify

3. Role (Please select the title from the drop down list which is most relevant)
• Humanitarian Coordinator
• HFU staff member
• Cluster coordinator
• Implementing partner/National NGO
• Implementing partner/International NGO
• Implementing partners/UN agency
• Implementing partner/Red Cross
• Donor representative
• Other, please specify

4. Please specify whether you participate in either of the following groups:
• CBPF Advisory Board
• CBPF Review Committee (strategic)
• CBPF Review Committee (technical)

5. Is your organization a recipient of CBPF funding?
• Yes (currently)
• Yes (in the past)
• No

6. Is your organization a donor to the CBPF?
• Yes (currently)
• Yes (in the past)
• No

Survey Questions

1. To what extent has the CBPF contributed to the following aspects of the humanitarian response?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeliness of the response (2.1)</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>Flexibility of the response e.g. to changing needs/ priorities (2.1)</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>Reach e.g. to hard to reach areas or groups (2.1)</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>Prioritization e.g. links with the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) (2.2)</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>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please explain your choices and/or give specific examples to illustrate your answers (optional)

How effective is the CBPF in strengthening collaboration between different members of the humanitarian system? Please rate the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CBPF strengthens coordination within clusters (2.2)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CBPF allows neglected sectors, themes or groups to be identified and supported (2.2)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CBPF strengthens coordination on cross-cluster/sector issues e.g. gender (3.1)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The CBPF strengthens coordination on cross-cluster/sector ways of working/modalities e.g. cash (3.2)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor decision making is more coordinated because of the CBPF (2.2)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please explain your choices and/or give specific examples to illustrate your answers (optional)

2. To what extent does the CBPF respond to the needs of people affected by crisis? Please rate the following statements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF projects are informed by coordinated and participatory needs assessment/analysis (3.1)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBPF project selection and implementation processes take into account issues of gender, age, disability and other factors related to inclusiveness (3.1)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The way that CBPF projects are selected and implemented adheres to humanitarian principles (1.1)</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree somewhat</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Affected populations are involved in the project management cycle of CBPF-funded project (3.1)

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

### CBPF partners ensure that adequate and accessible mechanisms are in place for information sharing with and feedback/complaints from affected populations (3.1)

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

**Please explain your choices and/or give specific examples to illustrate your answers (optional)**

### 3. To what extent does the CBPF encourage a localized humanitarian response? (3.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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>
</table>

**Please explain your choice and/or give specific examples to illustrate your answer (optional)**

**How would you rate the following aspects of the CBPF?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timely review of proposals and disbursement of funding (1.1)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk management procedures and processes (including partner capacity assessments and risk rating) (4.2)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project monitoring, financial spot-checks and audits (4.2)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reporting requirements and processes (4.2)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational guidelines, handbooks and other CBPF guidance/tools (4.3)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please explain your choices and/or give specific examples to illustrate your answers (optional)**

### 4. To what extent is there sufficient capacity in the humanitarian system to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects? Please rate the capacity of the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) for leadership and oversight of the CBPF (4.4)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBPF Advisory Board in its consultative role and support to the HC (4.4)</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Adequate</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Don’t know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### CBPF Review Committees, both strategic and technical (4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (or UNDP in cases where UNDP is the managing agent) for management of CBPF operations and policy advice (4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Clusters for providing strategic cohesion e.g., links between cluster strategies and the CBPF; and operational support e.g. technical review of projects (4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Cross-cutting advisors or networks e.g., on issues such as gender or modalities such as cash (4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### CBPF-funded partners for implementing all aspects of the project management cycle (4.4)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Please explain your choices and/or give specific examples to illustrate your answers (optional)

5. What do you consider to be the main strengths of the CBPF?

6. What do you consider to be the main priorities for improving the CBPF?

7. Are there any other comments or suggestions you would like to make about the CBPF or about the global evaluation of the CBPFs?
Annex 10: Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations

OCHA has developed a list of all CBPF-related recommendations from previous evaluations and audits. However, this annex focuses on relevant recommendations from previous evaluations against the questions for this evaluation in order to highlight potential ongoing challenges for the team to take into consideration.

Table 6: Mapping of recommendations from previous evaluations against evaluation questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td>3. Design, implement and track benchmarks for the timeliness of CHF processes (project selection, funds disbursement and project implementation) – including to subcontracted partners- and identify opportunities for increasing their speed. a) Improving Timeliness of Project Selection and Allocation b) Improving Timeliness of disbursement from CHF account to UN Agencies, MA and to NGOs and where applicable UN agencies to NGOs</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. EGS should mount exploratory sectorial evaluations at the global level to begin a process of developing the ability to report on results/impacts and also to promote organizational learning. OCHA field offices should work with OCHA Finance to ensure swift response in urgent cases to be able to finance immediate response more consistently.</td>
<td>ERF Evaluation 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 To what extent are CBPFs able to meet newly emerging needs in a timely and flexible manner?</td>
<td>3. c) Consider using stand-by capacity to improve responsiveness and/or extending ongoing projects as a means to expand coverage of new and unmet needs.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 How do CBPFs contribute to a coordinated humanitarian response?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 To what extent do CBPFs strengthen the leadership of the HC?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 To what extent do CBPFs respond to the needs of people and communities affected by crisis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questions (Continued)</td>
<td>Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.2 To what extent are CBPFs aligned with Humanitarian Response Plans, prioritized against needs and relevant to the context?</strong></td>
<td>9. Stronger strategic discussion should take place at the HCT level on the coordination, complementarity and use of different funding sources – pooled funds and bilateral – and respective their roles. Overall, the coordination and complementarity between CHF, CERF and Peace Building Funds (PBF) also needs to be further supported, longer term projects referred to development funding mechanisms with clear positioning of each fund based on its comparative advantages. MPTFO as administrator of the Funds, with a role in their design, could support this process.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. Encourage multi-year funding in line with welcome moves towards multi-year SRPs. Authorize CHFs to contract with partners for periods longer than a year where multi-year funding exists.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. Expand the use of multi-year prioritization within a standard allocation process for chronic crisis contexts.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. More work needs to be done to improve the clarity of criteria for project selection vis a vis longer-term remedial and recovery initiatives, and to enable ERFs to adapt approval/review processes to local conditions. Specific areas for improvement should include alternative approaches to workflow that would enable larger ERFs to be more transparent.</td>
<td>ERF Evaluation 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.3 To what extent do CBPFs employ effective disbursement mechanisms and minimize transaction costs?</strong></td>
<td>7. Apply reporting requirements consistently to all CBPF partners. Failure to submit adequate or timely reports should influence a partner’s future funding eligibility. OCHA should identify the minimum eligibility and reporting requirements for recipients and ensure that they are not burdened with additional requirements.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. The MPTFO should assess the non-United Nations participating organization pilot for direct access to United Nations pooled funds by non-governmental organizations, and should propose necessary adjustments to United Nations Development Group guidance (including the preparation of a revised standard administrative arrangements and memorandum of understanding for such modality), so that they can be rolled out as an option for other funds (particularly humanitarian and transition funds) where relevant.</td>
<td>Evaluation of UNDP inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. UNDP, as a participating United Nations organization, should increase its efforts to close the backlog of old project allocations that are essentially concluded but not yet financially closed, particularly in the four countries where it is managing agent to country-based pooled funds.</td>
<td>Evaluation of UNDP inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questions (Continued)</td>
<td>Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 To what extent and in what ways do CBPFs promote the use of the best-placed partners and strengthen localization?</td>
<td>6. Identify and remove barriers to NNGO funding within CHF country-level processes so as to increase NNGO funding where practical and where capacity exists. This must be carefully balanced with maintaining merit and effectiveness as primary guiding priorities. The proportion of NNGO funding tends to decrease when CHF funding has been more limited. Realistic funding targets for NNGO funding could be set for each CBPF and tracked over time.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. On eligibility of partners, simplify the HACT to make it more suitable for humanitarian action, ensure that entities receiving funding indirectly through UN agencies and NGOs are included in a common CBPF accountability framework and, drawing on the HACT and existing donor models, establish a pre-qualification procedure for international NGOs at the global level to decrease the burden at the country level.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. Eliminate conflict of interest (real or perceived) in situations where sector/cluster leads apply for CHF funding. Possible approaches for achieving this include:</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) withdraw voting rights from sector/cluster leads on decisions that directly affect them</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) design a grievance procedure that quickly resolves disputes and maintains productive relationships within a cluster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 To what extent do CBPFs support overall resource mobilization for HRPs?</td>
<td>2. Create a strategy for communication with global stakeholders. The strategy should follow and build on explicit resource mobilization coordination across OCHA departments as well as improved CHF annual reporting.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. OCHA HQ should seek additional donors for ERFs and strongly encourage Heads of Office and HCs to do so at the country level. Donors should continue to support the CHF and where required should increase their contributions. In order to improve predictability donors should where possible make commitments to the CHF for two years rather than just one year.</td>
<td>ERF Evaluation 2013, CHF Evaluation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questions (Continued)</td>
<td>Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Are CBPFs managing risks appropriately, and is there sufficient oversight and accountability, including monitoring and reporting systems?</td>
<td>15. Fortify the M&amp;R of CHF projects with the following inputs: a) sufficient staffing b) clear performance and results indicators c) systematic reporting d) frequent field visits (including annual visits by technical experts to assess achievements by cluster / thematic range of projects) e) active involvement of local stakeholders at the community level f) performance informing future funding decisions 12. OCHA should set performance standards for project monitoring that would over a three year period rise to 100% compliance. 13. OCHA, as part of the revision of the ERF Guidelines in 2013, should more explicitly indicate that project monitoring must include assessment of the number/type of beneficiaries affected by/impacted by the project; and that end of project reports explicitly require the same data. Simple Monitoring requirements for CHF recipients should be agreed across each cluster, and should be the same for all categories of partners. The performance of CHF recipients, both strong and weak, should affect future eligibility for CHF funding. The CHF Advisory Boards should consider allocating a percentage of funding to support monitoring by the sectors, and OCHA should have sufficient senior staff in each country to co-ordinate this monitoring with the clusters and ensure that the results feed into future funding allocations. OCHA should reduce the emphasis on financial audits and focus more on monitoring and evaluation in order to assess project outcomes. Ideally, OCHA should monitor projects throughout their life cycle. OCHA offices should be creative about involving a range of actors in monitoring, such as local government structures and beneficiaries. 1. UNDP should initiate a dialogue with the United Nations Development Group to increase transparency in fund utilization further down the results delivery chain, and to demonstrate a clear United Nations comparative advantage and value for money … To contribute to that effort, the MPTFO should refine its financial and narrative reporting framework and guidelines for participating United Nations organizations.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015 ERF Evaluation 2013 ERF Evaluation 2013 CHF Evaluation 2011 CHF Evaluation 2011 ERF Evaluation 2007 ERF Evaluation 2007 Evaluation of UNDP inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation questions (Continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation questions</th>
<th>Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Has the global standardization of CBPFs (as per the Policy Instruction, Operational Handbook and Common Performance Framework) increased efficiency?</td>
<td>4. The purpose of CHFs needs to be more clearly defined. Given inherent constraints the value of CHFs in their country contexts as early response funding mechanisms should also be re-examined. New CBPF guidelines appear to focus less on rapidity but this needs to be further clarified at global and country levels.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. Where OCHA is the MA, increase discretionary financial authority to in-country HCs. This increase should coincide with streamlined (i.e. reduced) consultation with HQ FCS units for project approval.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. OCHA should clarify the focus of the ERF mechanism (where the ERF “fits”): an emergency response mechanism versus a tool to promote longer-term resilience building.</td>
<td>ERF Evaluation 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. OCHA should consolidate in New York all ERF-related functions including the HQ review and approval of grant applications, but excluding the fiscal responsibility for disbursement. Other options to the current arrangement of UNDP acting as the Management Agent should be explored in order to ensure that the most efficient management model possible is in place. These options include OCHA taking on the MA role itself, or putting CHF management services out to competitive tender.</td>
<td>ERF Evaluation 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. UNDP may consider initiating a dialogue with the United Nations Development Group for the revision of its policy and documents to properly reflect the role of the managing agent by indicating that its accountability is limited to financial and project management issues, while programmatic accountability lies with the responsible project authority (steering committee or humanitarian coordinator) and the respective non-governmental organization.</td>
<td>Evaluation of UNDP inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. UNDP needs to fast-track the implementation of its updated guidelines and responsible party agreement for the managing agent function under humanitarian funds (and update programme and operations procedures to reflect the special dispensation required for provision of such services).</td>
<td>Evaluation of UNDP inter-Agency Pooled Financing Services 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation questions (Continued)</td>
<td>Relevant recommendations from previous evaluations</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Is there sufficient capacity in the humanitarian system to manage CBPF processes and deliver CBPF projects?</td>
<td>5. Prioritize human resources. Prevent extended vacancies in critical management / key support positions and ensure thorough handover occurs during staff transitions. This will require more responsive, reliable and timely human resource planning. Consider an incentivized fast track training programme to ensure that sufficient staff are being developed within the organization to strengthen existing roster and deal with the additional responsibilities globally.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Ensure flexible CHF Funding Units. Review the structure and level of staffing for the CHF Technical Secretariats on an annual basis in order to ensure adequate financial and human resources for cost-effective execution of the Fund.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16. Create venues (e.g. online Community of Practice) and opportunities for CBPF staff members to test ideas, share tools and examine results across CBPFs.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. More work needs to be done to strengthen the roles of Review and Advisory Boards.</td>
<td>ERF Evaluation 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. OCHA should strengthen the Head of Office’s management responsibility for the ERF.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OCHA needs to make the successful management of funds like the CHF a higher corporate priority and needs to advocate more consistently both within the UN system and to its donors to ensure that it has adequate management resources for this task, especially at country level.</td>
<td>CHF Evaluation 2011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex 12: 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