
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (In number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Inclusive governance – size and composition of the Advisory Board</strong>&lt;br&gt;Number and percentage of seats at the Advisory Board by type of Stakeholder (donor, INGO, NNGO, UN)</td>
<td>The maximum number of Advisory Board’s members is 12, as per CBPF Guidelines and Advisory Board’s TOR. Each constituency represented at the MHF Advisory Board (national NGOs, international NGOs, UN agencies and donors), excluding HC, OCHA and observers, has three seats (25 per cent of the total).&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Scoring scale:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 = very low: There is no equal representation of stakeholders (NGOs, UN Agencies and donors).&lt;br&gt;2 = low: Each of the stakeholder’s type (NGOs, UN Agencies and donors) has equal representation and has 1 seat.&lt;br&gt;3 = medium: Each of the stakeholder’s type (NGOs, UN Agencies and donors) has equal representation and has more than 2 seats.&lt;br&gt;4 = high: Each of the stakeholder’s type (NGOs, UN Agencies and donors) has equal representation and has 2 or 4 seats.&lt;br&gt;5 = very high: Each of the stakeholder’s type (NGOs, UN Agencies and donors) has equal representation and has 4 seats.</td>
<td>Promote the participation of specific stakeholders as invitees in some of the AB meetings, when required. Rotation or alternate of the one observer seat for no-contributing donor will be promoted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Inclusive programming – size and composition of strategic and technical Review Committees</strong>&lt;br&gt;Number of organizations engaged in the strategic and technical review of projects through Review Committees, broken down by type (INGO, NNGO, UN Agencies, Cluster Coordinators and Co-Coordinators and OCHA)</td>
<td>Equitable representation is ensured during the strategic review within cluster/sector. For the Technical Review Committees as sectoral level representation should be inclusive: at least one cluster/sector coordinator – UN, one INGO and one NNGO (33 per cent each)&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;<strong>Scoring scale:</strong>&lt;br&gt;1 = very low: There is no equal representation of stakeholders (INGOs, NNGOs, UN agencies, cluster coordinators) and OCHA is not playing an active role in facilitating the whole review process.&lt;br&gt;2 = low: Each of the stakeholder’s type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation and has 1 seat, but OCHA is not playing an active role facilitating the whole review process.&lt;br&gt;3 = medium: Each of the stakeholder’s type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation (1 seat) and OCHA is playing an active role facilitating the whole review process.&lt;br&gt;4 = high: Each of the stakeholder’s type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation with 2 seats or more, but OCHA is not playing an active role facilitating the whole review process.&lt;br&gt;5 = very high: Each of the stakeholder’s type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation with 2 seats or more and OCHA is playing an active role facilitating the whole review process.</td>
<td>Emphasis on balanced representation. Strengthen the representation of INGOs and NNGOs in Technical Review Committees at sectoral level. Conduct refresher session with clusters and sectors on processes applied for strategic and technical reviews.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Target (In number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3  | Inclusive implementation – CBPF funding is allocated to the best-positioned actors | • By type of partner, targets for 2020 are:  
  - Only national NGO: 50 per cent  
  - NGOs (national and international): 80 per cent | Support capacity building activities among local partners for better project implementation and funding management. Continue to provide allocation strategy in close consultation with key stakeholders, including local partners, and existing coordination mechanisms. |
|    | Percentage of CBPF funding directly and indirectly\(^1\) allocated to eligible organizations (INGO, NNGO, UN, RC/RC) that are best placed to address the identified humanitarian need. | Scoring scale:  
 1 = very low: NNGO received less than 30 per cent of the allocated funding, while NGO partners received less than 60 per cent of funding.  
 2 = low: NNGO received between 30 and 40 per cent of the allocated funding, while NGO partners received between 60 and 70 per cent of funding.  
 3 = medium: NNGO received between 40 and 50 per cent of the allocated funding, while NGO partners received between 70 and 80 per cent of funding.  
 4 = high: Established targets were reached.  
 5 = very high: More than 50 per cent of funding was allocated to NNGO and, in total, more than 80 per cent of funding was allocated to NGO partner. | |
| 4  | Inclusive engagement – outreach and investment in local capacity | • Two training / workshop rounds (with multiple sessions; in English and Myanmar languages and in several locations: Sittwe, Myitkyina, Lashio, Yangon) for partners.  
  • 70 per cent of participants to awareness, training and workshops activities are national staff of international or national partners. | Continue to improve access of national partners to the country-based pooled fund and strengthen their institutional capacity to manage MHF funding in coming allocations. |
|    | Number of partner trainings and partners trained, broken down by training type and by gender. | Scoring scale:  
 1 = very low: Limited or no planned activities took place.  
 2 = low: Some planned activities took place (up to 50 per cent).  
 3 = medium: Most planned activities took place (between 50 per cent and 100 per cent), but partner feedback is not very positive (survey).  
 4 = high: All planned activities took place (100 per cent), with positive partner feedback.  
 5 = very high: Planned activities surpasses 150 per cent, with positive partner feedback. | |

\(^1\) First layer of sub-granting
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flexible assistance – CBPF funding allocated for cash assistance</td>
<td>10 per cent of funding (or $1 million) goes to cash-based activities, when possible and appropriate.</td>
<td>Cluster and allocation-specific. Cash as a response modality will be strategically prioritized and operationally considered, where appropriate, as per CBPF cash guidance note.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated to cash assistance | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: Cash is nor prioritized nor used.  
2 = low: Cash is prioritized but not used by clusters.  
3 = medium: Cash is prioritized and used, but very modestly (up to 10 per cent).  
4 = high: Cash is considered, prioritized and used when considered viable, usage between 10 per cent and 25 per cent of grant value.  
5 = very high: Cash is considered, prioritized and used when considered viable, usage above 25 per cent of grant value. | In Myanmar, support to enable the operational environment is mainstreamed, as needed, within individual project proposals. In 2020, the MHF team will monitoring the total funding allocated to commons services, including security, coordination and needs assessments. |
| 6  | Flexible operation – CBPF funding supports an enabling operational environment | 10 per cent of funding (or $1 million) is allocated to common services (security, coordination and needs assessments) | Strengthen evidence-based funding allocations through an inclusive consultation and prioritization process. Different modalities (reserve or standard) will be used according to the nature of the humanitarian needs highlighted in the allocation strategy papers. |
|    | Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated to projects that enable delivery of effective response, common services through Clusters of Logistics and ETC, coordination, etc.) | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: There is no funding made available for common services / enabling services.  
2 = low: Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, but sporadically, up to 5 per cent of all allocations.  
3 = medium: Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, but sporadically, up to 10 per cent of all allocations.  
4 = high: Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, strategically, up to 10 per cent of all allocations.  
5 = very high: Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, strategically, up to 20 per cent of all allocations. |  |
| 7  | Flexible allocation process – CBPF funding supports strategic planning and response to sudden onset emergencies | At least 80 per cent of funds allocated through Standard modality and up to 20 per cent kept in Reserve. The Fund responds to changes in humanitarian context, as well as based on funding situation allows. |  |
|    | Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated through standard and reserve allocations. | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: No Standard or no Reserve allocations.  
2 = low: Allocation modalities distribution is off target by more than 50 per cent and not well justified.  
3 = medium: Allocation modalities distribution is off target between 20 per cent and 50 per cent and not well justified.  
4 = high: Allocation modalities distribution is off target between 20 per cent and 50 per cent, but well-justified (contribution trends, sudden onset needs etc.)  
5 = very high: Allocation modalities distribution is within 20 per cent margin. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8  | **Flexible implementation – CBPF funding is successfully reprogrammed to address operational and contextual changes**  
Number of revisions processed by revision types and reasons for no-cost extension requests. | Project revision requests submitted by partners are processed within 10 working days (2 weeks).  
Number and type of revision will depend on context and associated factors.  
**Scoring scale:**  
1 = very low: Revision requests not utilized or taking more than 30 days, on average.  
2 = low: Revision requests taking between 20 and 30 days, on average, with delays not well-justified.  
3 = medium: Revision requests taking between 20 and 30 days, on average, with delays justified or due to partner inaction.  
4 = high: Revision requests taking between 10 and 20 days, on average.  
5 = very high: Revision requests processed within 10 days, on average. | Capacity building with funded partners to submit better project revision requests will be strengthened in 2020, as well as capacity building with clusters and sector and liaison with OCHA HQ for quick approval of revisions.  
Capacity building with funded partners to submit better project revision requests will be strengthened in 2020, as well as capacity building with clusters and sector and liaison with OCHA HQ for quick approval of revisions.  
Capacity building with funded partners to submit better project revision requests will be strengthened in 2020, as well as capacity building with clusters and sector and liaison with OCHA HQ for quick approval of revisions.  
Capacity building with funded partners to submit better project revision requests will be strengthened in 2020, as well as capacity building with clusters and sector and liaison with OCHA HQ for quick approval of revisions.  
Capacity building with funded partners to submit better project revision requests will be strengthened in 2020, as well as capacity building with clusters and sector and liaison with OCHA HQ for quick approval of revisions. |
| 9  | **Timely allocations – allocation processes have an appropriate duration vis-à-vis the objectives of the allocation timeline**  
Average number of working days of the allocation process from the closing date of the allocation (submission deadline) to HC approval of selected projects by allocation type (standard and reserve) | • For standard allocations: the average duration from the submission of project proposal until partner signature of the Grant Agreement is 30 working days (6 weeks)  
• For reserve allocations: the average duration from the submission of project proposal until partner signature of the Grant Agreement is 15 working days (3 weeks)  
**Scoring scale – Standard:**  
1 = very low: The average duration of all launched standard allocations is higher than 99 days.  
2 = low: The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 71 to 99 days.  
3 = medium: The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 51 to 70 days.  
4 = high: The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 31 to 50 days.  
5 = very high: The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 30 days or less.  
**Scoring scale – Reserve:**  
1 = very low: The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is higher than 45 days.  
2 = low: The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 36 to 45 days.  
3 = medium: The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 26 to 35 days.  
4 = high: The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 16 to 25 days.  
5 = very high: The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 15 days or less. | Capacity building with partners to submit better project proposals will be strengthened in 2020, including at sub-national level. Specific deadlines will be requested of partners to address comments from the sectoral review committees during technical and financial reviews.  
In addition, HFU will continue to increase cluster and sectors capacity to review projects, with specific workshops prior to any new allocation.  
In addition, HFU will continue to increase cluster and sectors capacity to review projects, with specific workshops prior to any new allocation.  
In addition, HFU will continue to increase cluster and sectors capacity to review projects, with specific workshops prior to any new allocation.  
In addition, HFU will continue to increase cluster and sectors capacity to review projects, with specific workshops prior to any new allocation.  
In addition, HFU will continue to increase cluster and sectors capacity to review projects, with specific workshops prior to any new allocation. |
<p>| 10 | <strong>Timely disbursements – payments are processed without delay</strong> | 10 calendar days (from EO clearance of grant agreement) | Global target.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (In number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11 | Average number of working days from EO signature of a proposal to first payment by type of allocation (standard/reserve). | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment is higher than 40 calendar days.  
2 = low: The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 31 to 40 calendar days.  
3 = medium: The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 21 to 30 calendar days.  
4 = high: The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 11 to 20 calendar days.  
5 = very high: The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 10 days or less. | Strengthen liaison with OCHA HQ to follow-up initial payments and subsequent disbursement with partners, particularly those national partners receiving payments through UNDP Country Office in Myanmar. |
| 11 | Timely contributions – pledging and payment of contributions to CBPFs are timely and predictable | Two thirds of annual contributions (66 per cent) committed before the end of the first half of the year. 75 per cent of contributions are paid in less than one month from pledges.  
Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: No contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year. No contribution is paid in less than one month from pledges.  
2 = low: up to 15 per cent of contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year. Up to 25 per cent of contributions are paid in less than one month from pledges.  
3 = medium: Between 15 per cent and 33 per cent of contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year. Between 25 and 50 per cent of contributions are paid in less than one month from pledges.  
4 = high: Between 33 per cent and 66 per cent of contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year. Between 50 and 75 per cent of contributions are paid in less than one month from pledges.  
5 = very high: More than two thirds (66 per cent) of annual contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year. More than 75 per cent of contributions are paid in less than one month from pledges. | Advocacy with current and new potential donors to the MHF is being implemented to receive committed / pledged contribution early in the year. Advocacy with current and new potential donors to the MHF is being implemented to receive committed / pledged contribution early in the year. |
| 12 | Efficient scale – CBPFs have a critical mass to support the delivery of the HRP | MHF allocations amount to 15 per cent of the actual 2019 HRP funding ($26.8 million).  
Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: MHF allocations amount to less than 5 per cent of the received HRP funding.  
2 = low: MHF allocations amount to between 5 per cent and 7.5 per cent of the received HRP funding.  
3 = medium: MHF allocations amount to between 7.5 per cent and 10 per cent of the received HRP funding.  
4 = high: MHF allocations amount to between 10 per cent and 15 per cent of the received HRP funding.  
5 = very high: MHF allocations amount to more than 15 per cent of the received HRP funding. | Advocacy with current and new potential donors will be reinforced to increase available funding channelled to cover 15 per cent of the actual 2019 HRP funding, at least. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13 | **Efficient prioritization – CBPF funding is prioritized in alignment with the HRP**<br>Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated toward HRP strategic objectives. | • 100 per cent of funded projects address HRP strategic priorities and the 2020 Strategy for the MHF  
• 100 per cent of funded partners report on environmental risk management measures.                                                                 | Efficient prioritization will continue in 2020, strengthening inclusiveness during consultations for defining the allocation strategy and during the selection process.  
OCHA HFU will deliver a workshop on environmental mainstreaming for MHF partners and encourage reporting on environmental assessment, mitigation and monitoring measures. |
| 14 | **Efficient coverage – CBPF funding reaches people in need**<br>Number of targeted people in need reported to have been reached by partners through the Fund’s allocations (standard/reserve) disaggregated by gender and age. | • 95 per cent of targeted people within approved project proposals have been reached by MHF funded projects, as per final narrative reports.  
• 100 per cent of project proposals include disaggregated data monitoring, including age, gender and diversity, particularly related to persons with disabilities  
• At least, 4.6 per cent of people targeted by the MHF funded projects are persons with disabilities. | OCHA HFU will improve the analysis of people reached by introducing more variables linked to sectors and geographical area. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (In number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td><strong>Efficient management – CBPF management is cost-efficient and context-appropriate</strong></td>
<td>OCHA HFU operations (direct cost) will not exceed of 3 per cent of the total contributions to the fund during the year.</td>
<td>OCHA HFU will increased MHF management performance, strengthening work planning and further investing in staff development.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | Value and percentage of HFU direct cost expenditure in proportion to total value of allocation. | Scoring scale:  
1 = **very low**: HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account more than 10 per cent of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs)  
2 = **low**: HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account between 8 per cent and 10 per cent of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).  
3 = **medium**: HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account between 5 per cent and 8 per cent of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).  
4 = **high**: HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account between 3 per cent and 5 per cent of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).  
5 = **very high**: HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account for less than 3 per cent of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs). |                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| 16 | **Efficient management – CBPF management is compliant with guidelines** | • MHF Operational Manual updated based on the latest version of global CBPF guidelines by the end of March 2020.                         | OCHA HFU will undertake a revision of the MHF Operational Manual to be ready by the end of March 2020 and will prioritize the implementation of the new Common Performance Framework.               |
|    | Level of compliance with management and operational standards required by the CBPF Global Guidelines | • Annual report is ready by 31 March 2020 (initial draft by 29 February 2020)  
• 100 per cent of allocation strategies compliant with global guidance documents and template.  
• 90 per cent of stakeholder satisfaction survey conforming that MHF helped strengthen coordination system and humanitarian response | Annual report is ready by 31 March 2020 (initial draft by 29 February 2020)  
Allocation papers compliant with global guidance documents and template |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (In number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principle 5: Accountability and Risk Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>OCHA HFU will continue to integrate a community engagement approach into workshop and refresher sessions, encouraging partners to include community participation activities into new projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Accountability to affected people – CBPF allocations are accountable to affected population</td>
<td>5 per cent of funding (or $0.5 million) goes to activities to promote the participation of affected population, as a component of funded projects.</td>
<td>100 per cent of project proposals integrate a strategy on the accountability to affected population (AAP), including complaint and feedback mechanism. 100 per cent of monitoring field visits and reports include a component of consultation with affected population.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | Percentage of CBPF funded projects that have a clear strategy to promote the participation of affected people. | | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: Less than 25 per cent of project proposals indicate AAP and less than 25 per cent of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries’ component.  
2 = low: Between 25 per cent and 50 per cent of project proposals indicate AAP and the same range of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries’ component.  
3 = medium: Between 50 per cent and 75 per cent of project proposals indicate AAP and the same range of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries’ component.  
4 = high: Between 75 per cent and 99 per cent of project proposals indicate AAP and the same range of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries’ component.  
5 = very high: All project proposals indicate AAP and all associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries’ component (if applicable). |
| 18 | Accountability and risk management for projects – CBPF funding is appropriately monitored, reported and audited | 100 per cent compliance with operational modalities, as per OCHA assurance dashboard (may not be applicable for audits falling outside of the reporting time-frame). | OCHA HFU will strengthen the capacity to revise and follow up on auditing processes to ensure compliance with the global operational manual. A management plan will be updated to follow-up on audit observations. |
|    | Rate of completion of planned monitoring, final narrative reports, final financial reports, financial spot checks and audits in accordance with operational modality applied to each grant. | | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: Less than 25 per cent compliance with operational modalities.  
2 = low: Between 25 per cent and 50 per cent compliance with operational modalities.  
3 = medium: Between 50 per cent and 75 per cent compliance with operational modalities.  
4 = high: Between 75 per cent and 99 per cent compliance with operational modalities.  
5 = very high: 100 per cent compliance with operational modalities, as per assurance dashboard. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Target (In number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 19 | Accountability and risk management of implementing partners – CBPF funding is allocated based on full utilization of accountability tools and measures | • 100 per cent of eligible partners received funding according to the partner risk level.  
• The number of eligible partners increased by 10 per cent in comparison to the number of new eligible partners in the previous year.  
• At least 50 per cent of new eligible partners are national NGOs. | This target is a bench mark (for tracking purpose). The Fund’s robust accountability system allows for funding decisions not to be taken based on risk levels, but rather determines the modality of funding based on risk. |
|  | Number of capacity assessments approved against number of capacity assessments conducted | | |
|  | Number of risks assessed based on partners performance index (PI) | | |
|  | Amount allocated per partner’s risk level | | |
| 20 | Accountability and risk management of funding – appropriate oversight and assurances of funding administered through CBPFs | • Number and status of potential and confirmed cases of diversion  
• 100 per cent of compliance with CBPFs SOPs on fraud management.  
• 100 per cent of partners have clear policies on the prevention, the reporting and the response to alleged cases of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA). | OCHA HFU will reinforce its advocacy with partners on fraud and corruption reporting and prevention, including specific training sessions with the support of OCHA HQ.  
OCHA will require partners to have operational mechanisms on safeguarding including the prevention of sexual exploitation and abuse (PSEA) |
|  | Number of potential and confirmed cases of diversion\(^2\) by Fund | | |
|  | | Scoring scale:  
1 = very low: The number of eligible partners decreases in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.  
2 = low: The number of eligible partners does not increase in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.  
3 = medium: The number of eligible partners increases from 1 per cent to 5 per cent in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.  
4 = high: The number of eligible partners increases from 5 per cent to 10 per cent in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.  
5 = very high: The number of eligible partners increases more than 10 per cent in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year. | |

\(^2\) Diversion of funds includes intentional and unintentional loss or misuse due to fraud, theft, looting or mismanagement