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FOREWORD

In 2021, the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF) remained a critical strategic tool that helped improve the humanitarian response and make a difference in the lives of people in South Sudan. The Fund ensured a quick and flexible allocation of US$68.8 million dollars under one Standard and one Reserve allocation.

The year was particularly difficult for people in South Sudan. Armed conflicts, epidemics, natural disasters, and the socio-economic effects of COVID-19 considerably worsened existing vulnerabilities in a context marked by a severe lack of access to essential services. We adapted our response and modalities quickly to ensure timeliness and flexible allocation processes, while adding value to the overall humanitarian response.

The abiding support and generosity of the Fund’s donors made this possible, and I am deeply grateful for their long-standing partnership and renewed commitment. In 2021, their contributions reached $55 million, enabling 64 humanitarian partners to provide humanitarian assistance to 1.8 million people in 42 counties. Our collective thanks go to the governments of Azerbaijan, Canada, the European Union, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, and private donors, for their continuous trust in the Fund.

I wish to acknowledge the measured and joint efforts of national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), agencies of the United Nations (UN), and cluster coordinators and members of the Advisory Board. Besides, through continued efforts to provide flexible funding for local frontline responders, we are pleased that nearly 23 per cent of the funding in 2021 went directly or indirectly to national partners, which is close to the Grand Bargain commitments target 25 per cent. The Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) continues to work devotedly to improve the Fund as an effective and inclusive tool for the humanitarian response. Together with the members of the Advisory Board, we are working at defining the Fund’s vision for 2022 and strengthening its risk management framework.

As the custodian of the Fund, I aspire to reinforce the Fund’s position while prioritizing life-saving interventions, adopting a person-centered approach, being context-driven, and remaining flexible.

In 2022, the humanitarian landscape will continue to be challenging; $1.7 billion is required to assist the 8.9 million most vulnerable people in the country. Women, children, and men in crisis in South Sudan will need the renewed generosity of donors and hard work of everyone to continue to respond effectively to their most pressing humanitarian needs.

In nine years of operations, the SSHF has mobilized and allocated $885 million dollars with the contributions of 22 donor countries and private donors, helping millions of people in need in the South Sudan.

Our funding target for this year should be almost $170 million, which represents 15 per cent of the estimated 2022 Humanitarian Response Plan funding level for this year. However, given the level of the SSHF funding in 2021, we are setting our target at $70 million.

The solidarity of all is more than ever essential to support the most vulnerable people in South Sudan, save lives and alleviate human suffering. I look forward to continuing to work closely with donor governments to support the most effective humanitarian response possible.

SARA BEYSOLOW NYANTI
Humanitarian Coordinator for South Sudan
A beneficiary collecting crop seeds from an FSL project.
Credit: CARE/Josh Estey.

We are here for the people of South Sudan. Let’s be brave enough to take risks and be agile

SARA NYANTI
HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR FOR SOUTH SUDAN
2021 in Review

HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

Humanitarian situation in 2021
The humanitarian situation for people in South Sudan worsened due to escalating internal violence and conflict, drought, rising food insecurity, flooding, disease outbreaks, and the continued effects of COVID-19 on lives and livelihoods. People already face underlying vulnerability and limited access to basic services including health care, education, safe water, hygiene and sanitation, and limited access to justice and rule of law.

The estimated number of people in need of direct humanitarian assistance increased from 8.3 people reported at the beginning of 2021 to 8.9 million people by the end of 2021. Protection concerns remain high with people affected by violence having limited access to justice and the rule of law.

Prolonged flooding
Above normal rainfall for the third consecutive year led to major floods. A reported 835,000 people were affected by severe floods between May and December 2021, 80 per cent of those affected were from Jonglei, Unity and Upper Nile states. By the end of the year, many flood-displaced people, including those who were displaced by the 2020 floods, still could not return to their homes.

The cumulative effects of recurrent flooding contributed to the destruction of farmland: 65,107 hectares of land planted with cereals have been damaged with an estimated loss of 37,624 tons and water facilities were destroyed1.

Disease outbreaks
Life-threatening diseases such as acute watery diarrhoea, cholera, and measles continued to affect thousands due to the lack of safe water and limited access to health facilities. In 2021, the number hepatitis E virus (HEV) cases increased significantly, from 564 reported between 2018-2020, to 1143 suspected cases with five deaths2.

Population movements
Continued conflict, instability and widespread flooding in the country resulted in large-scale internal displacement, as well as cross-border displacement. Over 550,000 people were newly displaced in 2021, leading to a total number of two million internally displaced people (IDPs). Some 55 per cent of all displaced people are women and girls across the country.

Because of the absence of adequate capacities and institutional preparedness to prevent and respond to internal displacement in the short-, medium, and longer-term, the IDPs continue to live in camps, crowded settlements, or hosted by the local communities.

Security and access constraints
The insecure operating environment further worsened the humanitarian crisis. Between January and December 2021, OCHA recorded 591 reported humanitarian access incidents. These ranged from violence against humanitarian personnel and assets to operational interference.

In 2021, five aid workers lost their lives while delivering humanitarian assistance and services. Due to insecurity, 322 aid workers were relocated. Humanitarian warehouses and facilities were targeted during the violence and humanitarian supplies were

---


looted, significantly affecting response operations in conflict-affected and food-insecure areas.

**Food Insecurity and malnutrition**

Food insecurity increased in 2021. The prolonged flood eroded previous gains achieved by improved access.

The Food Security Livelihoods Sectoral Analysis estimates that 8.3 million people (including refugees) are expected to experience severe food insecurity by the peak of the lean season (May – July) in 2022, an increase of seven per cent above the 7.7 million people in need in 2021.

Acute malnutrition remained a significant problem in South Sudan. The level of malnutrition has increased by about two million people including 1.3 million children under-five and 676,000 pregnant and lactating women. The main contributing factors to high malnutrition rates included high levels of food insecurity, widespread conflict and insecurity, population displacement, poor access to services due to poor infrastructure, high morbidity and hygiene and sanitation conditions.

**VISION STATEMENT**

South Sudan faces increasing humanitarian needs, driven by internal conflicts and localized violence. This insecurity drives large-scale internal displacement, resulting in deteriorating food security and high levels of malnutrition. Prolonged flooding, poor economic performance and the COVID-19 pandemic exacerbate humanitarian needs.

As one of the first contributors to the country’s Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), the SSHF was instrumental in addressing urgent food insecurity in 2021. The Fund’s flexibility and timeliness helped respond to the widespread flooding and HEV outbreak quickly. The Fund enhanced psychosocial and referral support for survivors of gender-based violence (GBV) and promoted the centrality of protection as a priority throughout the projects’ cycle.

Looking ahead to 2022, the SSHF will strengthen an enabling operational environment, by securing access of the humanitarian actors to the affected areas.

The Fund will maintain its localization agenda by providing flexible funding in a strategic and principled manner to local frontline responders.

Once again, the Fund will ensure coordinated, inclusive and participatory processes, which remain unique in the South Sudan humanitarian context.

Furthermore, the SSHF will continue to encourage the complementarity with other funding mechanisms including the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF), Health Pooled Fund, and the Rapid Response Fund (RRF). This will help the Fund to promote synergies and avoid duplications.
Rising food insecurity due to COVID-19, local and sub-national violence, flooding, general inflation, and increase in the prices of food items.

CERF RR allocated $7 million to address the needs of 221,600 people affected by food insecurity in 35 counties using the cash assistance modalities.

Increase in number of people in need of humanitarian assistance from 7.5 million in 2019 to 8.3 million people as confirmed in the 2021 HRP.

CERF RR allocated $10 million to scale-up the humanitarian response in six priority counties.

Increase of the food insecurity affecting 872,000 people in South Sudan as per the revised IPC figures.

CERF RR allocated $11 million to scale up the humanitarian response in 11 counties.

Worsening humanitarian situation coupled with underfunded HRP.

CERF UFE allocated $11 million to scale-up the humanitarian response in 11 counties.

Deterioration of humanitarian situation in due to surging floods, escalation of internal violence, and disease outbreaks.

CERF UFE allocated $1.5 million to respond to the needs of persons with disabilities in Aweil South and Tonj North counties.

Escalation of humanitarian needs due to surging floods, internal violence, and disease outbreak in additional 20 counties.

CERF RR allocated $13 million to replenish core pipelines and support the implementation of critical life-saving activities in 20 counties.

3. Central Equatoria (Juba, Kajo-keji, Lainya, Morobo, Terekeka, Yi), Northern Bahr el Ghazal (Aweil Centre, Aweil East, Aweil North, Aweil South, Aweil West), Upper Nile (Balti, Fashoda, Longachuk, Luakpiny/Nasar, Maban, Maiwut, Malakal, Manyo, Melut, Panyikang, Renk, Ulang), Western Bahr el Ghazal (Jur River, Raja, Wau), Lakes (Awerial, Cueibet, Rumbek Centre, Rumbek East, Rumbek North, Wulu, Yirol East, Yirol West), Unity (Rubkona/Bentiu) States.

4. Akobo, Aweil South, Tonj East, Tonj North, Tonj South, Pibor.

5. Akobo, Ayod, Bor South, Duk, Pibor, Twic East, Baliet, Tonj East, Tonj North, Tonj South, Aweil South.

6. Rubkona, Guit, Mayom, Leer, Mayendit, Koch, Panyijar, Fashoda, Nasir, Malakal, Panyikang, Melut, Ayod, Canal/Pigi, Fangak, Twic East, Tonj East, Rumbek North, Rumbek East, Cubiet.
**2021 IN NUMBERS**

$55M
CONTRIBUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Allocation in US$ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECHO</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (through UNF)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$68.8M
ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Allocation in US$ million</th>
<th>People Assisted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JONGLEI</td>
<td>$20.3M</td>
<td>517,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPPER NILE</td>
<td>$8.1M</td>
<td>227,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITY</td>
<td>$13M</td>
<td>317,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WARRAP</td>
<td>$5.9M</td>
<td>327,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NORTHERN BAHR EL GHAZAL</td>
<td>$3.3M</td>
<td>102,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAKES</td>
<td>$7.7M</td>
<td>38,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN BAHR EL GHAZAL</td>
<td>$2.3M</td>
<td>24,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTERN EQUATORIA</td>
<td>$7.9M</td>
<td>268,500 people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL EQUATORIA</td>
<td>$7.7M</td>
<td>38,500 people</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3
PEOPLE ASSISTED

1.8M
**1.1M**
PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY

364K
Boys

42.4K Boys with disability

394.6K
Girls

45.9K Girls with disability

621.9K
Women

72.4K Women with disability

457.7K
Men

53.3K Men with disability

in thousands of people

**The Annual Report will use the number of people targeted as a proxy for the number of people reached and henceforth the term people assisted will be used. This approach allows for more timely global reporting as the final data on people reached only becomes available over a year after the allocation of CBPF funds. The reported outcomes will be available on the https://cbpf.data.unocha.org/ and the CBPFs will continuously monitor if targets are reached.**

** Figures for people assisted may include double counting as people often receive aid from multiple clusters. The maximum methodology was applied by the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund to estimate the number of people assisted in 2021. This means that for each county the cluster that targeted the maximum number of people is used as the total number of people assisted.

ALLOCATIONS BY CLUSTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Allocation in US$ million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and NFI’s</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food security and livelihoods</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Coordination/Management</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination of Common Services</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

64 PARTNERS

95 PROJECTS

$11.1M
National NGOs
25 Partners
29 Projects

$37.6M
International NGOs
32 Partners
52 Projects

$20.1M
United Nations
7 Partners
14 Projects
While the SSHF remained a key funding mechanism to address critical humanitarian needs, the total contributions to the Fund declined in the last two years from $89 million in 2018 to $66 million in 2020 to $55 million in 2021.

Compared with 2020, Canada, Germany Ireland and Switzerland increased their contributions; ECHO and Luxembourg maintained the same level of their funding; the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden renewed their commitment with a slight decrease of their contribution.

The United Kingdom decreased its contribution by 62 per cent. Besides the Republic of Korea, three more countries Australia, Belgium and Denmark changed their global geographical areas of interest. Therefore, the SSHF was not under their radar for new contributions in 2021.

Three donors, Canada, Germany and Switzerland each made multi-year commitment to the Fund totalling $30 million.

The Fund received nearly 62 per cent ($34.2 million) of the contributions during the first half of the year. The end of 2020 contributions, $35.5 million carry over, jointly with the early 2021 ones were crucial as they allowed to launch a large Standard Allocation (SA) of $49.5 million in the second quarter of the year.

Among the 12 donors, eight provided the SSHF between 18 and 100 per cent of their total contribution to the 2021 HRP, demonstrating that the SSHF is a key funding instrument in the humanitarian response.

In 2021, the SSHF accounted for approximately 4.6 per cent of all secured funding for the HRP ($1.15 billion). The Fund was ranked eighth globally in terms of contributions received.
• Germany was the largest contributor to the SSHF, reaching $19.8 million with three deposits, 36 per cent of total contributions.

• The Netherlands remains a consistent donor contributing $9.7 million. In the past four years their contributions have reached $41.2 million.

• Norway has contributed $5.8 million in 2021. Over the past five years Norway contributed $40 million to the SSHF.

• Although Sweden’s contribution dropped by 26 per cent in 2021 compared to 2020, Sweden remains among the top 5 donors of the SSHF over the past five years.

• With two contributions amounting to $3.6 million in 2021, Canada increased once more its support to the Fund, representing nearly 14 per cent of all contributions during the year.

• While the United Kingdom decreased its contribution to $3.4 million in 2021, it remains the biggest contributor to the Fund over the past five years totaling $87.8 million.

• Switzerland made two contributions of $2.2 million in 2021, a considerable increase of 54 per cent from 2020.

Donors with Multi-Year Contribution Agreements

- Germany: $23.3M (2021 - 2024)
- Switzerland: $5.5M (2021 - 2024)
- Canada: $0.8M (2021 - 2022)
Allocations overview

STRATEGIC STATEMENTS

In 2021, the SSHF allocated $68.8 million through two allocations targeting 1.8 million people in need, 55 per cent of whom were women and girls: a Standard Allocation of $49.5 million in June, and a Reserve allocation of $19.3 million in October.

**Standard Allocation: Scale up food, protection, and COVID-19 response**

With the launch of the 2021 HRP, the SSHF launched a standard allocation (SA) of $49.5 million in June to scale-up critical humanitarian assistance across nine clusters. It also helped mitigate the spread and effects of the COVID-19 pandemic in highly affected areas.

The allocation enabled 54 partners to respond to the needs of 1.7 million of the most vulnerable people including 399,000 people in IDP camps or informal settlements, experiencing limited access to basic services.

The multi-cluster approach ensured an integrated response and enhanced complementarity among partners.

**Reserve Allocation: Response to flooding, violence and HEV outbreak**

Following the rapid deterioration of the humanitarian situation due to increased violence, massive flooding and HEV outbreak, the SSHF launched a reserve allocation (RA) of $19.3 million in October, availing timely support to address the increased humanitarian needs in 19 counties.

The deteriorating situation in Tambura County led to a dramatic increase in displacement. The RA provided $8.1 million for basic services to the most vulnerable people fleeing the violence in Tambura and displaced in neighboring counties of Ezo, Nagero, Nzara and Yambio.

The funding ensured the continuity of the response in locations affected by the flood with additional $9.1 million.

The remaining $2.8 million helped respond to the HEV outbreak in Bentiu, covering critical funding gap in health and WASH.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2021 ALLOCATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$49.5M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$19.3M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Allocations Overview**

- **Total Allocations**: $68.8M
- **Standard Allocation**: $49.5M
- **Reserve Allocation**: $19.3M

**Allocation by Type**

- **$31.1M** for S01
- **$22M** for S02
- **$15.7M** for S03

**People Assisted by Type**

- **Host Community**: 0.9M
- **Internally Displaced Persons**: 0.8M
- **Returnees**: 0.1M
- **Refugees**: 0.001M

**People Assisted by Cluster**

- **Health**: 1.5M
- **Food Security**: 1.2M
- **WASH**: 0.8M
- **Shelter/NFIs**: 0.5M
- **Protection**: 0.4M
- **CCCM**: 0.4M
- **Nutrition**: 0.3M
- **Education**: 0.1M

**Allocation Flow by Partner Type**

- **INGOs**: $37.6M (60% direct implementations, 92% sub-granting)
- **UN Agencies**: $20.1M (30%)
- **NNGOs**: $11.1M (10%)
HIGHLIGHTED ACHIEVEMENTS

PROMOTING LOCALIZATION

In line with the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) and the Grand Bargain commitments on localization, the SSHF strives to provide flexible funding in a strategic and principled manner for local frontline responders.

In 2021, the Fund continued to advance localization by ensuring that response is as local as possible and as international as necessary. The Fund channelled nearly 16 per cent of funding ($11.1 million) to 25 national NGOs (NNGOs) to implement 29 projects in 27 counties.

The SSHF ensured inclusive governance with equal representation of the constituencies, NNGOs included, in the Advisory Board (AB) and in project review committees.

The Fund enhanced inclusion of NNGOs in coordination mechanisms by encouraging the participation of all NGOs in cluster coordination mechanisms, as a condition of eligibility to receive funding.

In 2021, the SSHF reached out to NNGOs through several activities and events organized by the Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU). The latter organized six induction sessions on the overall CBPF processes, focusing on strengthening the HF partners capacity in proposal writing, effective implementation, and risk management. In addition, the Fund hosted bilateral clinics for partners upon request.

The SSHF assurance activities (monitoring, reporting and audit) have been an opportunity to ensure capacity development for national partners through the feedback provided on strengths and weaknesses at the institutional and project implementation levels.

EFFECTIVE PROGRAMMING

KEY PRINCIPLES FOR INCLUSIVE PROGRAMMING

Strengthening Accountability to Affected People

The SSHF promoted accountability to affected people (AAP) by ensuring that funded projects are incorporating activities that permit meaningful participation of the affected people throughout the programme cycle (assessment, planning, design, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation).

According to the project proposals the 64 funded partners are expected to establish 297 community complaints and feedback mechanisms across all the implementation sites.

During the field monitoring the HFU has been verifying the existence and efficiency of the mechanisms. The Fund recommended improvements, such as adapting the proposed tools and mechanisms to the operational context to ensure access of the targeted population when needed.

Promoting the Centrality of Protection

The response to protection needs was prioritized in both allocations. 18 per cent of the allocations went to protection activities, ensuring complementarity through a comprehensive package with other clusters such as Water Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) and Shelter and Non-Food Items (S/NFIs). The funded interventions included training of 4,257 humanitarian staff on protection guiding principles.

Addressing gender equality and responding to Gender Based Violence (GBV)

The SSHF strengthened its overall efforts to improve Gender Equality and respond to Gender-Based Violence (GBV) through specific funded activities:

- 93 per cent of the projects are planned to contribute to gender equality;
- 18,397 GBV survivors were reached through the case management services;
- 117,023 people were assisted with GBV preventive activities and awareness sessions;
- 185 humanitarian workers were trained on safety audits that evaluates site-level GBV risks.

Including Persons with Disabilities

According to the 2021 HRP, one million people were targeted for an inclusive humanitarian response (15 per cent of the targeted population).

18,397 GBV survivors
Provided with specialized protection service and 117,023 people targeted with GBV prevention activities and awareness raising.

$66.3M or 96% of project funded by CBPFs contributed to gender equality

SSHF funded projects supported access to Health services for 8,702 persons with disabilities
The number of persons with disabilities targeted by the SSHF funded projects in 2021 increased by 13.3 per cent compared with 2020. 214,000 persons with disability have been benefiting from the various services provided under the 2021 funded projects. Particularly, 8,702 people were reached through the health, education and WASH implemented activities (such as ensuring that WASH facilities and distribution points are accessible to the persons with disabilities).

**Areas of Contextual Programming**

**Advancing Cash and Voucher Assistance**
The SSHF continued to promote Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA) in humanitarian response where relevant. While opportunities for cash programming remains limited in most parts of South Sudan due to market accessibility and functionality, some cash-based interventions present opportunities for scale up and complementarity with in-kind response where appropriate.

In 2021, the Fund encouraged partners to consider the unconditional cash transfer modality when the context allowed considering security and market conditions. Therefore, the Fund’s cash activities increased to nearly three per cent of the allocated resources, from one per cent in 2020. Some 92,256 people were reached with cash-based assistance, including multi-purpose cash (MPC) transfers, cash for work, NFIs vouchers, and cash support to GBV survivors.

**Improving Humanitarian Access**
The SSHF improved humanitarian access to vulnerable people in flood affected areas and other hard to reach areas. At a time when road networks had been cut by floods and large swaths remained inaccessible due to poor road infrastructure, the SSHF allocated $4.8 million to three logistics projects. The allocation improved humanitarian access by supporting the transportation of 15,250 metric tonnes of relief supplies to priority locations and facilitating the movement of about 30,000 humanitarian workers to various destinations across the country. In addition, the allocation prevented further deterioration of humanitarian situation in Bentiu, Rubkona county, at a time when floods were widespread by supporting the rehabilitation of road networks and dykes.

**Enhancing complementarity with CERF and other funding streams**
To ensure the delivery of a stronger collective humanitarian response, the SSHF strives to work in synergy with other sources of funding, such as CERF. As the HFU coordinates CERF and SSHF allocations at country level, the unit leveraged complementarity between the two Pooled Funds, using the comparative advantages of each mechanism to provide a more comprehensive and coherent response.

In 2021, jointly the CERF and SSHF allocated $111 million to support the scale-up of the humanitarian response to food insecurity, address underfunded emergencies and facilitate the provision of services to people affected by the floods.

Furthermore, the SSHF coordinated with other funding mechanisms such as the RRF to ensure complementarity and avoid potential duplications.
SECTOR/CLUSTER ACHIEVEMENTS

**Allocations Overview**

- **1 multi-sectoral assessment to guide humanitarian response planning and programming.**
- **922,000 people in need received vegetable kits through direct distribution.**
- **616,000 IDPs reached through Camp management services.**
- **SSHF allocated $12.1M to enable 20 partners implementing health-related activities in 23 counties.**
- **SSHF allocated $14.3M to support access to Safe water for 615,000 people.**
- **313,000 people received life-saving NFIs.**
- **SSHF contributed with 8% of the total funding to nutrition services, benefitting 48,000 People (women & children under 5).**
- **1 multi-sectoral assessment to guide humanitarian response planning and programming.**
- **11,000 dignity kits were distributed to women and girls.**
- **72,800 children supported with access to education.**
- **922,000 people in need received vegetable kits through direct distribution.**
- **$4.8M allocated to facilitate the delivery of essential humanitarian services.**

**Sector/Cluster Achievements**

- **616,000 IDPs reached through Camp management services.**
- **SSHF allocated $12.1M to enable 20 partners implementing health-related activities in 23 counties.**
- **SSHF allocated $14.3M to support access to Safe water for 615,000 people.**
- **313,000 people received life-saving NFIs.**
- **SSHF contributed with 8% of the total funding to nutrition services, benefitting 48,000 People (women & children under 5).**
- **72,800 children supported with access to education.**
- **922,000 people in need received vegetable kits through direct distribution.**
- **$4.8M allocated to facilitate the delivery of essential humanitarian services.**

**Allocations Overview**

- **1 multi-sectoral assessment to guide humanitarian response planning and programming.**
- **922,000 people in need received vegetable kits through direct distribution.**
- **616,000 IDPs reached through Camp management services.**
- **SSHF allocated $12.1M to enable 20 partners implementing health-related activities in 23 counties.**
- **SSHF allocated $14.3M to support access to Safe water for 615,000 people.**
- **313,000 people received life-saving NFIs.**
- **SSHF contributed with 8% of the total funding to nutrition services, benefitting 48,000 People (women & children under 5).**
- **72,800 children supported with access to education.**
- **922,000 people in need received vegetable kits through direct distribution.**
- **$4.8M allocated to facilitate the delivery of essential humanitarian services.**
Lessons learned and best practices

Established in 2012, the SSHF has had a significant funding level to address critical humanitarian needs in a timely and efficient manner.

The year 2020 was exceptional for the Fund, both in terms of the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic and Managing Agent (MA) transition of the SSHF from UNDP to OCHA. The transition exercise between 2019 and 2021 helped identify key challenges and opportunities to strengthen the Fund’s internal accountability and control mechanisms.

Accountability and risk management
In 2020, as part of the MA role transition from UNDP to OCHA, the OCHA HFU reviewed the financial capacity of the existing partners. The exercise revealed the need to review the risk rating of the partners to respond to OCHA CBPFs requirements. As a result, in 2021, the risk level of 43 partners was updated and 21 partners were made ineligible for future SSHF funding. Although this was a standalone exercise, it helped the Fund to strengthen its accountability framework in such a high-risk operational context. It provided learning opportunities to track the partners’ performance and pro-actively engage with partners to address risk-related issues and compliance concerns.

For the second capacity assessment (CA) round conducted by OCHA in 2021, following the MA transition, the HFU reviewed the global CA module to adopt a threshold for the financial capacity. Therefore, as part of the desk review, prospective partners must get 60 per cent and above on the financial component, otherwise they cannot proceed with the CA process.

Multi-cluster programming
Between 2012 and 2019, all the SSHF funded projects followed a single cluster approach for a maximum duration of implementation of six months.

In 2021, the SSHF promoted more effective programming by allocating 61 per cent of its resources to multi-sector approach, in comparison with 49 per cent in 2020. This ensures that the limited resources delivered the best outcomes through an integrated package of services and helped enhance cross-sectoral coordination.

Project review process
To expedite the review process, the Fund limited the Technical Review Committee (TRC) to Cluster Coordinator or Co-Coordinator and the HFU.

The GenCap advisor reviewed the recommended projects to ensure gender analysis are at the core of the needs identification and that the Gender and Age Marker is accurately reflected in the project proposals.

Committee members agreed to maintain professionalism, integrity, and confidentiality throughout the review process by signing an SSHF code of conduct in every allocation. Nevertheless, in addition to the connection problems during the online review, some challenges were identified during the allocation process. Not all members were available during the allocation, the lack of technical expertise of some representatives and the lack of preparation before the review committees’ meetings. These factors meant project reviews took longer.

Furthermore, it was observed that several NGOs and UN agencies were members of several committees. From an accountability perspective, this is likely to feed the perception that these actors have an influence on the recommended projects for funding
In 2021, John decided to return to his home town. However, he found out that his house was occupied by another family who refused to return the house.

Access to land and property is a seriously contested issue in Upper Nile in South Sudan, as years of conflict have weakened the judicial system and there are limited services available to support claims.

Additionally, many families no longer have official papers to their land or property, lost either during displacement or damaged through the years of living in cramped settlements.

John’s case is only one out of thousands, as disputes in relation to housing, land and property rights are rife throughout Upper Nile. With the SSHF, Humanitarian and Development Consortium in partnership with the Danish Refugee Council helped through static and mobile Legal Aid Clinics, informing people of their legal rights, providing legal counselling on specific issues and legal administrative assistance when required.

Addressing the land issue is key to supporting continued peace in Upper Nile, helping families rebuild their lives and communities to recover together from previous conflict.

Not knowing how to resolve this issue on his own, John approached a Legal Aid Clinic where he learned of his rights and was given financial support to help resolve the case. As the current occupant had made several renovations to the house, part of the resolution was to compensate the occupant for this work.

"I am now able to move back into my home safely and with dignity, without fear of violence as the dispute was settled peacefully and according to recognized laws," John said.

Note: John real name is changed to protect his identity.
Fund performance

The SS HF measures its performance against a management tool that provides a set of indicators to assess how well a Fund performs in relation to the policy objectives and operational standards set out in the CBPF Global Guidelines. This common methodology enables management and stakeholders involved in the governance of the Funds to identify, analyze and address challenges in reaching and maintaining a well-performing CBPF.

CBPFs embody the fundamental humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence, and function according to a set of specific principles: Inclusiveness, Flexibility, Timeliness, Efficiency, Accountability and Risk Management.

Principle 1  **INCLUSIVENESS**
A broad range of humanitarian partner organizations (UN agencies and NGOs) participates in CBPF processes and receive funding to implement projects addressing identified priority needs.

Principle 2  **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.

Principle 3  **TIMELINESS**
CBPFs allocate funds and save lives as humanitarian needs emerge or escalate.

Principle 4  **EFFICIENCY**
Management of all processes related to CBPFs enables timely and strategic responses to identified humanitarian needs. CBPFs seek to employ effective disbursement mechanisms, minimizing trans-action costs while operating in a transparent and accountable manner.

Principle 5  **RISK MANAGEMENT**
CBPFs manage risk and effectively monitor partner capacity and performance. CBPFs utilize a full range of accountability tools and measures.
Host community members collecting water from a newly rehabilitated borehole in Tonj South.

Credit: IOM/Liatile Putsoa
**PRINCIPLE 1**

**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.

---

Target

Two UN agencies, two NNGOs, two INGOs and two Donors.

Results

Score = 3 - High:

In addition to the Chairman (Humanitarian Coordinator), and permanent member (OCHA Head of Office), the 2021 AB was composed of eight (8) members: two NNGOs (Titi Foundation and IMPACT), two INGOs (Mercy Corps and Save the Children), two UN Agencies (UNHCR and UNICEF), and two donors (Norway and Netherlands). As per 2020 operational manual the USA - Bureau for Humanitarian (BHA), as the biggest contributing donor to the HRP in South Sudan, was added as an observer.

Analysis and follow up

In line with the SSHF operational manual, the AB membership was renewed in the beginning of the year:

- The election of the NGOs members was organized by the NGO Forum of South Sudan;
- The donors’ representatives were nominated by the group of humanitarian donors contributing to the SSHF;
- The UN agencies were nominated by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC).

All AB members participated (virtually or physically) in the five board meetings organized in 2021. During the HC’s mandate turnover, three Heads of UN agencies fulfilled the HC’s role as custodian of the Fund, WFP, FAO and UNHCR.

In 2022, the OCHA HFU will ensure that:

- The AB members carry out consultations with their respective constituencies and keep them informed on allocation strategies and priorities of the SSHF;

- The board’s composition is reviewed in line with the revised Global guidelines to include a Gender advisor and ensure the participation of the Women and/or Girls Organizations.

---

**COMPOSITION OF ADVISORY BOARD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UN representatives</th>
<th>INGOs representatives</th>
<th>NNGOs representatives</th>
<th>Donor representatives</th>
<th>HC representative</th>
<th>OCHA representative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nyaruach accessing health services in Bentiu IDPs site.
Credit: OCHA/John Ndiku.
INCLUSIVE PROGRAMMING
The review committees of the Fund have the appropriate size and a balanced representation of different partner constituencies and cluster representatives.

Target
• Full composition of the Strategic Review Committee (SRC): 5 members from UN, NNGO, INGO, Cluster and OCHA HFU.
• Full composition of the Technical Review Committee (TRC): 2 members including the Cluster coordinators and OCHA HFU staff.

Results
Score = 3 - Medium:
For the SA, the SRCs maintained equable participation of one representative of each constituency (1 UN Agency, 1 NNGO and 1 INGO) in addition to the respective Cluster Coordinator or Co-coordinator and an OCHA HFU staff.

For the RA the SRCs composition was limited to the Cluster coordinator or Co-Coordinator and an OCHA HFU staff.

Analysis and follow-up
The members of the SRCs were nominated by the Strategic Advisory Group (SAG) of each cluster based on the technical expertise needed for the exercise.
All ten clusters had equal representation during the review process, except for the Protection Cluster which was extended to representatives of the different sub-clusters (Child protection, General Protection, GBV, and Mine Action).

Cluster coordinators and the OCHA HFU reviewed the multi-cluster projects based on the feedback received from the SRCs’ members.

The SRCs had inclusive representation, in line with the revised 2021 Operational Manual.

In collaboration with the cluster coordinators, the OCHA HFU will:
• Ensure that the NNGOs representatives have the needed technical expertise to carry-on their role in a professional and efficient way.
• Provide better and more detailed feedback to partners on GMS regarding rejected projects.
• Ensure the participation of new and diversified actors.
INCLUSIVE IMPLEMENTATION

CBPF funding is allocated to the best-positioned actors, leveraging the diversity and comparative advantage of eligible organizations.

**Target**

60 per cent of the funds are allocated to NGOs (INGOs and NNGOs) if best-positioned actors.

**Results**

Score = 5 - Very High:

The SSHF allocated $68.8 million to best placed partners to address humanitarian needs in South Sudan – at least 72 per cent ($49.3 million) to NGOs and 28 per cent ($19.5 million) to UN agencies.

**Analysis and follow-up**

The SSHF ensured that funding is accessible to the best-positioned actors, including national and international organizations, and UN Agencies, leveraging comparative advantages and encouraging collective ownership of the response.

In 2021, almost 23 per cent of total funding was allocated, directly and indirectly, to NNGOs. The level of direct funding to NNGOs decreased by 10 per cent in comparison with 2020. This is partially linked to the partners’ capacity risk re-assessment conducted by the HFU in 2021. As a result of the exercise, 21 NNGOs became ineligible for SSHF funding and 43 more organizations became of a high risk with limited access to funding.

For the UN agencies, the level of funding granted increased by three per cent, as they were best positioned to implement specific activities such as the replenishment of the clusters’ core pipelines and the infrastructure projects.

Looking ahead to 2022, the SSHF will maintain its localization agenda by providing flexible funding in a strategic and principled manner to local frontline responders.

Besides providing an increased share of direct funding to NNGOs, the Fund will seek to support enhanced coordination with local organizations and encourage consortia under the SSHF projects.
**INCLUSIVE ENGAGEMENT**

Resources are invested by OCHA HFU in supporting the capacity of local and national NGO partners within the scope of CBPF strategic objectives partners within the scope of CBPF strategic objectives.

**Target**
- 10 training rounds for partners focused on developing their capacity to manage and implement SSHF projects.
- Over 200 partner staff trained on various SSHF issues.

**Results**

Score = 4 High:
- Six trainings were conducted for SSHF partners: 353 participated in the trainings (56 per cent from National, 39 per cent from INGOs and 5 per cent from UN agencies).
- 162 staff of NGOs were trained on CBPF related processes.

**Analysis and follow-up**

In 2021, OCHA HFU conducted six trainings covering the different processes and procedures of the OCHA managed Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs). Prior to the launch of an allocation, the OCHA HFU organized on-line trainings on proposal writing. The two trainings organized during the year, were an opportunity to stress on the budget requirements post the MA transition to OCHA.

During the implementation period, the SSHF implementing partners benefited from another list of trainings capturing all the aspects of the accountability framework (monitoring, reporting and audit) and the CBPF procedures on Protection on Sexual Exploitation (PSEA) and Fraud. In addition, the HFU made available online Grant Management Clinics (GMS) for partners.

Besides, a targeted training was organized for the newly assessed partners who joined the list of eligible partners in 2021.

Furthermore, the HFU was approached to take part in two trainings organized by the GBV sub-cluster targeting 37 Women-led organizations in South Sudan. It was an opportunity to present the Fund and explain the eligibility process to prospective partners.

OCHA HFU will continue to conduct similar trainings before future allocations and provide technical support to partners in 2022, considering the frequent staff turnover in partners’ organizations.
5  INCLUSIVE RESPONSE

CBPF funded projects have a clear strategy to promote the participation of affected people (AAP).

Target
All the SSHF funded projects are required to indicate how AAP will be implemented.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High:

All the SSHF funded projects were required to include an AAP component. At least, 88 funded projects embedded AAP fully in their projects. This includes clear communication channels, complaint feedback mechanism and inclusion of affected people in the project design. The remaining seven funded projects partially included AAP as they lacked involvement of the affected people in the project design. By the end of 2021, 93 per cent of the projects considered AAP across the programme cycle.

Analysis and follow-up
The SSHF remained committed in ensuring that communities are involved in decisions and humanitarian interventions that directly affect their lives. The Fund emphasized on the inclusion and involvement of the affected people in the whole project management cycle. Specific questions were included in the project’s proposal score card to ensure that AAP is captured as a key element to recommend a project for funding.

Although all funded projects include an AAP component, during the projects’ monitoring, most of the interviewed people highlighted a minimum consultation conducted by the funded partners at the project’s design stage. However, the overall lack of functional complaint mechanisms was identified. Others were not yet put in place during the monitoring visits.

With the progress made in 2021, more remains to be done in 2022 to improve community engagement and effort on AAP. There is a need to ensure mechanisms included in the funded projects are in place, accessible and functional, to inform management decisions.

The SSHF will continue to encourage partners to engage in early consultations during the project’s design with local authorities and community leaders or chiefs.

2 The project includes the provision of accessible and functioning feedback and/or compliant mechanisms for assisted people.
1 The project partially includes the provision of accessible and functioning feedback and/or compliant mechanisms for assisted people.
0 The project does not include the provision of accessible and functioning feedback and/or compliant mechanisms for assisted people.
Target
Cash as a response modality will be strategically prioritized and operationally considered, where appropriate, as per CBPF cash guidance note. 10 per cent of the allocations to include cash-based programming.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High:
In 2021, 2.6 per cent of SSHF funding was channelled through CVA; 27.8 per cent using the MPC modality.

Analysis and follow-up
Out of 95 projects funded in 2021, 17 projects considered cash transfer as a modality for an overall budget of $1.8 million ($0.9 million under the SA and $0.9 million under the RA) representing 2.6 per cent compared to 1 per cent in 2020).

In addition to the MPC ($0.5 million), three sectors have integrated the cash transfer modality in their interventions: S/NFIs ($0.2 million), Protection ($0.2 million) and food security ($0.9 million).

While the 2021 allocation strategies promoted the cash transfer modality, several parameters limited the partners’ prioritization. Challenges reported by partners include:

- Low market viability;
- Limited capacity of financial services to expand their operations due to security and access constraints;
- Inflation rate resulting in discrepancies between data from market assessments and the value of inputs during project implementation;
- Weak presence of financial services and mobile money operators;
- Protection issues raised by women assisted by funded projects on increase of domestic violence and insecurity cases, when they are the direct recipients of the cash assistance.

In 2022, OCHA HFU will engage with the Cash Working Group in the development of SSHF allocation strategies to ensure an expansion of the cash programmes funded through the SSHF allocations as well as the participation of the coordinator in the review of the project proposals including cash components.
FLEXIBLE OPERATION
CBPF Funding supports projects that improve the common ability of actors to deliver a more effective response.

Target
Up to 10 per cent of allocations support coordination, common services and other support services.

Results
Score = 4 - High:

In 2021, nearly eight per cent ($5.5 million) of the total allocation were channelled to logistics ($4.8 million) as well as to coordination and common services ($0.7 million) activities. The remaining allocated funds were prioritized for direct humanitarian assistance.

The SSHF funded three logistics projects implemented by IOM and WFP. The funding covered the rehabilitation of vital infrastructure works urgently needed to improve access of the humanitarian actors to those in need. The allocated funds helped facilitate the delivery of essential humanitarian services to non-accessible areas by funding the cargo transport.

In 2022, as part of its role to ensure an effective response of the humanitarian actors in the field, the SSHF will prioritize urgently required and critical preparedness and early action interventions when needed.

Analysis and follow-up
The Fund remained flexible in supporting enabling activities that improve the collective ability of partners on the ground to deliver a more effective response.

Women collect crop seeds from an FSL project.
Credit: CARE/Josh Estey
**8 FLEXIBLE ALLOCATION PROCESS**

CBPF funding supports strategic planning and response to needs identified in the HRP’s and sudden onset emergencies through the most appropriate modalities.

### Target

- At least 60 per cent of funds allocated through Standard modality and up to 40 per cent kept in Reserve.
- 100 per cent of the total amount allocated is aligned with sectors and geographical areas prioritized in the respective Allocation Strategy Papers.

### Results

Score = 5 - Very High:

In 2021, the SSHF allocated $68.8 million: $49.5 million using the standard modality and the remaining amount of $19.3 million through the reserve modality.

In that manner, funding for the SA represented 72 per cent of total SSHF funding in 2021, compared to 56 per cent in 2020. The remaining 28 per cent were allocated under RA towards the end of the year to respond to the needs of vulnerable populations.

### Analysis and follow-up

In 2021, the SSHF ensured that more funding is channelled through the SA to support a more sustainable intervention with long term projects (in comparison with the previous years).

In 2022, a collective review of the Fund’s strategic vision will be undertaken, in consultation with the AB. This will inform the use of the different modalities upon the needs on the ground.
Target
Project revision requests processed within 15 working days.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High:
OCHA HFU processed 40 revisions within an average of 13 working days from the submission in GMS.

Analysis and follow-up
- In 2020, the HFU processed 40 revision requests within an average of 13 working days. Additional requests were rejected off-line, either because the rationale of the request was not relevant, or the request was not in line with the 2020 operational modalities (timeline and budget).
- While the high number of revision requests demonstrates the flexibility of the Fund, it raises a concern about the alignment of revised activities with the SSHF original allocation strategies. Nearly, 32 per cent of the projects funded in 2020 were subjected to reprogramming in 2021.
- Most revision requests in 2021 implied changes in project duration No-Cost Extensions (NCE), budget, and target people.

- Along with other CBPFs, the SSHF rolled out the flexibility measures introduced in 2020 due to COVID-19 pandemic, allowing the partners to submit cost extension requests if needed. No request was received in 2021.

Of the 40 revision requests:
- 22 NCE requests were processed. The requests were mostly linked to the operational environment such as security incidents and physical access, as well as weak programming (delays in recruitment, procurement, etc.).
- 82.5 per cent were submitted by 25 INGOs; 10 by three NNGOs and 7.5 by one UN agency.
- 35 per cent of the revisions were linked to projects funded though the 2020 RAs.

In 2022, the Fund will remain flexible, enabling partners to review projects when necessary and appropriate. Nevertheless, the HFU will work to better capture the effect of changes on priority needs to be covered by HF funding, consistent with the allocations approved by the AB and the HC.
PRINCIPLE 3
TIMELINESS
CBPFs allocate funds and save lives as humanitarian needs emerge or escalate.

Target
The average duration of the allocation process from the closing date of the allocation to the HC’s approval of selected projects is:

- 60 days for the SA’s.
- 30 days for the RA’s.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High (for both targets):

The two allocations launched by the HC in 2021 were processed in respect to the initial targets:

- 41 days for the SA;
- 22 days for the RA.

Analysis and follow-up
In 2021, the HFU received and reviewed 248 project proposals during the year, amounting to almost $110 million. The high number of project proposals can be explained by a high level of partners eligible to the Fund (146 in January; 121 in August) and the significant increase of the humanitarian needs in South Sudan.

Furthermore, over the past two years, the HFU multiplied its efforts to strengthen the quality control of the process to ensure that funded projects are in line with OCHA CBPFs requirements. The induction trainings for partners and bilateral follow-up sessions conducted by the unit, helped enhancing the quality of the proposals submitted by the partners and consequently shortening the time for projects’ review.

OCHA HFU will ensure that 2022 allocation processes are carried out in line with the endorsed SSHF Operational Manual in a timely and strategic manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average working days of allocation processing</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>2019</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From allocation closing date to HC signature of the grant agreement</td>
<td>Standard Allocations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserve Allocations</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TIMELY DISBURSEMENTS

**Payments are processed without delay**

**Target**
10 calendar days from Executive Officer (EO) clearance of grant agreement.

**Results**
Score = 5 - Very High:

The average number of days for disbursement of funds to SSHF partners was 9 days for both Standard and Reserve allocations.

**Analysis and follow-up**
In 2021, disbursement of funds to SSHF partners took 9 days. Although the average timeline is in line with the CBPF global commitment, the process was much slower than 2020 (6.5 days). Slight delays were observed due inconsistent bank accounts information between OCHA Treasury, and the GMS data provided by the partners.

No follow-up action required.

### TIMELY CONTRIBUTIONS

**Pledging and payment of contributions to CBPFs are timely and predictable.**

**Target**
More than 60 per cent of contributions were committed during the first half of the year.

**Results**
Score: 5 = Very High:

62.2 per cent ($34.2 million) was contributed within the first half of the year.

**Analysis and follow-up**
Most of the SSHF donors maintained the same timeline and level of contributions compared with the previous years. This helped the Fund to ensure a certain predictability of funding throughout the year.

With more than 60 per cent of the contributions received during the first half of 2021, the SSHF was able to launch the prioritisation process for a large SA of $49.5 million, in April. By the end of the year, the SSHF allocated $68.8 million, using the total funds carried over from 2020 ($35.2 million) and 61 per cent of the total 2021 contributions.

The remaining funds reached the SSHF account towards the end of the year. Jointly with the early contributions of 2022, the total amount will ensure that the Fund has a sufficient reserve to respond to critical needs that could be raised in the beginning of next year.

OCHA HFU will support the HC to proactively advocate for predictable financial resources, encouraging receipt of committed contribution earlier in the year, and signing multi-year funding agreements.
Among the 10 top donors contributing to the HRP, eight donors were among the SSHF donors. In 2021, 50 per cent of the SSHF donors (ECHO, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway and The Netherlands) contributed between 18 to 48 per cent to the Fund: nearly 17 per cent (Azerbaijan and UNF) allocated all their contributions to the SSHF.

Target
The SSHF allocations amount to 15 per cent of received HRP funding.

Results
Score = 1 - Very Low:

In 2021, the contributions of the SSHF represented 4.5 per cent of the total funding received for the HRP in South Sudan ($1.15 billion).

Analysis and follow up
Among the 10 top donors contributing to the HRP, eight donors were among the SSHF donors.

In 2021, 50 per cent of the SSHF donors (ECHO, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Norway and The Netherlands) contributed between 18 to 48 per cent to the Fund: nearly 17 per cent (Azerbaijan and UNF) allocated all their contributions to the SSHF. Although Canada and Switzerland increased their contribution to the SSHF in 2021, this didn’t go beyond 9 to 12 per cent of their contribution to the HRP. As for the United Kingdom their contribution did not exceed 5 per cent of their total allocations in 2021, due to the significant drop of funding (62 per cent comparing to 2020).

To increase available funding to cover 15 per cent of the HRP funding received in 2022, the HFU will support the HC in her resource mobilization action plan to maintain support from existing donors; reach out to new potential donors to the Fund; diversify sources of contributions; and increase visibility of the HF public profile.

In addition, the HFU will continue to liaise with OCHA Donor Relations Sections to advocate for more multi-year agreements with donors.
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EFFICIENT PRIORITIZATION
CBPF funding is prioritized in alignment with the HRP

14

Target
100 per cent of the SSHF funded projects are linked to HRP projects.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High:

100 per cent of the funds were allocated to HRP projects.

Analysis and follow-up
In 2021, all projects were aligned to the HRP strategic objectives and were responding to humanitarian life-saving criteria:

- 45 per cent to support SO1: addressing critical problems related to physical and mental well-being, with humanitarian response focusing on life-saving interventions;
- 32 per cent to support SO2: addressing critical problems related to living standards, with humanitarian response prioritizing provision of an inclusive basic services package;
- 23 per cent to support SO3: addressing critical problems related to recovery and resilience of affected people, particularly areas of return from displacement, where services and support could be strengthened.

Considering the volatile operational environment and situation in South Sudan, the SSHF will maintain efforts to ensure efficient prioritization with the needs of all vulnerable people in the country appropriately reflected in allocation strategies and HF funded programming.

ALLOCATION BY HRP STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO1</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SO1 Reduce morbidity and mortality, protection threats and incidents for the most vulnerable populations in severity levels 4 and 5.
SO2 Ensure safe, equitable and dignified access to critical cross-sectoral basic services to enable populations meet their basic needs in locations of severity level 4 and.
SO3 Enable vulnerable people to recover from crisis, see solutions to displacement in the respect of their rights, ar build resilience to shocks and stresses.

Adhel constructing her household latrine in NBEG.
Credit: ACF/Peter Caton.
Target
The SSHF allocations collectively prioritized life-saving humanitarian needs and assisted the people identified as most vulnerable and at risk.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High:

In 2021, the SSHF assisted 1.8 million people in need in South Sudan.

Analysis and follow-up actions
While 13.5 million people were targeted for assistance across the 95 funded projects, a maximum of 1.8 million people (comparing to 1.9 million in 2020) people were assisted in 42 counties in nine states.

The deterioration of the situation in Tambura County due to the internal violence affected additional geographical areas (Ezo, and Nzara, and Tambura) were not considered in the HRP. Through its RA the SSHF was able to assist 80,000 displaced people in these areas.

By the end of the year, 8.9 million people was estimated to be in need of humanitarian assistance. In 2022, the SSHF will channel the allocation to the most vulnerable people in need. Special attention will be given to the women and children as well as elderly and people with special needs.
**16 EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT**

CBPF management is cost-efficient and context-appropriate

---

**17 EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT**

CBPF management is compliant with management and operational standards required by the CBPF Global Guidelines

---

**PRINCIPLE 4**

**EFFICIENCY**

**Target**
The HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account for less than 4 per cent of the overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).

**Results**

Score = 4 - Medium:

In 2021, the HFU operations cost was $2.6 million. This constituted a 3.64 per cent of the total funds utilized.

**Analysis and follow-up**

The total HFU direct cost represents $2.6 million compared to $2.4 million in 2020.

In 2021, the HFU operations’ cost accounted for 3.64 per cent of total $71.4 million utilized funds, compared with 3 per cent of $64.5 million total funds used in 2020. The budget increased by $0.2 million to cover additional human resources costs (2 national posts were added to straighten the HFU capacity) and secure potential need of Third-Party Monitoring.

The OCHA HFU cost plan expenditure rate accounted for $2 million. The savings occurred mainly on the expenses related to the personnel (due to the delays in the replacement of two international staff) and the contractual services (the third-party monitoring services were not needed). The savings will be reimbursed to funds account to be used for upcoming SSHF allocations.

In December 2021, the AB approved the HFU 2022 direct costs amounting to $2.4 million. The Fund will consider a mid-year revision of the cost plan if needed.

---

**Analysis and follow-up**

The 2021 SSHF operational manual revision included minor updates capturing the frequency of the AB meetings, the review process of the common performance framework targets and the project’s revision process. The exercise was also an opportunity to add an annex, a code of conduct of the SRC to be signed by the committee members that they abide to the principles of integrity, transparency, and neutrality of the review process.

The Fund will revise the operational manual in 2022 in alignment to the revised CBPF global guidelines, expected during the second quarter of the year.
**RISK MANAGEMENT**

CBPFs manage risk and effectively monitor partner capacity and performance. CBPFs utilize a full range of accountability tools and measures.

**Target**

100 per cent compliance with operational modalities, as per OCHA assurance dashboard.

**Results**

Score = 4 - Medium:

The compliance rate ranged from 91 per cent for financial spot checks to 100 per cent for field monitoring. The average compliance rate was 93 per cent.

**Analysis and follow-up**

Programme and financial monitoring

In 2021, the HFU continued to monitor funded projects, increasing compliance rates to 100 per cent. The Fund conducted visits to verify and follow-up on critical findings identified during the first monitoring exercise.

The remote monitoring modality was used in 35 per cent of the required programme exercise as a last resort, when it is impossible to conduct field visits in insecure and highly volatile environments with limited access project locations.

OCHA HFU followed up with partners providing them guidance on the actions required or corrective measures. Below are some of the key weaknesses and challenges identified during the monitoring exercises:

- Delayed access and delivery of core-pipeline supplies;
- Non-operational complaint mechanism;
- Duplication of response in concentrated locations;
- Inability to access some areas due to bad road conditions and/or insecurity;
- Poor implementation of programming due to weak project management capacity of partners;
- Excessive use of cash in payments;
- Non-adherence to the local laws/statutory requirement (e.g. payment of withholding taxes);
- Major weaknesses in the internal operational manuals (Finance, Procurement, Human Resource);
- Lack of exchange rate policy for many partners

**Narrative Reporting**

Most of SSHF partners submitted progress and final narrative within the reporting due date.

Compliance and completion of the financial reports represents 99 per cent.
Project’s Audit

The first batch of 19 financial audits under OCHA management was triggered during the year’s second half.

The critical monitoring results (programme and Financial Spot-Check (FSC) were shared with the auditors for follow-up and extended verification as necessary.

58 additional audits were due in 2021. The process is pending the renewal of the global agreement for CBPFs.

The HFU will continue to monitor assurance activities to ensure the rate of 100 per cent is met and will work to further enhance the joint programmatic and financial monitoring.

The HFU will continue to work closely with the partners to address the weaknesses and challenges identified.
**RISK MANAGEMENT OF FUNDING**

Appropriate oversight and assurances of funding is administered through CBPFs.

**Target**
New eligibility process implemented by HFU assessing at least 10 NGOs per year.

**Results**
Score = 5 - Very High:

The 2021 CA of prospective partners was launched in October 2021. Only five organizations among the 127 organizations who expressed interest, succeeded to become eligible for the SSHF funding.

**Analysis and follow up**
The 2021 CA call for potential partners was launched in October. Among the 127 organizations who expressed interest, only 10 succeeded the pre-screening step. Of these 10 organizations, a total of three did not pass the due diligence stage of the eligibility process.

As a result, only seven organizations had a fully fledged CA, five NGOs will become eligible for the SSHF funding in 2022. The rest did not meet the minimum eligibility criteria.

Throughout the year, the HFU undertook regular update of the Partners’ performance and risk levels. Out the 146 eligible partners of the HF at the start of 2021, a total of 112 partners performance was reviewed (the other 34 partners were not reviewed as they did not have active projects), impacting the risk level of 64 partners.

Out of the 64 partners, a total of 43 partners had their risk levels downgraded to high risk and 21 were suspended as they did not meet the minimum requirements, particularly in terms of financial capacity (in line with the new threshold introduced post MA transition).

Additional twelve partners were also made ineligible (i) two because of not having had access to the SSHF funding for more than 3 years (ii) seven because of compliance issues and (iii) another three because of they were no longer operational in South Sudan. The overall resultant of this performance review and index adjustment was a total of 113 eligible partners.

The total number of the SSHF eligible partners was 121 (including OCHA) by the close of 2021, this includes 53 High risk; 43 Medium risk and 25 Low risk partners.

The 2022 CA exercise will be developed in line with the revised CBPFs Global Guidelines and will be designed based on the operational needs of the SSHF.

**IMPLEMENTATION BY PARTNER RISK LEVEL TYPE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Allocation</th>
<th>Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Risk</td>
<td>$8.5M</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Risk</td>
<td>$28.6M</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Risk</td>
<td>$31.7M</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Allocations: $68.8M
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PRINCIPLE 5
RISK MANAGEMENT

Target
100 per cent cases of potential diversion or fraud are treated in compliance with CBPFs SOPs.

Results
Score = 5 - Very High:
Two cases of potential diversion or fraud were reported in 2021.

Analysis and follow-up
In 2021, the HFU maintained its efforts to ensure that all instances of potential diversion or fraud are treated in compliance with the CBPFs SOPs on Response to Concerns of Fraud or Misuse of Funds. The HFU continued awareness-raising on fraud to help partners engage in a rigorous process to analyze, manage and mitigate these risks.

As of December 2021, HFU finance team flagged one alert on a suspected fraud incident during a Financial Spot-Check (FSC). The suspected fraud was related to non-compliance with procurement processes. Appropriate actions were taken including (i) a series of verification activities, and (ii) a review of the overall financial performance of the partner, which resulted in the suspension of the partner’s eligibility to the SSHF. The projects implemented by the same partners are under financial audit.

In addition, a fraud allegation was self-reported by a partner, concerning financial malpractice. Internal investigation conducted by the partner could not establish the estimated financial loss. While the partner remained eligible for SSHF funding, the case was referred to the CBPF Oversight and Compliance Unit for guidance on the next steps.

One case which has been ongoing since 2020 remained open by the end of 2021. The financial audit results will inform the decision on the partner’s status and eligibility.

In 2022, the HFU will continue strengthening the risk management of the SSHF, such as the increase of OCHA HFU risk management capacity (a Risk management officer is being recruited). This will help to ensure that all instances of potential diversion, misconduct or fraud are reported in a timely manner and treated in compliance with the CBPF SOPs.

Demonstration garden in Yambio.
Credit: OCHA/Foda.
Maureen, 17 years old, was displaced during the escalating conflict in Tambura, in Western Equatoria in June 2021. This conflict displaced close to 80,000 people to nearby counties; 50,000 in Ezo with thousands of others moved to Yambio, Nagero, Wau and Nzara.

Determined to pursue her education, Maureen enrolled herself in a local school in Yambio. However, because of a lack of finances she had to abandon school yet again. All what she wished for, that she could go back in time to her life before the conflict.

Access to minimum basic services is very challenging for people who were forced to flee their homes because of violence.

Protection and schooling for children affected by conflict is critical. Through SSHF funding, ADRA constructed 18 temporary learning spaces and rehabilitated 4 to accommodate 4,558 boys and girls. With financial support from ADRA, Maureen was able to go back to school.

“I was so frustrated and had a feeling of failure as I had to drop out from the school, now my dream might become true”. Maureen added.

Note: Maureen not her real name

A student from Alliance Secondary school, Yambio.
Credit: ADRA

**THE CHANGE TO RETURN TO SCHOOL**
A demonstration farm established in Aweil County.

Credit: OCHA/Lonyi
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ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AAP</th>
<th>Accountability to Affected Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHA</td>
<td>Bureau for Humanitarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Capacity Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF</td>
<td>Country Based Pooled Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVA</td>
<td>Cash Voucher Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
<td>Executive Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Grant Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEV</td>
<td>Hepatitis E Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFU</td>
<td>Humanitarian Fund Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Managing Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPC</td>
<td>Multi-purpose Cash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCE</td>
<td>No Cost Extension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFI</td>
<td>Non-Food Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Reserve Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRF</td>
<td>Rapid Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAG</td>
<td>Strategic Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/NFIS</td>
<td>Shelter and Non-Food Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td>Standard Operation procedures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRC</td>
<td>Strategic Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSHF</td>
<td>South Sudan Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRC</td>
<td>Technical Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNF</td>
<td>United Nations Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHS</td>
<td>World Humanitarian Summit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## SSHF ADVISORY BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>Titi Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>Save the Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agency</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN agency</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONOR</td>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>USA - BHA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Disclaimer: The boundaries and names shown, and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. The final boundary between the Republic of South Sudan and the Republic of Sudan has not yet been determined. The final status of Abyei area is not yet determined.
### ALLOCATIONS BY RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION

#### in 105.5 million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount (in 105.5 million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UN agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for UN agencies:** 73.5 (55.1%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National NGOs</th>
<th>Amount (in 105.5 million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIDO</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAO</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADA</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHO</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS-Sudan</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDICAIR</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRM</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOF</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRISS</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHO</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VoF</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWASSA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFAF</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HERY</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHA</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEDA</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDIS</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCO</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKESA</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JACC</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPOCI</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWARDWOMEN</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for National NGOs:** 11.1 (7.8%)

---

#### International NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Amount (in 105.5 million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WWI</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMC-UK</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTED</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAH</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSOS</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDI</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MADM</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFOD</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRA</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicap</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAS</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CW</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAM</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDI AIR</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHH</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor Initiative</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEARFUND</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total for International NGOs:** 37.5 (55.1%)

---
#InvestInHumanity