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1. FOREWORD BY THE DEPUTY REGIONAL HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

In terms of allocations, in 2016 the Turkey Humanitarian Fund (THF) became the largest of all OCHA Humanitarian Funds globally, disbursing US$93.5 million to 144 projects, targeting 7.3 million beneficiaries. In line with the objectives of the “Grand Bargain” and commitments made by the UN Secretary-General at the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016 to prioritise national “Front Line Responders”, $34.3 million (or 37 per cent) of this money went to directly funding the projects of Syrian National NGOs. This amounts to over 27 per cent of all monies disbursed by OCHA globally to national NGOs and is an achievement that we can all be extremely proud off.

Funding was disbursed through two standard allocations with a total value of $49 million to support the financing of strategic objectives as outlined in the Syria HRP for 2016 and three emergency reserve allocations of over $44 million to support unplanned emergencies in northern districts of Syria as outlined in Cluster contingency plans for Aleppo and Ar Raqqa. In all these emergency allocation projects took an average of 8.2 days from proposal submission to project implementation. Of the 7.3 million beneficiaries, 55 per cent (or over 4 million) have been women and girls reflecting the HF’s support to partners on the use of the Gender Marker.

Of course none of this would be possible without the generosity of the donor community who have provided over $67 million to the THF in 2016. This represents an increase of nearly 40 per cent or ($18 million) from 2015, in addition the THF’s donor base grew from 8 to 12 donors an increase of 50 per cent. I would also very much like to thank the donor community for their support for the move to a direct cost approach that ensures greater accountability of the fund. I feel that this is the right direction for the CBPFs particularly in Turkey as it will enable us to significantly strengthen our risk management framework. This is especially important in light of the recent fraud investigations conducted into several cross border international NGOs operating from Turkey. I believe that it is further testament to the risk management approach adopted by CBPFs globally that no THF project was affected by these fraud cases.

Looking forward to 2017 and in line with the “Grand Bargain” which highlighted the critical role of country-based pooled funds (CBPFs), we will aim to increase the proportion of humanitarian appeal funding channelled through CBPFs to 15 per cent by 2018. At current levels, that would translate to the THF disbursing more than $120 million per year for cross border operations not only from Turkey but from Iraq and Jordan where the THF is now identifying partners to expand access into Syria. I therefore very much look forward to further working with our donors in support of this key commitment and to expanding the reach of the THF into Syria in 2017.

May 2017 be the year that finally brings peace to the Syrian people, who have been through unimaginable suffering.

Ramesh Rajasingham
Deputy Regional Humanitarian Coordinator
Turkey | Syria: CBPF - Allocations

Timeline of contribution and project allocation

Cluster Overview

# of projects | Reserve | Standard | Reserve | Standard | # of beneficiaries | Reserve | Standard
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Health | 9 | 33 | 8.6 M | 18.5 M | 2.87 M | 4.1 M
Food Security | 10 | 26 | 7.2 M | 15.6 M | 0.35 M | 0.4 M
Water Sanitation and Hygiene | 11 | 23 | 8.2 M | 14.2 M | 0.09 M | 0.18 M
Camp Coordination and Management | 9 | 18 | 13.2 M | 18.0 M | 0.67 M | 1.4 M
Protection | 1 | 17 | 0.4 M | 7.8 M | 0.27 M | 0.5 M
Education | n/a | 16 | 0.5 M | 6.0 M | 0.02 M | 0.4 M
Emergency Shelter and NFI | 7 | 14 | 7.0 M | 12.5 M | 0.16 M | 0.3 M
Nutrition | n/a | 7 | 0.7 M | 0.7 M | 0.11 M | 0.1 M

Allocation Map

For real time CBPF data and infographics click [https://gms.unocha.org/bi](https://gms.unocha.org/bi)
By any measure, the humanitarian situation had worsened by the beginning of 2016. After almost half a decade of conflict, a staggering 6.5 million people, including 2.8 million children, were displaced within Syria and 4.2 million were registered refugees in neighbouring countries and North Africa. On average, since 2011, 50 Syrian families had been displaced every hour of every day and the pace of displacement remains relentless; well over 1.2 million people were displaced throughout 2015, many for the second or third time. In addition, increasing numbers of Syrians fleeing the violence were willing to risk their lives to reach Europe. Over 50 per cent of the estimated 680,000 arrived in Europe by sea in 2015 were Syrian.

As families exhausted their savings and resources, they were forced to pawn their future to survive. Children are at risk of being withdrawn from school to act as breadwinners, placing an increasing number of girls at risk of early marriage and leaving boys vulnerable to child labour and exploitation. Violence has become pervasive in many areas, increasing the risk of gender-based violence, especially for women and girls. Unexploded ordnances have left entire neighbourhoods at risk with humanitarian and protection needs reaching a record high whilst with the intensification of aerial bombardment, civilians became the primary victims of violations of international humanitarian and human rights law.

Despite knowing where the most vulnerable are located, aid actors are not able to attain sustained, unimpeded access to millions of people, including hundreds of thousands living under siege. The danger and unpredictability of everyday life fuels the forced displacement of hundreds of thousands of people. Despite UN Security Council resolutions seeking to protect civilians caught amidst the fighting and ensure that civilian facilities and infrastructure are not targeted, attacks against schools, hospital, water networks, places of worship, and civilian infrastructure continued.

Humanitarian partners in particular Syrians NGOs made remarkable sacrifices in their efforts to deliver assistance, reaching millions of people per month despite operational constraints, funding shortfalls and the deliberate targeting of their staff and projects.
2. ALLOCATION OVERVIEW

In line with the strategic objective to provide support to life-saving and life-sustaining activities while filling critical funding gaps for the humanitarian crisis in Syria, the THF developed its Standard Allocation Strategies to provide funding towards the key priorities of the Syria Humanitarian Response Plan 2016 (HRP). Overall in 2016, the THF disbursed a total of $93.3 million to 143 projects and 37 per cent of the total funds were provided to fund the projects of national NGOs. This makes HF Turkey one of the largest and nearly only direct funding source for Syrian national NGOs based in Turkey and working cross border inside Syria.

Allocations by Governorate and Sub-district

THF Partners provided vital humanitarian assistance to beneficiaries in 12 of the 14 Governorates inside Syria including Damascus and Rural Damascus. Within these Governorates aid was delivered in 68 sub-districts with the majority of funding going to Aleppo ($40.51 million) and Idleb ($37.77 million). For details of the number of beneficiaries by Governorate please see below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>2,914,591</td>
<td>618,518</td>
<td>832,505</td>
<td>690,997</td>
<td>772,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hasakeh</td>
<td>86,315</td>
<td>22,354</td>
<td>27,904</td>
<td>16,084</td>
<td>19,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Raqa</td>
<td>305,446</td>
<td>34,925</td>
<td>37,075</td>
<td>113,932</td>
<td>119,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>26,780</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>8,160</td>
<td>5,450</td>
<td>5,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dar’a</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir-ez-Zor</td>
<td>247,294</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>120,214</td>
<td>125,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hama</td>
<td>311,843</td>
<td>75,750</td>
<td>95,855</td>
<td>66,211</td>
<td>74,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td>229,756</td>
<td>33,444</td>
<td>73,451</td>
<td>56,610</td>
<td>66,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idleb</td>
<td>2,763,625</td>
<td>619,163</td>
<td>767,773</td>
<td>641,314</td>
<td>735,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lattakia</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>1,123</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>1,163</td>
<td>1,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quneitra</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Damascus</td>
<td>453,864</td>
<td>80,037</td>
<td>185,950</td>
<td>87,186</td>
<td>100,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>7,344,135</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,494,274</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,030,805</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,799,161</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,019,895</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The THF has two separate funding modalities, the Standard Allocation which is conducted twice a year in line with the SRP Humanitarian Program Cycle and the Reserve Allocation, launched by the DRHC in consultation the Clusters in cases of unexpected emergencies or to respond the critical gaps in the humanitarian response. In line with the CBPFs guidelines, HF Turkey conducts a participatory, flexible, timely and efficient allocation process. Allocation papers for both Standard and Reserve are developed in close consultation with the Clusters and the Advisory Board.

In 2016 the Turkey HF launched a total of five Allocations; two “Standard Allocations” launched in March and August and three “Emergency Reserve Allocations” to respond to unplanned emergencies as result of increased fighting in northern districts along the Turkish border, including Azaz and Afrin (February 2016), Aleppo and Idleb (July 2016) and Aleppo and Ar Raqqa contingency plans (December 2016). In total 52 per cent of the funds ($48.5 million) were disbursed to 96 Standard Allocation projects and the remaining 48 per cent ($44.5 million) were disbursed through 47 Reserve Allocations projects.

Where possible, the HF has also been used to increase Humanitarian Access in 2016 by prioritizing the funding projects in besieged and hard to reach locations and by funding of $1.25 million to a project of the Turkish Red Crescent Society to provide facilitation services at the Syria Turkey border to national and international NGOs. These services include customs clearance, transportation into Syria and supporting partners with Turkish government administrative processes.
Gender Marker

Building on the work undertaken in 2015 to strengthen partner proposals in relation to Gender and the training provided to partners by the Gender Advisor, the HF and Technical Review Committees prioritized partner projects that used the Gender Marker to strengthen the development of HF Proposals. The HF also encouraged fielding gender balanced assessment and monitoring teams, developing gender sensitive indicators and ensuring programming tools (surveys, strategies, objectives) are gender sensitive. Over 4 million or 55 per cent of HF target beneficiaries in 2016 were women and girls.

As a result, there was a significant increase from 70 per cent to 86 per cent of projects being coded 2a/2b, i.e. that Gender had been considered during the project needs assessment and that these considerations were reflected in the activities and expected project outcomes. A further 13 per cent of the projects were scored code 1 i.e. that they contributed in a limited way to gender equality, whilst 3% of the projects were scored N/A as these projects did not deal directly with people or focused on service provision (such as providing border transhipment facilitation services).
PERFORMANCE

A. Performance against CBPF outcomes:

OUTCOME 1: “Improve the effectiveness of the humanitarian response by directing funding towards priority humanitarian needs. Priority needs are identified through an inclusive and participatory process, which includes national actors (e.g. NGOs).”

The THF directed funding towards the humanitarian needs as identified in the Syria HNO and further articulated in the HRP Objectives; (1) Saving Lives; (2) Enhancing Protection and (3) Supporting Resilience (see above). The THF also supported the financing of emerging humanitarian needs as identified in Cluster contingency plans, all of which had significant input from national NGOs and the Clusters and through the various stages of the Humanitarian Programme Cycle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Objectives</th>
<th>Budget Allocation</th>
<th>Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SO1</strong> Support saving lives, alleviate suffering and increase access to humanitarian response for vulnerable people and those with specific needs.</td>
<td>$5.0m SO1</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SO2</strong> Enhance protection by promoting respect for international law, IHL, and HRL through quality principled assistance, services and advocacy.</td>
<td>$6.8m $81.5m SO3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SO3</strong> Support the resilience of affected local communities, households and individuals within the humanitarian response by protecting and restoring livelihoods, enabling access to essential services and rehabilitation of socio-economic infrastructure.</td>
<td>93.3 million USD allocated</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 2016 HNO identified 13.5 million people in need (PIN), 6.5 million of these were IDPs and 8.7 million had a convergence of needs in multiple sectors making them the most vulnerable. To the extent possible and taking into consideration access constraints, the HF utilized its standard allocations in the areas with the greatest number of PIN with the highest degree of vulnerability (see map 1 below). The HF also aligned funding with the HRP Strategic Objectives (SO) with specific emphasis on SO one, saving lives and alleviating suffering. Furthermore Standard Allocations emphasized the HRP priority of besieged and hard to reach location.

(1) Heat Map of People in Need as identified in HNO 2016 (2) Heat Map of HF Beneficiaries in Targeted 2016
OUTCOME 2: “Strengthen the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), while leveraging his/her humanitarian coordination role.”

The fund has strengthened the leadership of the DRHC through promoting coordinated response based on consultation with the humanitarian community in the country through the development of the HRP and associated projects. **2016 saw a significant increase in the number of partners (particularly national NGOs) engaged in the HRP planning process and also uploading projects on the Online Project System (OPS) from 35 Syrian NGOs requesting $190 million for 2016 to 52 Syrian NGOs requesting $260 million for 2017.**

The fund has further assisted the DRHC in making timely, well-informed and strategic decisions regarding resource allocations that address operational constraints. This has included the HF allocated funding to the building the capacity of partners and also conducted its own training with 460 partner staff attending training provided by the HFU on budgeting, monitoring and evaluation, project cycle management and the GMS. The HF was also used to ensure that the cross border operations continue uninterrupted by facilitating the logistics of cross border operations and enhancing the safety and security of Humanitarian partners through resourcing the Saving Lives Together (SLT) framework.

OUTCOME 3: “Mobilize resources and support coordination in support of the humanitarian planning framework i.e. Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP).”

As the Cross Border lead in the development and delivery of the 2016 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) for Syria, in consultation with partners on the ground, the DHRC mobilized and allocated $48.8 million through two Standard Allocations to projects supporting the Cluster Objectives of the HRP. Additionally the DRHC was able to quickly mobilize over $44.5 million to the most urgent unplanned humanitarian needs and allocate funds through Emergency Reserve Allocations supporting coordination for unplanned emergencies through the development Cluster contingency plans for Northern Syria in January of 2016, the besiegement of Aleppo in July and both the Aleppo outflow and Ar Raqqa contingency plans in December 2016.

For the Aleppo outflow and Ar Raqqa emergency reserve allocation the DRHC was able to mobilize additional donor contributions to the value of over $15 million from six member states based on the Cluster contingency plans. For the Standard Allocations, coordination was supported with sector allocations made in consultation with partners through the Clusters taking into consideration actual and relative funding gap by sector to reduce critical gaps in the response.
B. Performance against CBPF principles:

**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."

Throughout 2016 the HF has worked with a broad range of partners including UN Agencies, International and National NGOs and the Red Crescent Societies of Qatar and Turkey. Furthermore in line with the objectives of the “Grand Bargain” and commitments made by the UN Secretary-General at the World Humanitarian Summit in February 2016 to prioritise national “Front Line Responders”, the HF allocated $34.3 million (or 37%) of funds directly to the projects of Syrian National NGOs. This amounts to over 27% of all monies disbursed by OCHA globally to national NGOs.

The HF has further promoted inclusiveness and partnership between partners by encouraging joint programming and prioritizing projects submitted jointly between UN Agencies, international and national NGOs. This has also supported the capacity building of national NGOs by ensuring that projects of UN Agencies and International NGOs working in partnership with Syrian NGOs always include budget lines and activities for capacity building components for their Syrian counterparts. Inclusiveness has been further promoted through the allocation process whereby partners are involved in the development of the allocation priorities and are represented on the Cluster Technical Review Committees (TRCs) to evaluate, provide feedback and recommend proposals to be funded.

**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.

Due to the escalating conflict most, if not all, THF partners faced significant challenges throughout 2016 which required a large degree of flexibility from the HFU with the management and revision of grants to reflect changes on the ground. These challenges included the indiscriminate targeting and shelling of projects including hospitals and schools funded by the HF by various armed groups including the Government of Syria and its allies. In all during 2016 there were a total of 155 confirmed attacks on hospitals killing 55 medical workers and injuring another 96. Furthermore according to reports there were reported an estimated 36 attacks on schools with 294 casualties, of which 166 were children, many of these facilities and staff were HF funded. As a result of such incidents 50% of all project revisions in 2016 were a result
of conflict related issues including projects being targeted and or shelled or project location changes as a result of shifting conflict lines.

The HF has also demonstrated it flexibility in responding swiftly to emerging needs as a result of the rapidly changing conflict context. In 2016 the HF worked with partners including UNHCR, IOM, UNICEF and WFP to fund pipelines for the prepositioning of stocks to enable partners’ access to life saving supplies at short notice when unplanned emergencies arose. These Emergency Reserve allocations were therefore used to finance the procurement and warehousing of stocks in the “lifesaving” sectors of Health, Food, WASH, CCCM and Shelter NFI to respond to emerging needs on the ground. This was in part also a strategic response to the discovery of fraudulent procurement activities of a few humanitarian partners and suppliers. It is further testament to the risk management approach adopted by the fund that no THF project was affected by these fraud cases, whilst the provision of “Pipeline” funding greatly reduced the risk of such fraud happening again.

**PRINCIPLE 3: Timeliness: CBPFs allocate funds and save lives as humanitarian needs emerge or escalate.**

In 2016 over 47% of funding or over $44.5 million was allocated through the Emergency Reserve Allocation modality targeting over 4.36 million people with lifesaving interventions and provision of emergency stocks. The Emergency reserve allocation greatly reduced timelines for the allocation of resources with funds often disbursed within 8 days of proposal submission. Working closely with the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group, the HF developed three reserve allocations for unplanned emergencies as outlined in Cluster contingency plans for Aleppo (twice), Idlib and Ar Raqqa. **For the Aleppo outflow plan the HF provided 10,000 winterized tents to families fleeing the city** after it was taken by the Syrian Government and its allies. In addition the HF funded the provision of household seed and agriculture kits to families in besieged areas so that they could grow their own food during times when it was impossible for aid agencies to access them.

As mentioned, the emergency reserve allocations largely supported the prepositioning of emergency stocks. However these funds were also used for establishing and maintaining water systems and mitigating against waterborne diseases in the WASH sector; strengthening referral systems, supporting mobile clinics and establishing communications systems in the Health sector; the establishment of reception centres and increasing the absorption capacity of IDP camps; finally they were also used for Unexploded Ordinance (UXO) and mine risk awareness raising for populations moving into and out of areas where there was a high risk of UXO contamination.
**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 transaction costs while operating in a transparent and accountable manner.

In the context of cross border operations where the delivery of humanitarian aid is largely undertaken by national NGOs, the THF took a strategic decision to support the capacity building of national partners. One of the ways that this objective is supported is through the Standard Allocation modality which is designed to incorporate ‘hands on’ feedback and support to partners with the development of their proposals, work plans and budgets by the Cluster coordinators and the HFU. There is of course a time cost to this process meaning that Standard Allocation processes in Turkey do take longer than is normally the case with CBPFs in other countries. To ensure accountability to all stakeholders and to meet the often conflicting needs of capacity building partners and the delivery of urgent humanitarian assistance, the HFU sets targets and agrees timelines with partners and Cluster coordinators as part of the allocation strategy.

**In the first Standard Allocation 63% of the 40 projects were reviewed within the agreed time frame articulated in the Allocation Strategy whilst for the second Standard Allocation 94% of the 54 projects were reviewed on time. Furthermore 62% of all Standards Allocation disbursements were made within 10 working days of Executive Officer approval.**

For the Emergency Reserve allocations however, the emphasis is very much placed on speed and the time taken to deliver vital humanitarian assistance to meet the needs of beneficiaries as articulated in the Cluster contingency plans. Time taken to process Emergency reserve allocations has been greatly reduced by the introduction of a set of criteria for partner selection that includes ability to pre-finance projects so that there is no delay while the partner is waiting for funds to be transferred, capacity to scale up, history of working with the affected population and the partners’ funding ceiling. These criteria greatly reduce the number of eligible partners for emergency allocations to 1 or 2 per cluster. This in turn greatly reduces both the technical and financial review phase to one day and also reduces the administrative process related to disbursement of funds. **As a result of this new emergency allocation process, projects took an average of 8.2 days from proposal submission to DRHC signature and project implementation.**

**PRINCIPLE 5: Accountability and Risk Management**: CBPFs manage risk and effectively monitor partner capacity and performance.

2016 saw a concerted effort by the HFU to operationalise the Risk Management framework of the THF, this was particularly important in light of the news received earlier in the year that the US Government Office of the Inspector General (OIG) was conducting fraud investigations into several cross border international NGOs operating from Turkey and it is further testament to the risk management approach adopted by the HFU that no THF project was affected by these fraud cases. In 2016 OCHA launched a Third Party Monitoring (TPM) pilot project in order to collect and verify project information.

**In this first round of TPM, 21 projects from 16 implementing partners were monitored and verified. Projects encompassed the sectors of CCM, education, WASH, food Security and livelihoods, health,**
and protection. The specific objectives of OCHA TPM include verifying whether activities were implemented and results achieved as per the original project plan, assessing the quality and effects of the implemented activities, gathering beneficiary feedback on the services provided, capturing relevant lessons from the field to improve future planning, and providing evidence to be used in the HF risk management process, such as the partner performance index and capacity assessment.

SREO, the company that conducted the monitoring, utilized various quantitative and qualitative methods in order to monitor and verify the selected projects in accordance with the above stated objectives. Observation checklists, key-informant interviews, focus-group discussions, household surveys, and photography were all methods of data collection used in the field. For each project, SREO held an inception meeting with the respective implementing partner in order to receive focal point contact information in Syria and determine exact tools to be used.

Finally, SREO compiled a “scorecard” of all 21 projects, reflecting their relative strengths and weaknesses in different categories, such as quality, verification, community relations and coordination, sustainability, and fairness. In each category, a score between one and four was assigned based on the relevant findings, and then a composite score calculated from these individual scores. According to the final scorecard 33% of the projects received a score in the highest category, 52% (11 of 21) of the projects received a score in the second highest category, only 14% or 3 received a score in the third category, and no projects received a score in the lowest category.

3. DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

The Deputy Regional Humanitarian Coordinator on behalf of the Humanitarian Community would like to thank the very generous donations of nearly $70 million provided to the Turkey HF in 2016 from member states (see table below). It should also be noted that the donor community also provided over $40 million to the Turkey HF in December 2015 (see annual report 2015) of which approximately $36 million was rolled over and allocated to Humanitarian Projects in 2016.

The $69.9 million received represents an increase of over 40% (or $20 million) from 2016 to 2017, in addition the THF’s donor base grew from 7 to 12 donors, an increase of nearly 45%.

Funding received enabled the THF to allocate $93.5 million in 2016 which is $46.5 million more than in 2015 and represents a growth of over 70% and has enabled the HF to fund the projects of 88 Humanitarian partners which is 14 more than last year.
The THF Standard Allocation priorities in 2016 for the Education Sector included scaling up education program implementation to address the growing needs of the education sector by enabling the continued delivery of quality education services provided for crises-affected children. Projects funded by the HF prioritised scaling up safe access of education (formal, non-formal) through provision of inclusive education and psychosocial support, professional development of the educational actors and local education authority’s capacity to deliver a timely and coordinated education response.

Furthermore, HF Funding was used to ensure that local communities have an improved capacity to continue delivering education services to their children, as well as absorb incoming displaced children with opportunities to access education despite displacement.

In all the THF provided $6 million to 16 Education projects in 2016, targeting over 96,000 people and reaching a total of 78,459 men, women, boys and girls throughout the year. The primary activities of these projects included:

- Rehabilitation of or establish temporary classrooms to increase the absorption capacity of schools in formal and non-formal settings
- Conducting Back to Learning (BTL) campaigns to mobilize and engage families and communities around the importance of education and school enrolment
- Non-formal education (remedial and catch-up education, literacy and numeracy courses, self-learning) for out-of-school children and youth
- Provision of early childhood education and vocational training to youth in most vulnerable communities
- Provision of learning and teaching materials, equipment and support packages.
- Provision of teacher professional development
For Food Security and Livelihoods under the Standard Allocation, the priority in 2016 was to enhance resilience and sustain the agriculture/livelihoods sectors by means of provision of quality inputs, knowledge transfer, financial support, storage infrastructure rehabilitation, markets opportunities. Activities were complementary to the provision of necessary food assistance especially for food insecure beneficiaries that retained access to productive assets (land/livestock) but were not able to sustain their livelihoods without support. In total the HF provided $8.4 million through standard allocations and a further $7.2 million to emergency projects, targeting over 400,000 beneficiaries and reaching almost 200,000. The primary activities of the standard allocation projects included;

- Training and inputs for both agriculture and livestock production
- Cash/vouchers modalities (linked to agriculture items purchasing)
- Rehabilitation of services and infrastructure also utilizing cash for work
- Prevention/preparedness/disaster risk reduction including fire risk reduction for crops at the last stage before harvesting Income generation activities
- Animal treatments and vaccinations
- Provision of start-up kits for jobs in the agriculture support services

In particular, the THF enabled the FSL Cluster members to increase the production of key staple crops that have been deeply affected by the conflict and last years’ drought. Home-gardening activities enabled beneficiaries to increase their dietary diversity, especially those families who host IDPs. Livestock treatment and animal distributions were also implemented aiming at protecting assets. Moreover, income generating activities targeted the youth through provision of vocational training. Key HTR/Besieged areas were reached with some of the above mentioned activities, such as Eastern Ghouta, Northern Hama and Afrin.

Under the two Emergency Reserve Allocations, the Cluster prioritized; emergency food stocks with the provision of ready to eat rations to IDPs fleeing from frontlines, and forced displacements; the purchasing of homestead and micro-gardening kits targeting communities at risk of besiegement and IDPs with access to land, and homestead and micro-gardening kits.
For the health sector under the two Standard Allocations, the THF provided almost ten million dollars of funding to support a wide range of services and activities including; trauma care, injury (including disabilities) and referral services; curative and preventive services at primary and secondary health care level for communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases, reproductive health (including emergency obstetric care and family planning), mental health and child health; preventive services including immunization.

Due to the attacks on health infrastructure and its subsequent damage and disruption of health services, the THF provided funding for ambulance and medical supplies, the rehabilitation and “fortification” of health infrastructure. The Health Cluster worked closely with the Nutrition cluster in the planning stages and as a result many partners submitted joint projects for health and nutrition priorities.

The health Cluster was one of the few Clusters to access ISIS controlled areas of Syria where partners undertook a measles vaccination campaign targeting over 420,000 people in Deir el Zor and Ar Raqq. Other primary activities included;

- Strengthening of trauma case management at health facility level
- Strengthening of the provision of physical rehabilitation services at the facility level, and establishing professional physical rehab centres.
- Provision of primary health care services in fixed and mobile clinics.
- Strengthening of the referral systems
- Strengthening of the community health worker’s programmes
- Establishing fortified HFs/rehabilitating and reinforcing HFs, including physical structure, equipment/supplies to provide safe and secure environments for health service delivery
Often in combined programmes with the Health Cluster, in the nutrition sector the THF prioritised the funding of projects in besieged and hard to reach areas in critical condition due to a shortage of services. The key priority programmes included the scale up of lifesaving curative and preventive nutrition interventions for management and prevention of malnutrition among women and children under 5 years in priority and highly affected areas by the conflict. Activities in this sector included:

- Screening and management of malnutrition
- Micronutrient supplementation
- Infant and young child feeding counselling services
For the Protection Cluster in 2016 it was a key priority of the THF to increase specialized protection services, expand protection monitoring and enable the strengthening of communities ability to cope on their own through community based protection interventions in accessible areas of Syria and in communities that are hard to reach, besieged or where no protection actors were operating.

For the Child Protection sub-Cluster, the focus was on strengthening community-based child protection mechanisms to improve protection of children from violence, abuse and exploitation in targeted locations through enhanced coordination among relevant agencies and service providers. Partners provided immediate psychosocial support for children while strengthening sustainable community-based support for them and their caregivers. By pairing service delivery and awareness raising for children, caregivers and community members, the response helped to protect children from violence and risks in their communities, while promoting the development of skills and positive coping mechanisms to safeguard their future.

The Gender Based Violence (GBV) sub-Cluster, prioritized underserved areas developing an emergency response model to promote an effective way to respond to different new emergencies according to access and presence of GBV actors on the ground. This included safety audit or rapid assessments, delivering GBV key messages on service provision, prepositioning of dignity kits and post-rape kits, providing psychological first aid.

The THF supported Mine action services to expand through data collection on hazards and casualties in order to adequately prioritise the mine action response. Key activities in this included clearance, risk education and victim assistance – with a particular focus on projects that included data collection on accidents, casualties, and hazardous areas, as well as examining the impact of explosive hazards on besieged and hard to reach areas; capacity building of Syrian partners to deliver risk education, with an emphasis on joint programming with other sectors where appropriate as a component.
For the Standard Allocation the Shelter/NFI Cluster utilised a portion of the THF funding to prioritize winterization projects due to a lack of funds in an on-going emergency characterized by multiple displacements. Shelter partners are often required to shift resources from winter allocations in order to prioritize other responses prior to the winter season. Through HF allocations the Cluster was able to support populations most in need of winter items in the least accessible areas including besieged and hard to reach locations. High priority areas were the locations where fuel availability was limited and more expensive and with the highest concentration of IDPs.

In all, the Shelter/NFI cluster received nearly $14M USD for winterization and emergency projects (of which $5.5M USD were for winterization only) providing beneficiaries with at least three of the following items as part of the minimum package for the winter assistance:

- Fuel for cooking and heating through the most suitable modality in respect of the ‘Do no harm’ principles (either in kind or through vouchers and or cash)
- One-off distribution of heaters in preparation of and throughout the winter season
- Winter clothes distribution through the most suitable modality in respect of the ‘Do no harm’ principles (either in kind or through vouchers and or cash)

For the Emergency Reserve Allocations, the Shelter/NFI Cluster partners received more than $7 million in funding from the THF of which the prepositioning of Non Food Items (NFIs) was prioritised. The THF provided pipeline funding to procure and warehouse essential NFI kits which were then made available to respond to emergencies and delivered by partners that had the capacity and history of working with the affected communities.
The priority for the WASH Cluster in 2016 was the provision of emergency services to IDPs and the highly vulnerable population in the form of access to safe water, hygiene items, sanitation and solid waste management. Under both the Standard Allocations, the THF provided a combined $6 million of funding to WASH Cluster partners to address the lack of potable water through the rehabilitation of WASH infrastructure. Additionally, these projects also covered the cost of ongoing operations and maintenance of existing WASH infrastructure including the provision of capacity building support to staff.

In addition to funding received from the Standard Allocations the WASH Cluster also received $8.2 million through the three Emergency Reserve Allocations targeting over 670,000 beneficiaries in 2016. The priorities for these allocations were as follows:

- Maintain stockpile of WASH NFIs (prepositioned in Syria, Turkey and Iraq)
- Deliver potable water and hygiene/baby kits and jerry cans to IDPs fleeing from the initial stages of military activity
- Provide sanitation facilities (latrines/shower blocks) and services in temporary IDPs camp
- If necessary, drill new water boreholes to sustain water supply
- Assess WASH conditions in urban areas after military activity subsides
- Repair water and sewage infrastructure, provide alternate power sources, re-establish solid waste management and conduct drainage control works, as necessary
The CCCM Cluster was the second largest recipient of funding receiving over $18 million from the THF in 2016. Additional CCCM priorities for the Emergency Reserve Allocations included the establishment of reception centres, increasing the absorption capacity of existing camps and prepositioning of emergency stocks. For the Standard Allocations the CCCM Cluster prioritized the maintenance and restoration of basic infrastructure in collective centres and IDP sites in order to maintain the level of services in the collective centres and IDP sites with diminishing resources. Infrastructure enhancements included basic gravelling, water, well pumps, fencing, lighting distribution sites, fuel for electricity generators, latrine facilities, multi-sectoral activities space and contingency stocks, both in IDP sites and within the hosting community that serve the IDPs in the targeted areas.

Needs varied greatly amongst collective centres and IDP sites, so to provide a dignified multi-sector response for the vulnerable families, projects were tailored to the specifics of each location. In all cases, beneficiaries were involved in the design and implementation of these programs and in the humanitarian management of the centres themselves. Activities included;

- Restoration of disused critical infrastructure and installation of multi sectoral spaces
- Structural repairs and maintenance of the key infrastructure with protection mainstreamed and solid vulnerability criteria
- Establishment and support of participatory approaches through gender balanced IDP Committees and promotion of participatory management in sites.
- Set up and running of Emergency transit centres
- The continuation of key-life sustaining services including WASH & Food provision
- Winterization Campaign for the most vulnerable

These interventions were critical to avoid the further deterioration of the services and the living conditions in informal settlements, planned camps, and collective centres. The projects prevent the outbreak of disease and spiralling shelter replacement costs for the displaced and, in general, enabled a more protective environment in the IDP sites.
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PROJECT INFO
Budget: $491,511.88
Location: Azaz, Aleppo Governorate
Cluster: Health/ Nutrition
Start date: 01/07/2016
End date: 31/01/2017

HIGHLIGHTS
# beneficiaries reached to date: 1083
# of IYCF BNF: 675
# of women benefited from safe breastfeeding space: 347
# of lactation sessions: 28
# of children MUAC screened: 319

HF Turkey allocated $ 25.2 million USD for Health and Nutrition related emergency assistance in Syria since November 2014

Heath care services for conflict-affected populations in Aleppo governorate

This project addresses the health and nutrition concerns of the IDPs in 3 camps and moving IDP settlements of Azaz district, Aleppo governorate, following the mass displacement in February 2016. It addresses the primary health care, nutrition and psycho-social care needs of the most vulnerable of an estimated catchment population of 100,000 IDPs and conflict affected host communities.

Part of this project consists of mobile clinics that ensure access to basic healthcare services with a capacity to support 14,000 IDPs, following the latest large displacements until the IDPs can be settled in permanent IDP camps with established PHC services.

The mobile clinics are currently in Yazbibag, Tel Alshaam and Al Resal. Within these mobile clinics, Infant and Young Child Feeding (IYCF) and psycho-social support (PSS) services are taking place to address women and children well-being. The mobile clinics are thus essential spaces to ensuring an integrated IYCF and PSS support for pregnant and lactating mothers (PLW) and children under 2 years in 3 IDP camps (Bab Al Iman, Shamareq and Al Rayan). The IYCF centers incorporate breast feeding support, training on the safe use of Breast Milk Substitute (BMS) and individual PSS in a safe, hygienic and private environment.
Fatima is new among mothers. She gave birth to her first baby, Hamza. Since Fatima had no babies before, she did not know what to do after giving birth. Here is an account of the help Fatima received from Dia’a, an IYCF health worker in Yazibagh.

Dia’a: Fatima has been coming to the hospital for a while. Fatima was advised to breastfeed her baby and avoid using infant formula due to its high cost and health risks if not used safely. However she has a problem with an inverted nipple.

Fatima: “Can I breastfeed my baby despite having my problem?”

Dia’a reassured Fatima that it was possible for her to breastfeed her baby with their help.

After Fatima delivered her baby, Hamza, she entered the labor room to have her first contact with her baby. Hamza was put in an incubator and Dia’a worked closely with Fatima to reverse her inverted nipple and stimulate the first secretion of breastmilk. After this was achieved Dia’a helped her express and collect breastmilk.

The milk was taken and fed to Hamza in his incubator. This support was continued until Hamza could leave the incubator and feed from his mother. Fatima was taught how to correctly position her baby during breastfeeding. At three days old Hamza was discharged from the hospital and Fatima was successfully breastfeeding.
ANNEX 3: 2016 ALLOCATION FACT SHEETS

Country Based Pooled Fund in Turkey
Aleppo Emergency Response (March 2016)

Project Locations

Estimated funding amount disbursed in million USD at Governorate level.

# of projects at sub-district
1-2
3-5
6-10
11-16

18.4 million USD disbursed
1,014,986 beneficiaries targeted
31 projects approved
24 agencies received funding

Funding amount by cluster (million USD)

- Water Sanitation Hygiene
- Camp Coordination
- Camp Management
- Food Security
- Emergency Shelter and NFI
- Health
- Protection

Funding amount by type of organisation (million USD)

- UN: 15,2
- INGO: 36
- UN: 3,5
- INGO: 133
- UN: 13
- INGO: 73

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.
Creation date: 15 Mar 2016
Sources: Grant Management System (GMS)
https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/idmapfp

Feedback: ocha@pf@un.org
Country Based Pooled Fund in Turkey
Emergency Response (August 2016)

Project Locations

Funding amount per cluster by governorate (USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Camp Coordination/Management</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter and NFI</th>
<th>Food Security</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Water Sanitation Hygiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>29,381</td>
<td>904,987</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>1,467,691</td>
<td>800,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Hasakeh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deir-ez-Zor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idlib</td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>904,987</td>
<td>21,292</td>
<td>733,846</td>
<td>800,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lattakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>80,076</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10.4 million USD disbursed

1,524,400 beneficiaries targeted

Beneficiaries by gender and age group

Funding amount by cluster (million USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>Estimated Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water Sanitation Hygiene</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,310,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Shelter and NFI</td>
<td>48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Coordination Management</td>
<td>54,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of beneficiaries

- Water Sanitation Hygiene: 100,000
- Health: 1,310,400
- Food Security: 12,000
- Emergency Shelter and NFI: 48,000
- Camp Coordination Management: 54,000

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

Sources: Grant Management System (GMS)
https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/strma/hop

Feedback: ochahpf@un.org

Creation date: 10 Aug 2016
Humanitarian Fund in Turkey
Second Standard Allocation 2016 (October 2016)

Project Locations

Estimated funding amount disbursed in million USD at Governorate level.

- 1.1 million USD
- 6.4 million USD
- 3.4 million USD
- 2.5 million USD
- 1.1 million USD
- 0.9 million USD
- 0.6 million USD
- 0.4 million USD
- 0.3 million USD
- 0.2 million USD
- 0.1 million USD
- 0.09 million USD
- 0.05 million USD
- 0.02 million USD
- 0.01 million USD
- 0.00 million USD

# of projects
- 1 - 2
- 3 - 4
- 5 - 6
- 7 - 8
- > 8

30.0 million USD disbursed

1,491,375* beneficiaries targeted

56 projects funded

Benefits by gender and age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>358,863</td>
<td>392,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>291,287</td>
<td>449,031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benefits by cluster

- Health: 5.7 million USD
- Protection: 5.5 million USD
- Food Security: 5.4 million USD
- Emergency Shelter and NFI: 4 million USD
- Camp Coordination and Camp Management: 3 million USD
- Water Sanitation Hygiene: 3 million USD
- Education: 3 million USD
- Nutrition: 0.5 million USD

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

Creation date: 7 February 2017 | Sources: Grant Management System (GMS) | Feedback: ochahq@un.org | Website: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/stima/hf

* Note: targeted beneficiaries equals number of beneficiaries as per project proposals, this number is subject to change as projects are ongoing.
Humanitarian Fund in Turkey
Reserve Allocation in December 2016

Project Locations

14.5 million USD disbursed
1,169,841* beneficiaries targeted
8 projects funded

Funding amount per cluster by governorate (million USD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governorate</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Camp Coordination / Management</th>
<th>Emergency Shelter and NFI</th>
<th>Food Security</th>
<th>Health</th>
<th>Water Sanitation and Hygiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aleppo</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ar-Raqqa</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hama</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idlib</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Amount</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Funding amount by cluster (million USD)

1. Camp Coordination / Management: 2.1 million USD
2. Health: 2.1 million USD
3. Water Sanitation and Hygiene: 1.8 million USD
4. Emergency Shelter and NFI: 2.8 million USD
5. Food Security: 1.7 million USD

Number of beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>257,103</td>
<td>286,236</td>
<td>543,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>297,539</td>
<td>328,963</td>
<td>626,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.

*Note: Targeted beneficiaries equals number of beneficiaries as per project proposals; this number is subject to change as projects are ongoing.

Creation date: 7 February 2017 | Sources: Grant Management System (GMS) | Feedback: ochaflip@un.org | Website: https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/operations/dimashk/hfp
ANNEX 4: HUMANITARIAN FUND STAKEHOLDER SURVEY 2016

During the first quarter of 2017 the THF conducted “Stakeholder Survey” with Cluster Coordinators, partners and representatives of the large NGO coordination forums. The purpose of the Survey conducted in both English and Arabic between 16\textsuperscript{th} of February and the 18\textsuperscript{th} of March, was to collect feedback on the THF’s performance from key stakeholders and users of the GMS. The feedback was then to be used to derive lessons learned and make improvements to the performance of the fund.

The THF used the website Survey Monkey to conduct the survey to ensure confidentiality. Respondents were asked a total of 24 questions that covered the following topics;

- Allocation strategy development and process
- Technical review committees
- OCHA’s Grant Management System (GMS)
- THF’s commitment to capacity building
- Overall support provided by the HFU

The survey received 140 responses from stakeholders including UN Agencies, Cluster Coordinators, INGOs, Syrian and Turkish NGOs, representing the membership of 9 Clusters.

The survey was comprised mostly of multiple choice questions; however, respondents were also able to provide substantive comments under each of the main sections. Whilst there is always room for improvement, the responses were largely very positive particularly in relation to the work of the THF in supporting the funding and capacity building of Syrian NGOs. Throughout these responses a number of key areas for improvement or changes were suggested as follows;

- **Increase funding and capacity building to smaller Syrian NGOs.** It was felt by many respondents that whilst the THF did a good job of supporting Syrian NNGOs, the fund has, over the past year, tended to prioritise the larger Syrian NNGOs with both funding and capacity building. The THF should in future look for ways to allocate more money to smaller Syrian NGOs and civil society organisations and provide them with more training on Project Cycle and financial management. It should be noted here that as a response to this and feedback provided by the advisory board, increase the amount provided by the first standard allocation to smaller NNGOs by encouraging partnership between them and the larger Syrian partners.

- **Improve the timeliness of the allocation processes.** There was considerable feedback on the timeliness of the different phases of the allocation process. This will be quite difficult to
address to everyone’s satisfaction because whilst many respondents felt that the overall process from launch of allocation to disbursement of funds could be shortened there were also many requests to increase the length of the proposal submission and technical review phases and it will be very difficult to do this without slowing down the overall process. It is suggested that during this year a workshop be held with stakeholders to review in detail the allocation process and see how some parts of it can be lengthened whilst reducing the time taken overall.

- **Reduce the time taken to audit and close partner projects and/or increase partner ceilings.** There was much feedback on this from partners who felt that due to delays in the auditing of projects, they would be ineligible for funding under future allocations if they had reached their funding ceiling as identified in the THF operational modalities. There had been a very long delay in the process for procuring auditors which meant that some partners were ineligible for funding under the 1st standard allocation of 2017. At the time the HFU had reviewed with the Cluster leads the capacity to deliver projects against the allocation priorities and concluded that there was still sufficient partner capacity without the need for increasing partner ceilings. However, measures were taken to ensure that no existing partner was excluded from the allocation and the audit process has now commenced. Finally, it should be noted that there will be no future delays to the audit process as OCHA is now in the process of identifying a global auditor for all CBPFs.

**Feedback on Allocation Papers**

![Pie chart for allocation priorities]

- **How well do you think that the Allocation Priorities have matched the Priorities of the Clusters?**
  - Excellent: 10.9%
  - Very: 43.4%
  - Sufficiently: 35.1%
  - Insufficiently: 7.1%
  - Not clear at all: 0.9%

![Pie chart for allocation clarity]

- **How clear have the Allocation papers been in defining needs and objectives of the Allocations?**
  - Excellent: 0.0%
  - Very: 45.7%
  - Sufficiently: 2.9%
  - Insufficiently: 5.0%
  - Not clear at all: 1.5%

![Pie chart for allocation rules and eligibility criteria]

- **How clear have the Allocation papers been in defining the rules and eligibility criteria for the Allocations?**
  - Excellent: 0.0%
  - Very: 2.9%
  - Clear: 34.3%
  - Sufficiently: 48.2%
  - Insufficiently: 6.6%
  - Not clear at all: 1.4%

![Pie chart for allocation paper helpfulness]

- **How helpful was the Allocation Paper in supporting you in preparing the proposals?**
  - Excellent: 0.0%
  - Very: 2.9%
  - Somewhat: 9.2%
  - Insufficiently: 5.0%
  - Neither helpful or unhelpful: 1.5%
  - Not at all helpful: 21.1%
Feedback on Review Phase

Do you think the composition of the TRC has a good balance between different stakeholders?

- Excellently Balanced: 43.0%
- Very Good Balance: 7.7%
- Somewhat Good Balance: 36.6%
- Insufficiently Balanced: 9.7%
- Not at all Balanced: 5.4%

Did the TRC provide useful feedback on your organization’s proposals to the HF?

- Excellently Useful: 35.5%
- Very Useful: 32.3%
- Somewhat Useful: 10.8%
- Insufficiently Useful: 7.6%
- Not at all Useful: 10.1%
- Not Applicable: 0.8%

How timely do you find the Allocation and Review processes?

- Excellently timely: 3.0%
- Very Timely: 18.3%
- Timely: 42.3%
- Insufficiently timely: 19.1%
- Not at all timely: 20.3%

Feedback on the Grant Management System (GMS)

How easy to use is the HF Grant Management System (GMS) for proposal submission?

- Very easy to use: 14.3%
- Easy: 46.2%
- Somewhat easy to use: 26.9%
- Insufficiently easy to use: 9.9%
- Not at all easy to use: 3.3%
- Not applicable: 0.5%

How easy to use is the HF Grant Management System (GMS) for reporting?

- Very easy to use: 46.2%
- Easy: 27.5%
- Somewhat easy to use: 12.1%
- Insufficiently easy to use: 4.4%
- Not at all easy to use: 6.6%
- Not applicable: 3.3%

How easy to use is the HF Grant Management System (GMS) for revisions and no cost extensions?

- Very easy to use: 7.1%
- Easy: 18.9%
- Somewhat easy to use: 24.4%
- Insufficiently easy to use: 13.3%
- Not at all easy to use: 7.8%
- Not applicable: 7.8%

Has OCHA IFU been able to provide enough training and guidance on the GMS?

- Yes: 70.7%
- No: 29.1%
Feedback on Partner Capacity Building

What HF facilitated training have you or your organization attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Type</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and Reporting</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How useful was this training to you or your organisation?

- Excellent: 43.8%
- Very Good: 45.6%
- Somewhat Good: 8.8%
- Not Very Good: 1.3%
- Very Poor: 1.3%

Feedback on the Support Received by the HFU

Do you think that OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) has provided enough guidance and support to partners?

- No: 24.7%
- Yes: 75.3%

How would rate the support of the OCHA HFU?

- Excellent: 12.6%
- Very Good: 36.0%
- Somewhat Good: 30.2%
- Not Very Good: 6.9%
- Very Poor: 3.4%