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**OCHA**  
United Nations  
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
I am pleased to share with you the first Ukraine Humanitarian Fund (UHF) Annual Report. It reviews the establishment of the fund and the management and accountability structure of the Fund.

It was one year ago, in February 2019, that I wrote to the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) requesting the establishment of a country-based pooled fund (CBPF).

The ERC responded positively by announcing the establishment of the Fund at a Member States briefing on Ukraine, in New York on February 12. Donors were quick to support the Fund with contributions in April that allowed OCHA to create a cost plan and recruit staff, and over the course of the year, a broad donor base was established as the UHF received contributions from nine donors.

Importantly, the UHF has also attracted support from donors who had not previously contributed to the response in Ukraine, such as the Republic of Korea. In addition, the UHF is the first CBPF that Poland, Estonia and, in 2020, ECHO have supported.

The UHF has quickly established itself as a strong pillar of the humanitarian response, and a driver of innovation. The first allocation focused on the needs of the most vulnerable in the most difficult circumstances: people with disabilities along the ‘contact line’.

This allocation supported tailored tools and approaches to consider the specific needs of people living with disabilities in assessments and project implementation. To support the allocation, OCHA coordinated with the protection cluster and other partners to prepare a working “definition” of disability, and some guiding principles. The UHF seeks to allocate funds strategically to address needs and improve the humanitarian response in Ukraine.

One of the strategic goals that the HCT and stakeholders had in mind when requesting the establishment of the UHF was to strengthen localization and participation in the coordination system. National NGOs (NNGO) serve as active members of the UHF Advisory Board and UHF Review Committee. In the first UHF allocation, six of 12 approved projects were from NNGOs, receiving 47 per cent of the funds from the allocation. OCHA has also conducted 32 capacity assessments of NNGOs and held over a dozen briefings and trainings to reach out to and target local partners.

In order to encourage greater participation of local partners in coordinated humanitarian planning and response, the UHF has tied eligibility to receive funding to participation in the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) process. This requirement has helped to almost double the participation of local organizations in the HRP from 12 in 2019 to 23 NNGOs in 2020.

In addition to supporting humanitarian response and increasing participation in coordinated humanitarian action, the UHF also improves the coherence of humanitarian response by empowering cluster coordinators, who play a central role as Review Committee members to inform allocations, review proposals and help monitor projects.

I want to thank our donors, without whose confidence and support we would not have been able to establish the UHF. The generosity of the Governments of Estonia, Germany, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Republic of Korea, Sweden, and the United States has enabled humanitarian partners in Ukraine to respond to the most urgent needs on both sides of the ‘contact line’. As we continue to grow the Fund in 2020, I encourage donors to renew their support for the UHF to enable more coordinated, principled and timely humanitarian action to assist the most vulnerable people impacted by the conflict in eastern Ukraine.
The UHF has quickly established itself as strong pillar of the humanitarian response, and a driver of innovation.

OSNAT LUBRANI
HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR IN UKRAINE

An elderly couple is standing in the yard of their house pockmarked by shrapnel. Eastern Ukraine. Credit: OCHA/Yevhen Maloletka.
This Annual Report presents information on the achievements of the UHF during the 2019 calendar year. However, because grant allocation, project implementation and reporting processes often take place over multiple years (CBPFs are designed to support ongoing and evolving humanitarian responses), the achievement of CBPFs are reported in the following years.

Information on allocations granted in 2019 (shown in blue). This method considers intended impact of the allocations rather than achieved results as project implementation and reporting often continues into the subsequent year and results information is not immediately available at the time of publication of annual reports.

Considering that the UHF became operational in June 2019, and launched the first allocation in July 2019, the partners who are implementing projects have not yet reported achievements. As projects from the first allocation are implemented, partners will report on the results achieved, and these will be captured and reported in the Grant Management System (GMS).

Going forward, and in line with the annual reports for other CBPFs, the reporting on the results of the first allocation will be captured in the subsequent year. This method provides a more complete picture of achievements during a given calendar year but includes results from allocations that were granted in previous years.

Figures for people targeted and reached may sometimes include double counting as individuals often receive aid from multiple cluster/sectors.

Contributions are recorded based on the exchange rate when the cash was received which may differ from the Certified Statement of Accounts that records contributions based on the exchange rate at the time of the pledge.
2019 IN REVIEW

HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

Humanitarian situation in 2019
In 2019, the crisis in eastern Ukraine entered its fifth year and civilians continued to bear its heaviest brunt. Since 2014, over 3,300 civilians have been killed while more than 7,000 have been injured in the hostilities that are most intense near the ‘contact line’ – the 427-km-long line, which is about the length of the French-German border, that splits the affected areas into those under the Government’s control (GCA) and those outside the Government’s control (NGCA).

Ongoing violence and impact of hostilities
Landmines and explosive remnants of war (ERW) continue to kill and maim civilians, especially in rural areas. A total of 1,077 civilians have been killed or injured by landmines and ERWs since 2014 - almost one-fifth of these casualties was among children.

Ukraine ranks fifth worldwide for casualties caused by landmines and other ERW and second for anti-vehicle mine casualties (2015-2018). Landmines and ERW accounted for 35 per cent of conflict-related civilian deaths in 2019.1

Some 240,000 children living near the ‘contact line’ regularly experience direct shelling and exposure to landmines and explosive hazards. With over half a million children in need of humanitarian assistance in the ‘conflict-affected areas, a generation is growing up in violence and fear, compromising their future.

A protracted crisis and its impact on living standards
After five years, the conflict in eastern Ukraine remains active and continues to produce significant humanitarian needs. Beyond causing death and physical injury, the continuing violence in the conflict-affected areas has also negatively impacted the psychological well-being of ordinary people. Almost eight in ten household members in communities close to the ‘contact line’ feel a threat to their lives due to clashes. The elderly, children, people with disabilities and women are particularly vulnerable.

People are increasingly affected by mental health issues having lived in fear for far too long, and lacking self-esteem after losing their job. The economic situation of the Donbas region, once the economic heartland of Ukraine, is dire, which has seriously impacted household well-being and living standards.

Elderly and people with disabilities are particularly affected
The overwhelming impact of the conflict on the elderly is what makes this crisis different from others. While the younger generation is able to escape the violence and seek employment elsewhere, elderly people are less mobile and have nowhere else to go. Hence, they constitute a significant proportion of the conflict-affected population and make up over 30 per cent of the people in need. In isolated settlements – those closest to the ‘contact line’ - in GCA, 41 per cent of the population is elderly, which is notably higher than in the rest of the affected area.

Some 700,000 pensioners from NGCA have lost access to their pensions since 2014, which is more than half of all pensioners registered in NGCA in 2014. Over 40 per cent of elderly people rely on their pension as the main source of income.

Nearly 60 per cent of the people who regularly cross the ‘contact line’ are elderly, and most of them cross from NGCA to GCA to access their social entitlements, including pensions, state administrative services, hospitals, markets or to withdraw cash.

Related to the disproportionately large number of elderly is the fact that conflict-affected areas also present a larger proportion of people with disabilities. While the proportion of people with disabilities lies at 6.2 per cent across the whole of Ukraine, the share of the population with disabilities among the 200,000 people living within 5km of the ‘contact line’ in GCA is as high as 15 per cent.

2019 Humanitarian Response Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People in need</th>
<th>3.5M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People targeted</td>
<td>2.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding requirement</td>
<td>$164M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Since 2014, over 165 children have been killed or injured by landmines, unexploded ordinances and other deadly explosive remnants of war.
Community infrastructure and civilian assets
Hostilities have also damaged essential community infrastructure and civilian assets. Shelling incidents have routinely affected water, sanitation, health and education facilities cutting the affected population off from basic services. Shelling and other conflict-related incidents affected water and sanitation facilities 88 times in 2019 – with more than 300 incidents recorded in the last three years – disrupting access to water for millions of people. Over 35 per cent of some 600 health-care facilities in conflict-affected Donetska and Luhanska oblasts have sustained damage.

Access to civil administration and services
Beyond the violence, communities have been divided by the inability of people to cross the ‘contact line’ except at five designated crossing points. The ‘contact line’ prevents people from visiting family members and accessing markets, hospitals, schools and state services they regularly relied upon prior to the crisis because these are now on the other side of the ‘contact line’. When it comes to seeking administrative support, banking services and social benefits, NGCA residents are predominantly affected as these are only available in GCA.

Restrictions on aid in NGCA
The humanitarian crisis has been further compounded by the insecure operating environment. In NGCA, humanitarian access has been severely restricted since 2015, and despite recent improvements, remains unpredictable. While humanitarian organizations have maintained delivery of humanitarian programmes over the last two years to respond to the critical needs of the population, the level of assistance remains far below the scale required.
Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) allocation

First Allocation to support people with disabilities

The UHF is launched on 12 February 2019, by the Emergency Relief Coordinator of the United Nations

With first contribution to the UHF from Sweden, OCHA establishes UHF and recruits staff

The new Ukrainian president, Volodymyr Zelensky, is inaugurated

Fund Manager arrives, Advisory Board (AB) is established, Operational Manual is drafted
HC and AB identify initial key criteria and geographic focus for first allocation

Risk Management Framework and thresholds for capacity assessment are agreed by AB

Partners apply for eligibility and first round of capacity assessments are conducted
Review Committee is established and jointly reviews and approves project submissions for first allocation

Second round of capacity assessments is conducted

HC and UHF initiate efforts with partners and entities in control in NGCA to strengthen implementation capacity in NGCA with allocations in 2020

The Normandy-four summit (Ukraine, France, Germany, and Russia) in Paris

First Allocation to support people with disabilities
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2019 ALLOCATION

$7.1M CONTRIBUTIONS

$3.0M ALLOCATIONS

16.8K PEOPLE TARGETED

9.3K PEOPLE TARGETED WITH DISABILITY

For people reached visit: http://bit.ly/CBPF_overview

1.7K Boys
1.6K Girls
5K Men

8.5K Women

100K Men with disability
270K Girls with disability

100K Boys with disability

176K

1.6M NATIONAL NGOs

1.4M INTERNATIONAL NGOs

$1.6M $1.4M

1.8% 1.8% OF HRP REQUIREMENTS

Allocations in US$ thousands

Allocations in US$ million

IN THOUSANDS OF PERSONS

IN US$ MILLION
ABOUT THE UKRAINE HUMANITARIAN FUND

UHF background and launch
In the middle of 2018, the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and stakeholders in Ukraine requested that OCHA assess the conditions and support for establishing a country-based pooled fund (CBPF). A scoping mission was conducted by OCHA Headquarters staff in September that considered the current and projected humanitarian context in Ukraine, the existing humanitarian funding and requirements, and held extensive consultations with key stakeholders in country.

Following the mission, the HC continued consultations with the humanitarian community and stakeholders, and key donors expressed strong support for the opening of the fund. Stakeholders felt that it could support an agile response in a rapidly changing context and be a strategic and vital tool to help deliver humanitarian action in eastern Ukraine. They also considered that the Fund would help to further strengthen humanitarian leadership and reinforce the HC’s coordination role.

Upon due consideration of these inputs, the HC determined that the establishment of a CBPF in Ukraine would strengthen coordinated humanitarian action and improve the funding environment for NGOs.

Operationalizing the Fund
Upon arrival of the UHF fund Manager in June, work was conducted simultaneously on three separate tracks: i) establishing the Advisory Board and approving the operational manual, ii) drafting the UHF Risk Management Framework and conducting capacity assessments and iii) the launching of the first UHF allocation. To ensure these three workstreams remained on track, staff from OCHA HQ and other CBPFs surged to provide support. The Advisory Board and the HC showed strong commitment to quickly review and agree on the strategic focus of the first allocation and to the UHF’s foundational documents. OCHA also undertook 24 capacity assessments and the first allocation was completed by end of August.

Who sets the Fund’s priorities?
The HC for Ukraine oversees the Fund and decides on the UHF funding allocations. Under the leadership of the HC, a wide range of relief partners jointly assess and prioritize the most urgent needs through an inclusive and transparent process. This collaborative process helps foster cooperation and coordination within and between clusters and humanitarian organizations. The specific priorities to be addressed and supported are reflected in individual allocation strategies that are issued by the HC.

What is the Advisory Board and OCHA’s role
The UHF Advisory Board (AB) is a governance body with an advisory function that supports the HC to steer the strategy and oversees the performance of the UHF. Board members serve as technical or strategic experts from their constituencies or stakeholder groups and do not represent the interests of their organizations or broader constituencies. The AB has equal representation of each of the three key stakeholders of the Fund (donors, UN agencies, and NGOs).

Operational support is provided by OCHA’s Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) based in Kyiv. Being located in Kyiv, with frequent missions to the field, ensures the UHF is managed from the frontlines of the crisis with allocation processes and monitoring close to operational partners and their projects, while maintaining a close link to strategic decision-making. The effective use of UHF funds is supported by OCHA’s wider coordination activities, including needs assessments and strategic planning.

Improvement of humanitarian response by addressing priority humanitarian needs
Upon the establishment of the Ukraine Humanitarian Fund, the Humanitarian Coordinator and the Advisory Board promptly issued a first allocation to assist people with disabilities, as well as the most vulnerable elderly, in the most remote and isolated communities.

The allocation was effective in bringing partners together to review their operational and policy approaches to people with disabilities, thereby promoting innovation and the adoption of best practices.
To support the allocation, OCHA coordinated with the protection cluster and other partners to prepare a paper with a working “definition” of disability, and some guiding principles, in order to provide clarity on what type of beneficiaries will be qualified as “People with Disabilities”, and to ensure the accountability and tailoring of assistance for the most vulnerable.

The UHF support and the guiding principles has helped improve the assistance targeted for people with disabilities, as the guidance included suggestions on needs assessment, identification of people with disabilities and improvements to implementation. This has supported step changes in the programming of assistance for people with disabilities.

**Strengthened coordination and contributing to the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)**

The UHF contributed to HRP results by linking allocations to the HRP and strengthened coordination by incentivizing the wider participation and inclusion of humanitarian partners in the HRP and coordination mechanisms. This has helped boost the involvement of NNGOs from 12 in 2019 to 23 in 2020.

The UHF has supported the empowerment of NNGOs and fully integrated them into UHF processes and decision making. NNGOs serve as members of the Advisory Board and UHF Review Committee. In the first UHF allocation, six of the 12 projects selected were submitted by NNGOs (two in NGCA and four in GCA), and 45 per cent of the funding was allocated directly to NNGOs.

The UHF allocations are also based upon HRP priorities. The first UHF Standard Allocation was informed by an Inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) led mid-year prioritization process of the HRP. The allocation priorities and focus on disabilities were among those activities identified as the most urgent during that process.

**Strengthened HC leadership**

The UHF seeks to support more efficient and coherent humanitarian action under the empowered leadership of the HC. In 2019, the HC used the Fund to address the priority needs of people with disabilities and started to use the Fund as an incentive to increase access for partners in NGCA. In 2020, the UHF will support the HCT’s strategy of expanding humanitarian access in NGCA to meet urgent needs. The UHF will focus on enhancing NGO operational access, profiling and outreach in order to diversify and increase operational response capacity and coverage in NGCA.

**Who can receive UHF funding?**

UHF funds are channeled to partners that are best placed to deliver prioritized activities in accordance with the agreed strategy and humanitarian principles in a timely, and effective manner. UN agencies, funds and programmes, NGOs and Red Cross Red Crescent movement organizations can receive funds. To be eligible, NGOs need to undergo a rigorous capacity assessment to ensure they have in place the necessary structures and capacity to receive UHF funding.

**Who provides the funding?**

The UHF collects donor contributions to make funding directly available to humanitarian partners operating in eastern Ukraine so they can deliver timely and effective life-saving assistance and protection to the most vulnerable people.

The UHF is funded with contributions from UN Member States but can also receive contributions from individuals and other private or public sources.

**What does the UHF fund?**

The UHF funds activities that have been prioritized as the most urgent and strategic to address critical humanitarian needs in eastern Ukraine in close alignment with the Ukraine HRP.
**DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS**
Donors contribute to the humanitarian funds before urgent needs arise.

**IDENTIFYING HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**
Aid workers on the ground identify the most urgent types of humanitarian assistance that affected people need.

**MANAGING FUNDS**
Contributions are pooled into single funds.

**ALLOCATING FUNDS**
Based on expert advice from aid workers and on needs, the Humanitarian Coordinator allocates CBPF funding.

**REQUESTING FUNDS**
Humanitarian partners work together to prioritize life-saving relief activities. They request CBPF funding through the Humanitarian Coordinator.

**HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE**
Relief organizations use the money for urgent aid operations. They always track spending and impact, and report back to the Humanitarian Coordinator.
2019 IN REVIEW

DONOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Following the launch of the UHF in February 2019, the first contribution by Sweden in March 2019 enabled OCHA to administratively open the UHF and begin recruiting staff.

Contributions from Estonia, Germany, Norway and the Republic of Korea soon followed and brought the total contributions close to $4 million.

This strong support allowed the HC and OCHA to quickly operationalize the Fund and make available $3.2 million for the first allocation.

This allocation supported the most vulnerable people and specifically targeted people with disabilities and elderly people.

By the end of 2019, contributions to the UHF accounted for approximately 8.5 per cent of the total Ukraine HRP funding. Considering that the AB was not established until June, this represents a significant contribution to the response, and a broad base of nine donors was established.

Importantly this included support from donors that had not previously contributed to the response in Ukraine, such as Korea, and donors that were new to CBPF.

UHF donors Poland, Estonia and EU Humanitarian Aid (ECHO) (2020) had not previously contributed to a country-based pooled fund.

Like all CBPFs, the UHF is designed to complement other humanitarian funding sources, such as bilateral funding and the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF).

Early and predictable contributions are crucial as they give stakeholders enough time to prioritize funds strategically and in complementarity with other available funding. In early 2020, ECHO contributed EUR1 million, and together with the $3.7 million carry over, the UHF is in a strong position for the first allocation of 2020.

Donors demonstrated strong trust and support for the Ukraine UHF, depositing $7 million between April 2019 and December 2019. The generous funding allowed the UHF to support humanitarian partners implementing urgent and life-saving humanitarian activities in Ukraine.
ALLOCATION OVERVIEW

Upon establishment of the UHF, the HC and the Advisory Board promptly issued a first allocation to specifically target people with disabilities and the most vulnerable elderly people.

A total amount of US$3.2 million was available for this allocation, with envelopes of $1.6 million for GCA, focusing on 53 isolated settlements close to the ‘contact line’ and $1.6 million for NGCA, focusing on settlements within 5 km of the ‘contact line’.

The allocation targeted households with people with disabilities and the most vulnerable elderly people close to the ‘contact line’. People living within 5 km of the ‘contact line’ are frequently the most in need of humanitarian assistance. Shelling and landmines have isolated some 70,000 people who live in some 60 communities in areas close to the ‘contact line’ in GCA. Almost half of them are elderly, and some 35 per cent are people with disabilities and chronic diseases.

Residents face challenges accessing social services, markets and healthcare. Many of these communities have been cut off from their typical service providers.

According to an assessment by REACH earlier in 2019, some 95 per cent of households with people with disabilities in NGCA reportedly do not receive any care support services. The allocation enabled humanitarian organizations on the ground to urgently scale up collective humanitarian action to target and address the needs of people with disabilities and elderly people.

Strengthening coordination and improving response

In line with the UHF’s goal of strengthening inter-cluster cooperation and seeking to support a holistic response, the allocation prioritized multi-sector projects. The Review Committee was therefore composed of an equal representation of clusters, and collectively reviewed and assessed projects.

Alignment with the Ukraine 2019 HRP

A total of 36 project proposals with total budget of over $12.5 million were submitted, including 21 proposals submitted by NNGOs, 12 by international NGOs (INGOs), one by the Ukrainian Red Cross and two by UN agencies. All partners were required to consult with cluster coordinators during the preparation of their projects and the quality of proposals was very high.

Review and capacity assessments

Alongside the preparation and briefings for the allocation, OCHA completed capacity assessments of 24 partners by the end of August. This included three capacity assessments that were conducted following the strategic review for partners whose projects were selected but that had not yet undergone capacity assessments.

There were many more projects that were recommended based on the scoring and strategic review of projects than funding available within the allocation, especially for projects submitted in GCA.

In NGCA, all projects must be submitted by implementing partners to the entities in control of NGCA for approval. The approval of UHF projects took from one to four months, and this delayed the signature of grant agreements for those five projects. In addition, one of the projects that was planned to be implemented in Donetska and Luhanska oblasts (NGCA) was not approved in Luhanska oblast (NGCA), so $200,000 that was available was not allocated for that project.

Planning for 2020, and expansion of assistance in NGCA to meet urgent needs

The Humanitarian Needs Overview that informed the development of the 2020 HRP in November 2019 found that of 1.9 million of the estimated 3.4 million people that require humanitarian assistance or protection services reside in NGCA. Living conditions in the entire NGCA are particularly challenging due to socioeconomic deterioration, lack of aid, pre-conflict poverty and unaddressed impacts of heavy fighting in the area in 2014 and 2015. Along with the larger number of people requiring assistance, the humanitarian needs of people in need also tend to be greater in NGCA.

Despite the greater number of people in need, and the higher needs in NGCA, the number of people reached in NGCA in 2019 was significantly lower than in GCA. Only 150,000 people in NGCA were reached in 2019 compared to 850,000 in GCA. This proportion is similar to previous years.

Access to people in need remains one of the key challenges for humanitarian actors in eastern Ukraine. Since July 2015, humanitarian access has been severely restricted and despite recent improvements remains highly unpredictable. Over the past two years, humanitarian organizations have maintained delivery of humanitarian programmes, but responding to the critical needs of the population remains far below the required scale.
2019 ALLOCATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3M</td>
<td>Standard allocation</td>
<td>July 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALLOCATIONS BY TYPE

$3.0M Total allocations
$0M Reserve allocations

SUBGRANT BY PARTNER TYPE

INGOs $1.6M
NNGOs $1.4M

PEOPLE TARGETED BY CLUSTER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster</th>
<th>People Targeted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>6,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>1,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>2,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security &amp; Livelihoods</td>
<td>2,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter/NFI</td>
<td>1,410</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ALLOCATIONS BY STRATEGIC FOCUS

C01 Affected people have access to adequate protection and means of livelihoods.
C02 Affected people have improved access to quality and affordable services.
C03 Affected people have consistent access to critical civilian structures.

Allocations by strategic focus

$0.1M CO1
$2.4M CO2
$0.5M CO3

In USD million
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GENDER WITH AGE MARKER PROJECTS

JULY - DECEMBER 2019

- Does not systematically link programming actions
- Unlikely to contribute to gender equality (no gender equality measure and no age consideration)
- Unlikely to contribute to gender equality (no gender equality measure but includes age consideration)
- Likely to contribute to gender equality, but without attention to age groups
- Likely to contribute to gender equality, including across age groups

TARGETED PEOPLE WITH DISABILITY

- 9.3K people targeted with disability
- 56% of people targeted

Alignment with the Ukraine 2020 HRP

The allocation will support the strategic objective (SO4) of the 2020 HRP (4) to expand and secure humanitarian access to two million people in need in all areas where needs are most acute and where access is limited acknowledging the importance of this assistance to preventing cycles of future violence.

Diverse set of partners

UHF allocations strengthened partnerships in humanitarian response by allocating funds to local and international humanitarian organizations.

Complementarity with other funding sources

In April 2019, the CERF provided $6 million, within the Under-Funded Emergencies window to UN agencies, prior to the launch of the UHF.
Oleksiy and his wife Svitlana live in the town of Marinka in eastern Ukraine. Their house has a stove, solid fuel for which takes a large share of their pension during winter. Oleksiy has a disability caused by hip arthrosis. Years of hostilities have had a devastating impact on Svitlana’s health. Last year, she had a stroke that paralyzed 70 per cent of her limbs, and Oleksiy has been caring for her ever since, while also suffering from continuous pain from his disability.

“I still can remember the times when my wife and I would run to work or to the local market… Unfortunately, the armed conflict ruined our health, and now neither of us can use our legs. My wife can’t walk at all, and I have to care for her in everything,” Oleksiy said. He now himself needs an expensive surgery to be able to continue taking care of his wife and their household.

With UHF support, Emmanuel supported Oleksiy and Svitlana with the installation of a new stove and provided them with 3.4 tons of solid fuel. This will help the couple to stay warm in their house during the harsh winter and help save some additional money for Oleksiy’s surgery, which costs an unsurmountable $6,000 for their family.

“Even though we still feel our pain, we, at least, will be warm during the winter,” – Oleksiy shared.
In 2019, the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) Mark Lowcock identified four priority areas that are often underfunded and lack appropriate consideration in the allocation of humanitarian funding.

These four priority areas were duly considered when prioritizing life-saving needs in the allocation processes.

Prior to the UHF allocation the OCHA gender focal point briefed partners on how to ensure that gender and age considerations were properly considered and articulated in projects and explained the use of the GAM tool. This aspect of project proposals was carefully reviewed during the strategic review of projects and played a large part in selection considering the strong competition. This helped ensure that self-reported GAM scores by partners indicated that 92 per cent of the projects were likely to contribute to gender equality, including across age groups, while 8 per cent were likely to contribute to gender equality, but without attention to age groups.

The share of the disabled population among the 200,000 people living within 5km of the ‘contact line’ in GCA is as high 15 per cent, and likely similar in NGCA. This reflects not only the presence of a large elderly population, but also suggests that their disability has kept them from moving away from particularly affected areas closest to the contact line. The first UHF allocation directly targeted people with disabilities in these hard to reach areas and 56 per cent of the UHF allocation went directly to support people with disabilities. The UHF sought to go beyond just providing assistance to people with disabilities but worked to create step changes in the way that humanitarian organizations in Ukraine respond to the needs of these people.

The Ukraine Humanitarian Coordinator has consistently highlighted that the conflict in eastern Ukraine is a protracted protection crisis and the AB agreed that the UHF should ensure that protection is strongly supported. The significance of the concerns around protection was also highlighted in the 2019 HRP, as $48 million was requested for protection activities which represented 30 per cent of the total requirements, and this was 10 per cent more than the next largest cluster. This was reflected in the first allocation as half of all projects included specific protection activities. In additional 25 per cent of the funding for GCA went to protection activities and 12 per cent of the funding in NGCA went to protection activities.
The UHF 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.

Considering that the UHF only became operational in June 2019, and the strategic priority of the UHF was to initiate an allocation and review the capacity of partners, there was no discussion on 2019 annual targets with the UHF advisory board. It would also not be appropriate to assess and measure performance on an annual basis considering that the Fund only operated for 6 months in 2019.

However, in order to enable reporting in line with the other CBPFs, the UHF has reported on those areas that are relevant and appropriate.

As outcomes numbered 8, 14, 18 and 20 are related to previous years allocations, these are not included but the numbering was maintained to be consistent with other CBPFs.
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.

1 Inclusive governance

The Advisory Board has a manageable size and a balanced representation of CBPF stakeholders.

Target
The target set in the UHF Operational Manual was reached. It requires that the AB ensures equitable representation of the key stakeholders to the Fund; two Donors, two UN agencies, two NGOs and OCHA. A non-contributing donor also serves as an observer on the AB. It requires that the AB ensures equitable representation of the key stakeholders to the Fund.

2 Inclusive programming

The review committees of the Fund have the appropriate size and a balanced representation of different partner constituencies and cluster representatives.

Target
Although no target was agreed, the UHF Operational Manual requires that the Review Committee is composed of Cluster Coordinators and one additional member from each Cluster, to ensure equal representation between UN agencies and NGOs.

COMPOSITION OF ADVISORY BOARD

Results
The AB had representation of stakeholders to the Fund and the target was reached.

Analysis
During establishment of the Fund, it was agreed that the AB should be relatively small and empowered so that members could efficiently review and agree on the Fund’s foundational documents. This allowed strong and timely discussions and good input on the Risk Management Framework, the Operational Manual, and allocation paper and decisions.

Follow up actions
It has been agreed that the HC will review the composition of the Advisory Board after the first year of operation and it is recommended to maintain the current representation.
PRINCIPLE 1

INCLUSIVENESS

multi-sector projects, the Review Committee jointly reviewed these projects and together conducted a final shortlisting of projects to be submitted to the Advisory Board and HC for endorsement.

Follow up actions
The UHF Review Committee members will also be involved in monitoring of projects.

3 Inclusive implementation

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

Target
No target was set.

Results
In first allocation, 12 projects were selected, six from NNGOs and six from INGOs. 54.7 per cent of funding went directly to INGOs and 45.3 per cent to NNGOs. In terms of net funding, 53 per cent was allocated to INGOs and NNGOs received 47 per cent of net funding.

The projects that were originally approved by the Review Committee included more funding to NNGOs but one of the NNGO projects ($419,000) in NGCA needed to be withdrawn as the organization lost their permission to operate in Donetska oblast (NGCA). The next best project was submitted by an INGO therefore their proportion of funding was reversed.

Analysis
The HC’s decision to establish the UHF was underpinned by the commitment on the Grand Bargain and the challenging funding landscape in Ukraine, due to the protracted nature of the conflict (which however remains an active one) and the particularly difficult funding environment for NGOs which are struggling to access funding despite the added value they bring to the response. The UHF Operational Manual also states the UHF will support the localization agenda by empowering local responders and providing funding to NGOs, while supporting the highest-priority projects of the best placed responders.

Projects submitted by NNGOs in the first UHF allocation therefore received some extra points in the scorecard during the Strategic Review.

Follow up actions
The UHF will continue to empower NNGOs and advocate strongly for their access and participation in NGCA, while also supporting the highest-priority projects of the best placed responders.

4 Inclusive engagement

Resources are invested by OCHA’s Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) in supporting the capacity of local and NNGO partners within the scope of CBPF strategic objectives.

Target
No target was set.

Results
In line with the strategic need to ensure and support broad participation in the UHF, OCHA conducted 14 targeted trainings for 251 participant and attended by 206 organizations.1

Follow up actions
The UHF will continue to empower NNGOs and advocate strongly for their access and participation in NGCA, while also supporting the highest-priority projects of the best placed responders.

TRAININGS

- 14 trainings
- 206 organizations trained
- 251 total people trained

1. Most participants and organizations attended more than one session as these covered different material in different locations.
In 2019 the UHF was successful in achieving the goal of strengthening the capacity and boosting the involvement of NGOs in the humanitarian response in Ukraine in line with one of the strategic priorities the Fund. Along with playing key roles in providing strategic direction to the fund as an Advisory Board member NGOs are also active participants in the review and vetting of project proposals. In order to ensure and support this participation OCHA and the UHF actively reached out to and trained NGOs on implementation and how the fund operates.

As expected during the opening of a fund, OCHA conducted a large number of targeted trainings in 2019 to support partners. This has ensured that partners are properly prepared to undergo a capacity assessment, project submission procedures are clear, and that project implementation goes smoothly and can be adjusted as appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th># of organizations trained</th>
<th># of people trained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training on Due Diligence and Assessment preparation</td>
<td>Webex</td>
<td>25.06.19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Webex</td>
<td>02.07.19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Briefing and instructional workshop on how to become eligible to receive UHF funding</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>03.07.19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sievieredonetsk</td>
<td>04.07.19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kramatorsk</td>
<td>05.07.19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>09.07.19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and workshop on project preparation and submission</td>
<td>Kramatorsk</td>
<td>24.07.19</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sievieredonetsk</td>
<td>25.07.19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>26.07.19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>31.07.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kramatorsk</td>
<td>07.08.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Donetsk</td>
<td>08.08.19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHF training for new UHF partners on project implementations, revisions and accountability</td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>03.09.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyiv</td>
<td>04.09.19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**

In 2019 the UHF was successful in achieving the goal of strengthening the capacity and boosting the involvement of NGOs in the humanitarian response in Ukraine in line with one of the strategic priorities the Fund. Along with playing key roles in providing strategic direction to the fund as an Advisory Board member NGOs are also active participants in the review and vetting of project proposals. In order to ensure and support this participation OCHA and the UHF actively reached out to and trained NGOs on implementation and how the fund operates.

As expected during the opening of a fund, OCHA conducted a large number of targeted trainings in 2019 to support partners. This has ensured that partners are properly prepared to undergo a capacity assessment, project submission procedures are clear, and that project implementation goes smoothly and can be adjusted as appropriate.

**Follow up actions**

In 2020, the UHF will complete all capacity assessments of partners that have already completed their due diligence and will continue to support partners with targeted training and invite new partners to become eligible.
**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.

**5 Flexible assistance**

CBPF funding is allocated for cash assistance.

**Target**

As the Fund was only established in 2019, no target was set.

**Results**

In 2019, 13 per cent of funding ($386,800) was allocated to cash assistance. Of this amount, 61 per cent was considered restricted cash assistance and 39 per cent was considered unrestricted cash assistance.

**Analysis**

The UHF supports cash assistance projects if the conditions are appropriate. This included cash for food and Multi-Purpose Cash. However, the first UHF allocation supported people in isolated settlements along the 'contact line' and in many of these locations, markets are not functioning and the disabled and elderly people that were targeted are not able to get to shops in larger communities. In NGCA, there are also significant restrictions on cash assistance. The selection of the type of assistance, i.e. cash versus items such as coal, food assistance, etc., was based on needs analysis and beneficiary preferences.

**Follow up actions**

The UHF will continue to work with partner and support the most appropriate response mechanisms in 2020.

**CASH TRANSFER PROGRAMMING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$3M</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2.6M</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BY ORGANIZATION TYPE**

- NGOs: $142K (37%)
- UN: $245K (63%)

**BY SECTOR**

- Health: $387K (4%)
- WASH: $149K (1%)
- FSL: $255K (6%)
- Restricted: $238K (67%)

**BY CONDITIONALITY**

- Unconditional: $132K (34%)
- Conditional: $255K (66%)

**BY RESTRICTIONS**

- Unrestricted: $149K (39%)
- Restricted: $238K (61%)

**6 Flexible operation**

CBPF Funding supports projects that improve the common ability of actors to deliver a more effective response.

**Target**

No target was set.

**Results**

There was no UHF funding that supported common services in 2019.

**Analysis**

During the allocation that targeted people with disabilities, it was not necessary or appropriate to support common services.

**Follow up actions**

In 2020, the UHF is considering supporting needs assessments in NGCA, as this common service provides vital analysis of the humanitarian situation and needs in NGCA. This multi-sector needs assessments will inform humanitarian strategy, including the 2021 HRP, UHF allocations and improve the collective understanding and targeting of needs in NGCA.
7 Flexible allocation process

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

Target
No target was set.

Results
The 2019 funding allocation was based on needs, and there was no strategic decision to provide more funding to any geographic area.

Analysis
In requesting the establishment of the Fund, the Ukraine HC envisioned that it would support the expansion of assistance to access in NGCA, so as to meet urgent needs in NGCAs and along the ‘contact line’.

The UHF Advisory Board and the HC were also cognizant of the expectations of the larger number of response organization who are only able to operate in GCA. In addition, REACH completed an in-depth assessment of conditions in isolated settlements in GCA near the ‘contact line’ that identified significant needs, especially amongst vulnerable people.

The HC and the Advisory Board therefore decided that the million allocation should cover both sides of the ‘contact line’. Part of one partners’ project that was to be implemented in Luhanska oblast NGCA was not approved, and so approximately $200,000 was not disbursed. Therefore approximately $1.6 million was disbursed in GCA and $1.4 million was disbursed in NGCA.

Follow up actions
In 2020 the UHF will again focus on areas with the highest humanitarian needs and based on the 2020 HNO may concentrate more funding in NGCA. It is however acknowledged that there are significant bureaucratic constraints that limit partners and delay approval of projects. Therefore beginning in November 2019 the HC, OCHA head of office and OCHA sub-offices and the UHF initiated discussions with the entities in control in NGCA and partners on an allocation that will support access in NGCA.

8 Flexible implementation

This is not relevant for UHF in 2019. There were no request for reprogramming of projects in 2019, although some projects have asked for reprogramming in 2020.
PRINCIPLE 3

TIMELINESS

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

9 Timely allocation

CBPFs allocation processes have an appropriate duration.

**Target**
No target was set.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>GCA</th>
<th>NGCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From allocation closing date to HC signature of the grant agreement (days)</td>
<td>Standard Allocations</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Analysis**
The average number of days was increased significantly due to issues in NGCA with approval of projects. All projects in NGCA must be submitted to the entities in control of NGCA for approval, and the approval of projects took between one month and four months.

As the UHF allocation requested multi-sector projects and all members of the review committee participated in reviewing projects the strategic review process also took a little longer than planned. This was the first time that all partners submitted projects and that review committee members conducted technical reviews, so the technical review also took additional time. OCHA conducted a lessons learned exercise following the allocation to capture concerns. The UHF will adopt practices to assist partners and review committee members to ensure a quicker process going forward.

**Follow up actions**
The UHF will continue to work closely with partners, the Review Committee and New York colleagues to rapidly review and approve projects in 2020.

10 Timely disbursements

Payments are processed without delay.

**Target**
Ten days from EO signature of a proposal to first payment.

**Results**
Average number of working days from EO signature of a proposal to first payment was four days.

**Analysis**
This performance surpassed the set target, and ensured that UHF Implementing Partners were able to initiate their projects promptly. This was the result of strong co-operation between the UHF finance office in Kyiv and the CBPF finance team in New York.

**Follow up actions**
The UHF will continue to work closely with OCHA New York finance colleagues to continue quick disbursements.
PRINCIPLE 3

TIMELINESS

11 Timely contributions

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

Target
Considering that the Fund was only launched in February and received its first contribution in March, there was no target set.

Results
Donors were quick to support the Fund soon after it was launched. This allowed the UHF to quickly become operational and launch an allocation in July within just over a month after the Fund manager was in place, as 70 per cent of funding received in 2019 was contributed by June 2019.

Analysis
Overall, donors were quick to follow through on their pledges with 91 per cent of contributions received within one month of a pledge. However, unfortunately no donors have made a multi-year contribution to the UHF.

Follow up actions
In early 2020 the UHF was also pleased to receive a contribution from ECHO, which was the first for a Country Based Pooled Fund globally.

OCHA will continue to request that donors provide contributions early in the year to support early response and allocations.
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.

12 Efficient scale

CBPFs have a significant funding level to support the delivery of the HRP’s.

Target

As Fund only became operational and Advisory Board was established in June 2019, no target was set.

Results

In 2019, 10 per cent of HRP funding was channeled through the UHF.

Analysis

Considering that the Fund only became operational in June, this was a significant mark of donor support and confidence in the Fund.

Follow up actions

In line with global commitments made during the grand bargain, in 2020, the UHF will seek contributions from donors amounting to 15 percent of the contributions to the HRP. To support and achieve this ambitious target, a Resource Mobilization Strategy will be developed for the Fund.

13 Efficient prioritization

CBPF funding is prioritized in alignment with the HRP.

Target

No target was set.

Results

The large majority of the activities (82 per cent) targeted Collective Outcome 2 of the HRP, “affected people have improved access to quality and affordable services”.

Follow up actions

In 2020, the UHF strategy will be closely linked to the objectives outlined in the 2020 HRP. For example, in November 2019 the UHF, HC and OCHA were already working to prepare an allocation to support access in NGCA, which is tightly linked to strategic objective four of the 2020 HRP.

14 Efficient coverage

As the UHF was established in 2019, data is not available.

ALLOCATION BY HRP COLLECTIVE OUTCOMES

- **$460K** CO3
- **$66K** CO1
- **$3M** TOTAL ALLOCATIONS
- **$2.5M** CO2

CO1 Affected people have access to adequate protection and means of livelihoods.

CO2 Affected people have improved access to quality and affordable services.

CO3 Affected people have consistent access to critical civilian structures.

Analysis

In line with the first allocation strategy and the focus on people with disabilities in isolated locations the activities focused on direct provision of services, which was primarily in line with Collective Outcome 2. In addition, 15 per cent of the allocation supported Collective Outcome 3, “affected people have consistent access to critical civilian structures”.

Follow up actions

In 2020, the UHF strategy will be closely linked to the objectives outlined in the 2020 HRP. For example, in November 2019 the UHF, HC and OCHA were already working to prepare an allocation to support access in NGCA, which is tightly linked to strategic objective four of the 2020 HRP.
PRINCIPLE 4

EFFICIENCY

15 Efficient management

CBPF management is cost-efficient and context-appropriate.

Target
No target was set.

Results
The total direct cost expenditure for the UHF in 2019 was $268,745.

HFU DIRECT COSTS AGAINST TOTAL ALLOCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Allocations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFU direct costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$0.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis
As there was only one UHF allocation, the percentage of direct cost compared to the allocation is 8 per cent, but the percentage of direct cost compared to contributions received is 4 per cent.

This proportion of direct costs is in line with the operational costs of a smaller fund, and the proportion tends to decrease if more funds are allocated.

Follow up actions
In 2020, the direct cost of the fund will remain similar, as the size of the OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit will not increase in size, but the UHF will aim to allocate over $10 million in 2020. This will improve the overall cost effectiveness of the Fund.

16 Efficient management

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

Target
No target set.

Results
The UHF is fully compliant with management and operational standards required by the CBPF Global Guidelines.

Analysis
As soon as the fund manager for the UHF was in place, OCHA worked closely with the Advisory Board to develop the UHF operational manual and the UHF risk management framework. These documents were prepared based on global best practices and ensure that all minimum requirements in the global guidelines are adhered to. During three meetings separate meetings, the Advisory Board reviewed and discussed the Fund’s foundational documents. A comprehensive discussion and review was conducted of the risk management framework including the thresholds for the capacity assessment. The major risks to the fund were also discussed in detail and ranked in order of severity and likelihood and risk mitigation activities were included in the risk management framework. These strategic documents informed the first allocation and the completion of the risk management framework.

The risk management discussions and risk management framework correctly identified the possibility and risk that the entities in control in NGCA could withdraw the permission of a UHF partner to implement. This helped overcome surprises when this occurred and sped up the discussion on how this should be addressed. The Advisory Board quickly agreed to allocate the funds to another partner.

Following the first allocation the UHF decided to undertake additional monitoring and financial spot check visits that were above the requirements in the operational modalities. This was undertaken in order to better understand partners, empower the Review Committee and support project delivery. It also ensured that partners’ systems are assessed and that new UHF partners are well prepared for reporting and audits.

Follow up actions
The UHF operational manual will be reviewed in July 2020.
PRINCIPLE 5

ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

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

17 Accountability to affected people

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

**Target**

No target was set.

**Results**

Partner projects complied with requirements to ensure accountability to affected population.

**Analysis**

The importance of accountability to affected populations (AAP) within the humanitarian response in Ukraine has been consistently highlighted and there is strong awareness and capacity in this area. This can be seen by the large number of hotline and feedback mechanisms that exist for people affected by the conflict.

The UHF briefed all partners during the project preparation stage on why it was important to incorporate accountability to affected populations in projects. The allocation’s scorecard for the first allocation considered and scored projects on their approach to accountability to affected populations. Considering the strong competition for the first allocation, the quality of a partner’s approach in this area impacted their likelihood to receive funding.

The UHF conducted monitoring missions of just over half of the projects from the first allocation in early 2020 and the AAP feedback mechanisms were looked at closely during the monitoring. The results from these monitoring visits were largely positive and confirmed that partners are doing an effective job at providing opportunities for feedback and importantly responding to these calls and questions.

**Follow up actions**

OCHA and the UHF will continue to support and require partners to full incorporate AAP into their projects and programming.

---

**ACCOUNTABILITY TO AFFECTED PEOPLE**

- **$0.6M**: 3 Projects Partially - 1
- **$3M** Total Allocations
- **$2.4M**: 9 Projects Yes - 2

- The project includes the provision of accessible and functioning feedback and/or compliant mechanisms for beneficiaries
- The project partially includes the provision of accessible and functioning feedback and/or compliant mechanisms for beneficiaries
- The project does not include the provision of accessible and functioning feedback and/or compliant mechanisms for beneficiary

18 Accountability and risk management for projects

As the UHF was established in 2019, data is not available.
PRINCIPLE 5
ACCOUNTABILITY AND RISK MANAGEMENT

19 Accountability and risk management of implementing partners

CBPF Funding is allocated to partners as per the identified capacity and risk level.

Target
No target set.

Results
During the first allocation, eight of the 12 partners were low risk (66 per cent) and the other four partners were medium risk (33 per cent).

Analysis
As noted previously, the UHF undertook capacity assessments at the same time as it was developing the first allocation strategy and completed 24 capacity assessments by the end of August and 32 by the end of the year. The UHF and OCHA sub-offices have made a concerted effort to reach out to new partners and raise awareness for the fund and encourage partners to become eligible.

Overall, the capacity assessments demonstrated the strong capacity of NGO partners that have been responding to humanitarian needs in Ukraine. This included many of the NNGOs that have been established after the crisis erupted and have quickly put in place strong financial administrative and program capacity and so were rated low risk. The level of understanding around administrative reporting and accountability requirements is very high among NNGOs in Ukraine and there is strong technical capacity, including in finance and administration, within staff of NNGOs.

Some NGOs that have been established more recently and have had less time to develop their systems, structures and tools, were rated medium to high risk or not yet eligible. The UHF has provided feedback and support throughout this capacity assessment process to encourage partners to address these issues and they are welcome to apply again in six months.

Follow up actions
In 2020, the UHF will be conducting financial spot checks and monitoring visits and will use these two support partners to develop and strengthen their capacity.

20 Accountability and risk management of funding

As the UHF was established in 2019, data is not available.
UHF supports TGH project to help people along the contact line with cash assistance and some home-based care

Yevhenia lives alone in a settlement close to the ‘contact line,’ where hostilities are still intense. Two years ago, she suffered from a hip fracture. After the surgery, it took her almost a year and a lot of strength and determination to start walking again, using the walking sticks to support herself. Yet, without the support of others, she cannot fully take care of herself and her household.

Even though Yevhenia does not ask for much, and her needs are very basic – food, medicine and some utility costs to cover – she can’t afford much with her $100 pension: ‘When you go shopping, it looks like you haven’t bought much, but spent at least $40.’ With UHF support, Triangle Génération Humanitaire provided Yevhenia with cash assistance to meet her most urgent needs and sent a volunteer caretaker to help Yevhenia in her everyday life. ‘I try to arrange for her to spend at least 15-20 minutes outdoors every day, even during cold days, because it’s difficult to stay alone in the house all day long,’ explains her caretaker Natalia.

The armed conflict has completely disrupted already limited access to markets, health care and basic services for people with disabilities like Yevhenia. The little support that they can get from humanitarian organizations means the world to them. But, above all, they need peace. ‘The shelling continues. These days it seems to be more than before. When will this war end? It feels like never,’ – Yevhenia said with a sigh.
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ANNEX A

ALLOCATIONS BY RECIPIENT ORGANIZATION

International NGO $1.6M 55%

- Medicos del Mundo $419
- People in Need $322
- HelpAge $272
- Emmanuel $219
- Triangle Generation Humanitaire $205
- Save the Children $200

National NGO $1.4M 45%

- Donbass Development Center $367
- arche noVa Ukraine $260
- Caritas Ukraine $223
- Proliska $213
- Dorcas $205
- Mira $181

In USD thousands

See Annex D for acronyms
# ANNEX B

## UHF-FUNDED PROJECTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>PROJECT CODE</th>
<th>CLUSTER</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
<th>BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/FSL/NGO/13624</td>
<td>Food Security &amp; Livelihoods</td>
<td>Docas Aid International Transcarpathia</td>
<td>$208,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/H-N-WASH/NGO/13737</td>
<td>Health (50%), Water Sanitation Hygiene (50%)</td>
<td>ICF Caritas Ukraine</td>
<td>$222,891</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/P-FSL/INGO/13730</td>
<td>Protection (25%), Food Security &amp; Livelihoods (75%)</td>
<td>Triangle Generation Humanitaire</td>
<td>$205,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/P-WASH/NGO/13752</td>
<td>Protection (87%), Water Sanitation Hygiene (13%)</td>
<td>Proliska</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/P-WASH-FSL/INGO/13701</td>
<td>Protection (31%), Water Sanitation Hygiene (26%), Food Security &amp; Livelihoods (43%)</td>
<td>People In Need</td>
<td>$321,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/P-WASH-H-N/INGO/13680</td>
<td>Protection (60%), Water Sanitation Hygiene (29%), Health (11%)</td>
<td>HelpAge International UK</td>
<td>$273,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/S-NFI/NGO/13777</td>
<td>Shelter and NFI</td>
<td>International Children's Fund 'Mira'</td>
<td>$140,902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/S-NFI-H-N-FSL/INGO/13722</td>
<td>Shelter and NFI (76%), Health (20%), Food Security &amp; Livelihoods (4%)</td>
<td>International Public Organization &quot;Emmanuel&quot; Charity Association</td>
<td>$215,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/WASH-S-NFI/NGO/13707</td>
<td>Water Sanitation Hygiene (58%), Shelter and NFI (42%)</td>
<td>Charitable Fund arche noVa Ukraine</td>
<td>$260,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/P-FSL-H-N-WASH-S-NFI/NGO/13694</td>
<td>Protection (15%), Food Security &amp; Livelihoods (15%), Health (15%), Water Sanitation Hygiene (40%), Shelter and NFI (15%)</td>
<td>Donbass Development Center</td>
<td>$307,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/WASH-P/INGO/13773</td>
<td>Water Sanitation Hygiene (96.1%), Protection (3.9%)</td>
<td>Save the Children International</td>
<td>$200,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>UKR-19/UKR_CBPF/SA1/H-N/INGO/14396</td>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Medicos del Mundo</td>
<td>$419,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# ANNEX C

## UHF ADVISORY BOARD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STAKEHOLDER</th>
<th>ORGANIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chairperson (non-rotating)</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO (rotating)</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO (rotating)</td>
<td>Right to Protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN (rotating)</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN (rotating)</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor (rotating)</td>
<td>The Government of Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor (rotating)</td>
<td>European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations ECHO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer (rotating)</td>
<td>The Government of Canada (as non-contributing donor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Custodian of the Fund</td>
<td>OCHA Head of Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB secretariat</td>
<td>UHF Fund Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX D

### ACRONYMS & ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAP</td>
<td>Accountability to Affected Populations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBPF</td>
<td>Country Based Pooled Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERF</td>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Collective Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPF</td>
<td>Common Performance Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorcas</td>
<td>Charitable Organization &quot;Dorcas Aid International Transcarpathia&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel</td>
<td>International Public Organization &quot;Charity Association &quot;Emmanuel&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERC</td>
<td>Emergency Relief Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAM</td>
<td>Gender and Age Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCA</td>
<td>Government Controlled Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMS</td>
<td>Grant Management System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Humanitarian Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCT</td>
<td>Humanitarian Country Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HelpAge</td>
<td>HelpAge International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFU</td>
<td>Humanitarian Financing Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HNO</td>
<td>Humanitarian Needs Overview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRP</td>
<td>Humanitarian Response Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASC</td>
<td>Inter Agency Standing Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICCG</td>
<td>Inter-Cluster Coordination Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDP</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>International Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Implementing Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicos del Mundo</td>
<td>Medicos del Mundo Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIRA</td>
<td>Charitable Organization &quot;International Children's Fund &quot;MIRA&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGCA</td>
<td>Non-Government Controlled Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>National Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCHA</td>
<td>Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWD</td>
<td>Persons with Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RA</td>
<td>Reserve Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RC</td>
<td>Review Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Standard Allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TGH</td>
<td>Triangle Generation Humanitaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOR</td>
<td>Terms of Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHF</td>
<td>Ukraine Humanitarian Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX E

REFERENCE MAP

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