Background

The YHF conducted its annual stakeholder survey in June 2018 to collect key stakeholder feedback on the Fund’s performance in 2017 to improve the Fund’s management processes. Members of the Advisory Board, Cluster Coordinators and Co-coordinators representing 11 active clusters/sectors in the country, and YHF partners were invited to take the survey. The survey comprised 23 questions covering allocation prioritization processes and the quality of allocation strategies, strategic and technical review processes, YHF performance against its objectives, and support provided by OCHA’s Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU).

Survey Results

The survey received 62 responses from stakeholders representing all constituencies. While the survey comprised mostly multiple-choice questions, respondents were asked to provide substantive comments where relevant. The responses were largely positive particularly on the improved allocation processes and partner engagements over the course of the year. Notably, 90 per cent of the respondents found the overall HFU support to be satisfactory (excellent, very good or fair). The below is a summary of key findings and recommendations.

Respondents’ professional role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YHF Advisory Board member</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Agency staff</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN or NGO staff - technical</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN or NGO staff - management</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Cluster (Co-) Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster (Co-)Coordinator/Sub-Cluster (Co-)Coordin:</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FEEDBACK ON THE CLARITY OF RULES AND ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR THE ALLOCATIONS AND SUPPORTING IN PREPARING THE PROPOSALS

- Do not know: 3%
- Not at all clear: 11%
- Not so clear: 23%
- Somewhat clear: 48%
- Very clear: 11%

USEFULNESS OF FEEDBACK PROVIDED BY THE STRATEGIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEES ON PROPOSALS

- Not at all or not so useful: 5%
- Not at all timely: 15%
- Not very timely: 28%
- Quite timely: 39%
- Very timely: 11%
- I don’t know / I was not involved: 7%

Extremely useful: 12%
Very useful: 49%
1. **Make the partnership and programme cycle management more inclusive**

While appreciating efforts made by the HFU to support partners throughout the programme cycle, several respondents noted that this partnership could be enhanced through timely consultation, increased engagement, information sharing and feedback, as well as more frequent technical trainings.

2. **Enhance the efficiency in the overall allocation process**

Many respondents noted that high-quality proposals require time to be developed. They felt that the deadline to submit proposals was too short to ensure a qualitative process and could be enhanced by increased visibility on the timing of allocations. This would also increase the coordination between partners, clusters and field hubs and clarify the roles and responsibilities of each stakeholders during the different stages of the proposal review process.

3. **Keep the Fund as a flexible funding mechanism**

Suggestions were made to keep the YHF flexible and agile to respond to the changing humanitarian environment in Yemen. Respondents recommended to ensure that the allocation strategy was based on wide consultation with partners to consider changing needs on the ground.

---

**Most challenging elements of the YHF process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity assessment process</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Due diligence procedure</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant application/projet and budget development</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project revision requirements</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project narrative and financial reporting requirements</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of guidelines/allocation strategies</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaging relevant coordination mechanisms</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timely disbursement of funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring procedures (incl. Third Party Monitoring, Financial Spot checks)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Quality of the overall HFU support**

- **Poor**: 2%
- **Fair**: 27%
- **Very poor**: 8%
- **Excellent**: 12%
- **Very good**: 51%

---

1. **Support life-saving and life-sustaining activities while filling critical funding gaps**

- Insufficiently: 32%
- To a large extent: 15%
- Very good: 37%

2. **Promote needs-based assistance in accordance with humanitarian principles**

- Insufficiently: 11%
- To a large extent: 37%
- Very good: 32%

3. **Strengthen coordination and leadership through the function of the HC and leveraging the cluster system**

- Insufficiently: 12%
- To a large extent: 29%
- Very good: 27%

4. **Improve the relevance and coherence of humanitarian response by funding HRP priorities**

- Insufficiently: 13%
- To a large extent: 35%
- Very good: 32%

5. **Expand the delivery of assistance in hard-to-reach areas by partnering with NGOs**

- Insufficiently: 14%
- To a large extent: 35%
- Very good: 32%

---

1. by number of responses