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The Yemen Humanitarian Fund (YHF) conducted 101 field monitoring missions to 78 projects in 2021 thus fulfilling all its 2021 monitoring requirements, despite access constraints and COVID-19 restrictions.

About 48 per cent of monitoring missions assessed YHF-funded projects as performing well while 46 per cent as underperforming but for reasons beyond the partners’ control.

The YHF made 674 recommendations from these monitoring missions, shared them with implementing partners, and followed up on the actions taken by partners to address them.

90 per cent of 5,202 assisted people interviewed via Beneficiary Verification Surveys indicated that they were satisfied with services they received through YHF-funded projects.

1,460 feedback/complaints were received through the YHF Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism in 2021 and were followed up on with the implementing partners.

Travel restrictions, bureaucratic impediments and poor quality of some monitoring reports were among the key challenges to monitoring of YHF-funded projects in 2021.

The YHF continued providing timely updates to cluster coordinators and hub managers with key monitoring findings upon review of monitoring reports to ensure that the findings of YHF monitoring were used by the broader humanitarian community.
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INTRODUCTION

This report provides an overview of key monitoring findings of YHF-funded projects (part 1). It covers monitoring conducted between 1 January and 31 December 2021. The report also provides a summary of monitoring data and explains the methodology of YHF monitoring modalities (part 2). It complements the YHF 2021 Annual Report which provides more details about the YHF and its operating context.

With over 100 monitoring missions a year and a vast monitoring coverage, the Fund collects a great wealth of information on the implementation of YHF-funded projects throughout Yemen. The Fund uses this information for internal project management and shares it with the broader humanitarian community through annual Monitoring Reports and real-time summaries of findings of each monitoring mission. This allows the humanitarian community to gauge the status of implementation of aid activities in Yemen beyond the YHF-funded projects. This is because many YHF findings are indicative of broader trends and issues in the delivery of humanitarian assistance in Yemen. The continuous information sharing of YHF monitoring findings puts humanitarian actors in a better position to collectively follow up on key common challenges.

Project monitoring is a critical part of the management of the YHF programme cycle and a key component of the Fund’s accountability framework. The YHF monitoring has the following key objectives:

- Verifying reported project implementation progress and results as well as assessing the quality of implementation.
- Seeking feedback from beneficiaries on whether the assistance they receive meets their needs.
- Reviewing the use of resources as per the projects’ budget.
- Verifying the projects’ adherence to the codes of conduct and cluster standards.
- Increasing partners accountability vis-à-vis affected populations, donors and the YHF.
- Using findings and recommendations for risk mitigation.
and risk management.

- Identifying systemic challenges and sharing the findings with the broader humanitarian community.
- Strengthening partnership and coordination between OCHA, implementing partners, clusters, local authorities and affected communities.
- Using the collected information for public information and advocacy.

Given the challenging operating environment in Yemen, the YHF uses the following three monitoring modalities for comprehensive monitoring of the projects it funds:

- Field site monitoring
- Beneficiary Verification Surveys
- Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism

The combination of these modalities enables the YHF to collect and triangulate information from several independent sources. Despite limitations at times on staff travel in Yemen, these monitoring modalities enable the Fund to retain direct access to the voices of beneficiaries.
Field site monitoring

Field site monitoring is the principal monitoring modality used by the YHF. It consists of reviewing implementation reports and meeting with partners in preparation for missions; visiting project sites to observe the implementation and to interview beneficiaries and other stakeholders; drafting of reports; following up with implementing partners on the monitoring findings; and sharing the summaries of monitoring findings with cluster coordinators and hub managers for broader follow up.

The YHF conducted 101 monitoring visits in 2021, thereby fulfilling all its monitoring requirements for the year, despite access challenges, COVID-19-related restrictions and other constraints. 48 per cent of monitoring missions assessed YHF-funded projects as performing well, 46 per cent as underperforming but for reasons beyond the partners’ control and 6 per cent as underperforming, without an adequate justification.

The YHF made 674 recommendations from 2021 monitoring missions, shared them with implementing partners, and followed up on the actions taken by partners to address them. In addition, upon review of monitoring reports, the Fund provided timely updates on key monitoring findings to cluster coordinators and hub managers, thus ensuring that the findings of YHF monitoring can be used by the broader humanitarian community.

Beneficiary Verification Surveys

The YHF uses remote call Beneficiary Verification Surveys (BVS) to collect data that helps to complement the findings of field site monitoring with quantitative and qualitative information received directly from beneficiaries. Out of 101 monitoring missions conducted by YHF in 2021, 39 were complemented by BVS. The data collected enabled the YHF to triangulate the information and validate the findings of field site monitoring by verifying that beneficiaries received assistance and by surveying their overall level of satisfaction.

In 2021, the YHF interviewed 5,341 people from beneficiary lists through BVS, of whom 5,202 confirmed that they received assistance. The collected feedback indicated that 90\(^1\) per cent of beneficiaries, who confirmed receipt of assistance, were satisfied with it. The surveys were conducted by trained data collectors through structured questionnaires. The respondents were randomly selected from distribution lists and constituted a representative sample of project beneficiaries.

\(^1\) This figure refers to beneficiaries who indicated that they were either “satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied”. 
Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism

The YHF Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (BFCM) gives opportunity to beneficiaries to directly call or send a text message to a dedicated channel (toll-free phone number and WhatsApp number) and provide complaints or feedback regarding YHF-funded projects. The BFCM complements the beneficiary complaints mechanisms that partners have in place and allows beneficiaries to provide confidential feedback directly to the YHF.

Overall, 1,460 feedback/complaints on 95 YHF-funded projects were received from beneficiaries through BFCM in 2021. The Fund shared the feedback received with implementing partners and tracked the actions taken by partners until complaints were resolved. Most complaints received were in relation to minor dissatisfaction with the assistance received.

Note on methodology used in this report

Field site monitoring missions included in this report are missions that took place in 2021 regardless of whether the monitored projects ended in 2021 or 2022. This methodology differs from the one used in the YHF Annual Report which includes missions on projects ending in 2021 regardless of whether these missions took place in 2020, 2021 or 2022. Hence, the number of monitoring missions presented in the 2021 YHF Annual Report and Monitoring Report are different.
Part 1:

SUMMARY OF KEY 2021 MONITORING FINDINGS
While 48 per cent of monitoring missions assessed YHF-funded projects as performing well and 46 per cent as underperforming but for reasons beyond the partners’ control, the monitoring of YHF-funded projects also identified numerous shortcomings in project implementation.

The following are the most common key challenges that were observed across monitored projects in all clusters. These challenges negatively affected implementing partners’ ability to deliver timely and quality assistance.

- Bureaucratic impediments such as delays in signing sub-agreements, delays in visa and work permits, and restrictions on staff movement.
- Lack of full control of beneficiary selection criteria, including beneficiary identification, registration, and verification by implementing partners (interference by other stakeholders).
- Breach of code of conducts by some beneficiary registration committee members involved in the work on the project (for instance, community leaders requesting payments from beneficiaries for humanitarian assistance).
- Lack of appropriate feedback and complaints mechanisms by implementing partners, beneficiaries lacking knowledge about such mechanisms, or lack of proper tracking systems for documenting feedback and actions taken.
- Inadequate information sharing by implementing partners, resulting in a low level of beneficiary awareness about available support.
- Poor field monitoring and oversight, as well as weak internal project monitoring and tracking systems among implementing partners, including lack of timely post-distribution monitoring.
- Inadequate locations of some distribution centres resulting in beneficiaries having to travel long distances and incur costs to collect assistance.
- Inconsistencies in payments of incentives. Some recipients were paid reduced incentive amounts; some were asked to share their incentives with others, who were not targeted by incentive payments; and some received their incentives late.

These and other monitoring findings were brought to the attention of implementing partners, cluster coordinators and hub managers for follow up immediately after the completion of monitoring reports on each mission.

Many of these findings are similar to those reported in the previous YHF monitoring reports. The recurrence of these challenges highlights the complex operating environment in Yemen. Most of these challenges are also beyond the capacity of implementing partners to address.

It must be noted that the analysis of assessed implementation performance by cluster faces several limitations. First, the sample size largely differed between clusters with the highest, 31 monitoring missions to projects with Food Security and Agriculture (FSA) components, and the lowest, 9 monitoring missions to projects with Protection components. Second, for multi-cluster projects, the monitoring missions did not assign separate scores per each cluster component but one score for the entire project. Last, the Coordination and Support Services (CSS) and Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) clusters were excluded from this analysis because there was only one CSS project and one RRM project monitored in 2021.
Overview of cluster specific findings

FOOD SECURITY AND AGRICULTURE

The YHF conducted 31 missions\(^2\) to monitor projects with FSA components in 2021. Of these missions, 16 assessed the project implementation as “good performance”, 13 as “underperforming but justified”, and 2 as “underperforming and not justified”. The YHF communicated the findings of each mission with the implementing partners for improvements. The Fund also shared the findings with respective cluster coordinators and OCHA hub managers for follow up and broader lessons learning on the implementation status of humanitarian assistance in Yemen.

The following is a summary of key monitoring findings associated with poor quality implementation.

- Poor warehousing and storage in some project locations led to agricultural kits and animal feed being spoiled due to humidity and exposure to rodents.
- Some projects lacked specific prioritization criteria for people with disabilities.
- Some beneficiaries complained that the seeds they received did not sprout due to their expiry.
- In some project locations the distributed seeds were not of desired variety.
- Some farmers missed the sowing season due to delayed seed distribution by some implementing partners.
- The quality of some agricultural tools was poor.
- Some distributed fishing nets did not have adequate hole sizes making them inappropriate for effective fishing.
- Some beneficiaries were asked to share their entitlements with local leaders and some received smaller cash amounts than they were entitled to.

\(^2\) Some projects were monitored twice, hence the number of monitoring missions was often different than the number of monitored projects. Please note that this section only focuses on the number of monitoring missions.

ASSESS 2021 IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE
RATING OF PROJECTS WITH FSA COMPONENTS

January - December 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of cluster specific findings

HEALTH AND NUTRITION

Since many projects with nutrition components were integrated with projects with health components, this section provides the findings of their monitoring jointly.

In 2021, the YHF conducted 28 missions to monitor projects with health components. Of these missions, 13 assessed the project implementation as “good performance”, 14 as “underperforming but justified”, and 1 as “underperforming and not justified”. The YHF also conducted 14 missions to monitor projects with nutrition components. Of these missions, 7 assessed the project implementations as “good performance”, and 7 as “underperforming but justified”.

The YHF communicated the findings of each mission with the implementing partners for improvements. The Fund also shared the findings with respective cluster coordinators and OCHA hub managers for follow up and broader lessons learning on the implementation status of humanitarian assistance in Yemen.

The following is a summary of key monitoring findings associated with poor quality implementation.

• Some patients were asked to pay fees by health care workers at the health facilities for services that were supposed to be provided free of charge. For instance, laboratory examinations.
• At some health care facilities, financial assistance for referral services was not availed timely.
• At some health care facilities, the health workers were not aware of their incentive entitlement.
• Some health care workers were paid reduced incentive amounts, and some were asked to share their incentives.

3 Some projects were monitored twice, hence the number of monitoring missions was often different than the number of monitored projects. Please note that this section only focuses on the number of monitoring missions.
with those not targeted for incentive payments.

- Some health care facilities received medical equipment without appropriate training required to operate them.
- Some beneficiaries and health care workers were unaware of the feedback and complaints mechanisms available to them.
- At some health care facilities, medical and nutrition supplies were stored in a poor and unsafe conditions.
- At some health care facilities, pregnant and lactating women were not provided with MAM commodities.
- At some health care facilities, the health workers were not provided the required training to run CMAM and IYCF services.
- Tracking of SAM and MAM services was affected in some health facilities due to delays in provision of registers.
- Some health workers and community health volunteers did not receive adequate training.
- Water and sanitation facilities in some health care facilities were out of use.
- Patient wards in some supported health facilities lacked enough beds and as a result, patients had to sleep on the mattresses on the floor.
Overview of cluster specific findings

WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE

In 2021, the YHF conducted 22\textsuperscript{4} missions to monitor the implementation of projects with Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) components. Of these missions, 7 assessed the project implementation as “good performance”, 13 as “underperforming but justified”, and 2 as “underperforming and not justified”. The YHF communicated the findings of each mission with the implementing partners for improvements. The Fund also shared the findings with the respective cluster coordinators and OCHA hub managers for follow up and broader lessons learning on the implementation status of humanitarian assistance in Yemen.

The following is a summary of key monitoring findings associated with poor quality implementation.

- The design of latrines was often not suitable for people with disabilities.
- Some latrines were filling up quickly due to small sizes of cesspits in relation to the number of households using them.
- Some latrines were missing one or more components despite that they were outlined in the project documentation.
- Some water systems lacked sufficient pressure due to the inadequate number of solar panels installed.
- Some water systems were poorly rehabilitated. For instance, rusted elements have not been replaced resulting in water contamination.
- Some rehabilitated water systems did not work during night hours because they lacked solar batteries.

\textsuperscript{4} Some projects were monitored twice, hence the number of monitoring missions was often different than the number of monitored projects. Please note that this section only focuses on the number of monitoring missions.
Overview of cluster specific findings

SHELTER, NON-FOOD ITEMS AND CAMP COORDINATION AND CAMP MANAGEMENT

Since many projects with Shelter and Non-Food Items (SNFI) components were integrated with projects with Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) components, this section provides the findings of their monitoring jointly.

In 2021, the YHF conducted 15 missions\(^5\) to monitor projects with SNFI components. Of these missions, 7 assessed the project implementation as “good performance”, 7 as “underperforming but justified”, and 1 as “underperforming and not justified”. The YHF also conducted 10 missions to monitor projects with CCCM components. Of these, 2 assessed the project implementation as “good performance”, 7 as “underperforming but justified”, and 1 as “underperforming and not justified”.

The YHF shared the findings of each mission with implementing partners for improvements. The Fund also shared them with the respective cluster coordinators and OCHA hub managers for follow up and broader lessons learning on the implementation status of humanitarian assistance in Yemen.

The following is a summary of key monitoring findings associated with poor quality implementation:

- Some beneficiaries received emergency shelters and/or shelter kits with one or more items missing.
- Several beneficiaries complained of poor quality of some of NFI's. These included local stoves that rust or break quickly as well as blankets, sleeping

---

\(^5\) Some projects were monitored twice, hence the number of monitoring missions was often different than the number of monitored projects. Please note that this section only focuses on the number of monitoring missions.
mats and mattresses that get damaged easily.

- Some transitional shelters were poor quality and did not provide adequate protection for beneficiaries from heat, rain, and dust because the walls were made of poor-quality materials such as palm fronds.
- Some beneficiaries were forced to relocate to other IDP sites without pre-eviction notices.
- Poor land tenure agreements for setting up IDP sites did not allow establishing adequate services. For instance, some allowed beneficiaries to construct shelters only but not latrines.
- Some sites were established in unsafe locations putting IDPs at risk.
- Some sites were established in areas far from local markets and public facilities.
- Some post-distribution monitoring was not done properly or not done at all.
Overview of cluster specific findings

EDUCATION

The YHF conducted 12 missions to monitor projects with education components in 2021. Of these missions, 4 assessed the project implementation as “good performance”, 6 as “underperforming but justified”, and 2 as “underperforming and not justified”. The YHF communicated the findings of each mission with the implementing partners for improvements. The YHF also shared the findings with the cluster coordinators and OCHA hub managers for follow up and broader lessons learning on the implementation status of humanitarian assistance in Yemen.

The following is a summary of key monitoring findings associated with poor quality implementation.

- Delays in the construction of some temporary learning centres resulted in some classes being conducted in the open space.
- There were delays with payments of some teachers’ incentives and issues with reduced incentive amounts.
- Some recreational, student and teacher kits were of poor quality and some items were missing from the kits.
- Rehabilitation of water and sanitation facilities and other reconstruction work was of poor quality and/or was delayed in some schools.
- Some schools received first aid kits without adequate trainings on how to use them.

6 Some projects were monitored twice, hence the number of monitoring missions was often different than the number of monitored projects. Please note that this section only focuses on the number of monitoring missions.

ASSESS 2021 IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE RATING OF PROJECTS WITH EDUCATION COMPONENTS
January-December 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of cluster specific findings

PROTECTION

The YHF conducted 9 missions\(^7\) to monitor projects with Protection components in 2021. Of these missions, 5 assessed the project implementation as "good performance" and 4 as "underperforming but justified. The YHF communicated the findings of each mission with the implementing partners for improvements. The Fund also shared them with the respective cluster coordinators and OCHA hub managers for follow up and broader lessons learning on the implementation status of humanitarian assistance in Yemen.

The following is a summary of key monitoring findings associated with poor quality implementation.

- Beneficiaries expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of some trainings due to the lack of training equipment, electricity, or other shortcomings.
- Some child-friendly spaces were set-up in unsafe locations, which put children at risk of car and other accidents.
- Some child-friendly spaces were set up using poor quality tents which were easily wearing out.
- Some legal assistance cases were not recorded properly and the follow up on some cases was inadequate.
- Some referral systems were weak, and some beneficiaries did not receive referral cash assistance.
- Some projects did not adequately prioritize people with disabilities for the provision of assistance.

\(^7\) Some projects were monitored twice, hence the number of monitoring missions was often different than the number of monitored projects. Please note that this section only focuses on the number of monitoring missions.
Part 2: METHODOLOGY AND SUMMARY OF THE 2021 YHF MONITORING DATA
About YHF field site monitoring

Field site monitoring is the principal monitoring modality used by the YHF. It consists of reviewing project reports and meeting with partners in preparation for missions; visiting project sites to observe the implementation and to interview beneficiaries and other stakeholders; drafting of reports; following up with implementing partners on monitoring findings; and sharing the summaries of monitoring findings with cluster coordinators and hub managers.

The 2021 YHF field site monitoring was done in-person by OCHA staff and in-person by two third-party monitoring companies.

Field site monitoring requirements and planning

The YHF field site monitoring requirements for each project are defined by the operational modalities outlined in the Fund’s Operational Manual. These requirements are determined by the partner’s assessed risk level, the size of the project budget, the duration of the project and the type of the partner. When necessary, from a risk management point of view, the YHF can conduct additional monitoring beyond the requirements specified by the operational modalities. Consequently, the YHF monitors nearly all projects it funds.

Once the monitoring requirements are defined, the Fund develops a detailed monitoring plan, which is continuously adjusted based on partners’ implementation progress and the identification of the optimal time to monitor the projects.

In 2021, YHF monitored 78 projects through 101 field monitoring missions. This included 97 missions that were required as per the operational modalities and four additional missions, which were not officially required. The YHF fulfilled all its monitoring requirements in 2021, which was consistent with 2020 when the Fund also had 100 per cent monitoring compliance rate.

The number of monitoring missions in 2021 was lower than in 2020. This is largely because due to the operating context in Yemen most projects are monitored the following year after they are funded. In 2019, the YHF allocated $239 million to 154 projects, while in 2020 the Fund allocated $99 million to 62 projects. This resulted in a higher number of monitoring missions in 2020 than in 2021.
Coverage of field site monitoring conducted in 2021

The monitoring missions conducted by the YHF in 2021 covered 86 districts of 16 governorates. Most districts were visited more than once, with the most frequently visited districts being Al Mukah of Ta‘iz Governorate, which was visited 12 times, Ad Dhale‘e of Al Dhale‘e Governorate, which was visited 9 times and Qa‘atabah of Al Dhale‘e Governorate, which was visited 8 times.

The number of monitored projects was lower than the number of monitoring missions because, as per the YHF operational modalities, some projects must be monitored more than once. Of the 78 projects monitored, 55 projects were monitored once, and 23 projects were monitored twice during their implementation period. This translated into 101 field site monitoring missions conducted.

In 2021, the Fund monitored 30 national NGO projects through 41 monitoring missions; 43 international NGO projects through 51 missions; 2 UN agency projects through 3 missions; and 3 Red Crescent Society projects through 6 missions.

The number of monitored projects as compared to the number of monitoring missions by risk level showed similar ratios. The YHF monitored 21 high-risk projects through 31 monitoring missions; 33 medium-risk projects through 41 missions; and 24 low-risk projects through 29 missions.

The COVID-19 pandemic and subsequent travel restrictions impacted the in-person site monitoring for OCHA staff. As a result, the Fund used Third-Party Monitoring (TPM) companies for more than three-quarters of monitoring missions and its staff for less than a quarter of monitoring missions.

The proportions of monitoring missions conducted by TPM and OCHA in 2021 were the same as in 2020 but showed more reliance on TPM companies than in 2019. Moving forward, the fund plans to increase the proportion of monitoring missions conducted by OCHA staff in 2022.
Methodology of assessing project implementation performance

Each of the 101 monitoring missions assessed the implementation performance of projects through reviewing and scoring the following monitoring components:

- Implementation progress against the project workplan and set targets
- Adherence to cluster standards, principles and code of conducts
- Beneficiary satisfaction and appreciation
- Coordination and collaboration with key actors and stakeholders
- Monitoring and reporting
- Gender mainstreaming
- Accountability to Affected Populations
- Protection mainstreaming

The final assessment score of each monitored project was then calculated using weighted average of these monitoring components with the first two — (1) progress against the work plan and (2) adherence to cluster standards, principles and code of conducts — accounting for 65 per cent of the overall score.

The final score was then translated into one of the following five implementation performance ratings:

- Outstanding performance – assigned when monitoring findings indicate that project implementation and quality of response exceeded expectations and is on track to exceed project targets.
- Good performance – assigned when findings indicate that project implementation progressed well against the workplan, is on track to achieve project targets and demonstrates good quality implementation.
- Underperforming but justified – assigned when project progress is less than expected against workplan but there is valid justification for underachievement.
- Underperforming and not justified – assigned when project progress is less than expected against work plan and the IP does not have a valid justification for underachievement.
- No performance – assigned when there is no tangible progress in implementation.

The project implementation performance ratings presented in this report include information from each monitoring mission, not final project performance scores.
The YHF aims to monitor the projects during their implementation period so the monitoring findings can be provided to the implementing partners and used to adjust the implementation of the projects. (For example, a one-year project may be monitored in its fourth month and its eighth month of implementation.) As such, the monitoring results included in this report do not represent the final picture of the project implementation but a snapshot at the time of monitoring.

**Assessed project implementation performance**

48 per cent of monitoring missions assessed YHF-funded projects as performing well at the time of monitoring and 46 per cent as underperforming but for reasons beyond the partners’ control. Only 6 per cent of monitoring missions assessed YHF-funded projects as underperforming for no valid reasons.

In 2021, less missions assessed project implementation as “good performance” and more missions as “underperforming but justified” as compared to 2020 and 2019. While the YHF does not have systems to allow for comprehensive trend analysis, the change may indicate a deteriorating operating environment in the country associated with growing challenges that are beyond partners’ control, such as difficulties with receiving sub-agreements, as well as access and security constraints.

The proportion of “good performance” ratings was the highest for national NGOs (54 per cent), followed by Red Crescent Societies (50 per cent) and international NGOs (45 per cent). The three monitoring missions conducted to the two projects implemented by UN agencies rated their performance as “underperforming but justified”.

While there is no direct evidence explaining why the national NGOs on average performed better than international NGOs and UN agencies, some informed assumptions can be made. National NGOs may have had less access constraints than international organizations and may have faced less bureaucratic impediments, including obtaining their sub-agreement approvals faster.

The ratings by risk level showed similar trends. The high-risk projects had the highest proportion of “good performance” ratings.
**REMOTE CALL BENEFICIARY VERIFICATION SURVEYS**

**About remote call Beneficiary Verification Surveys**

The YHF uses remote call Beneficiary Verification Surveys (BVS) to complement the findings of field site monitoring with quantitative and qualitative information received directly from beneficiaries. Out of 101 monitoring missions conducted by YHF in 2021, 39 were complemented by BVS. The data collected enabled the YHF to triangulate the information and validate the findings of field site monitoring by verifying that beneficiaries received assistance and surveying their overall level of satisfaction.

The BVS is conducted by trained data collectors from a call-centre operated by YHF’s TPM service provider. The data collectors call beneficiaries and use structured questionnaires tailored to each cluster requirements to survey the delivery of a specific type of assistance. The respondents are randomly selected from project distribution lists and constitute a representative sample of all project beneficiaries.

The BVS are used only for projects that include distribution of in-kind aid or cash/vouchers to beneficiaries. These include distribution of agricultural inputs, cash assistance, delivery kits, dignity kits, emergency shelters, food, hygiene kits, non-food items and water filters. They do not include interventions such as the provision of protection or health assistance.

**Assessed satisfaction rates through Beneficiary Verification Surveys conducted in 2021**

In 2021, the YHF interviewed 5,341 people from beneficiary lists through BVS, of whom 5,202 confirmed that they received assistance and 139 (2.6 per cent) indicated that they did not receive assistance. The collected feedback indicated that 90 per cent of beneficiaries, who confirmed receipt of assistance were satisfied with it.

According to feedback received, beneficiaries were the most satisfied with hygiene kits, unconditional cash transfers, and Shelter and NFI assistance. They were slightly less satisfied with agricultural inputs and cash for work assistance.

Allowances for health workers stood out with the highest level of dissatisfaction (29 per cent dissatisfied). This is also consistent with key findings from many monitoring missions. In 2021, the YHF took appropriate risk management measures in response to these findings. The low satisfaction rates with allowances for health workers tilted the overall satisfaction rates of beneficiaries with YHF-funded assistance down to 90 per cent, as compared to 96 per cent in 2020.

---

**CHART: ASSESSED BENEFICIARY SATISFACTION THROUGH BENEFICIARY VERIFICATION SURVEYS IN 2021**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ASSISTANCE</th>
<th>Total # of beneficiaries interviewed</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural inputs</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter kits/ NFI and CFW</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional Cash Transfer (UCT)</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for Work (CFW)</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Workers Allowances</td>
<td>1,513</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene Kits</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BENEFICIARY FEEDBACK AND COMPLAINTS MECHANISM

About Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism

As part of its commitment to improve Accountability to Affected Populations, the YHF launched a Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (BFCM) in February 2020, which is administered by its TPM service provider.

The mechanism gives opportunity to beneficiaries to directly call or send text messages to a dedicated channel (toll-free phone number and WhatsApp number) and provide complaints or feedback regarding YHF-funded projects. The BFCM complements the beneficiary complaints mechanisms that partners have in place and allows beneficiaries to provide confidential feedback directly to the YHF.

YHF requires all its partners to include information on BFCM in all project proposals and ensures that partners promote the mechanism among beneficiaries and crisis-affected communities. The YHF encourages beneficiaries and whistleblowers to report to the Fund cases of misconduct, aid diversion or other wrongdoing.

Call centre operators receive calls and messages, identify the relevant YHF-funded project, classify the feedback and register it in a dedicated online system.

Major breaches of code of conduct such as sexual exploitation and abuse, harassment, fraud, corruption and aid diversion are directly reported by the call centre to the YHF management. Upon review, the YHF management investigates this feedback with implementing partners on a case by case basis.

Other complaints and feedback such as exclusion of the most deserving people from beneficiary lists, issues relating to the receipt of goods and services, items missing from kits and mismanagement of distributions, are reported by the call centre to YHF partners and YHF focal points. YHF partners are then required to undertake corrective actions. The YHF reviews the actions taken by partners and, if appropriate, instructs the call centre to close the complaint. Once done, the call-centre calls the complainants to inform them of the corrective actions taken. The identity of the complainants is kept confidential and is not shared outside the YHF.

Overview of the feedback received through BFCM in 2021

In 2021, YHF received 1,460 feedback/complaints from beneficiaries through BFCM. Most of the feedback, 1,301 (89 per cent), were direct calls to the toll-free number, 149 were messages received via WhatsApp, 8 were voice messages and 2 were messages received via SMS.

More than half (52 per cent) of feedback related to projects implemented by national NGOs, 36 per cent related to projects implemented by international NGOs, 7 per cent related to projects implemented by Red Crescent Societies and 5 per cent related to projects implemented by UN agencies.
Type of feedback received through BFCM in 2021

Majority of feedback received related to minor dissatisfactions (1,085 cases) and dissatisfactions (190 cases). Minor dissatisfactions include issues such as broken items in kits, poor quality items received, long queues at the distribution sites and long distance between the location of beneficiaries and distributions sites. Dissatisfaction includes issues such as missing items from the kits, being on a beneficiary list but not receiving assistance and being asked for money in exchange for goods/services by community leaders, registration committee or other project stakeholders (see Annex for details of feedback categorization).

The remaining feedback received were requests for information (171 cases) and positive feedback (13 cases). There were no cases of major breaches including breaches of codes of conduct reported through the BFCM in 2021.

The requests for information fall outside of the scope of the mechanism which was not designed to provide information to beneficiaries. However, this points to weaknesses in sharing information with beneficiaries by some of the implementing partners.

National NGOs received the highest number of complaints classified as “dissatisfaction” (15 per cent), followed by Red Crescent Societies (10 per cent) and international NGOs (5 per cent). National NGOs also received the highest number of requests for information, indicating weaknesses in their mechanisms of sharing information with beneficiaries on assistance available to them.

Some 84 per cent of the complaints on UN agencies were classified as “dissatisfactions”. However, great majority of these complaints were on the project providing allowances to health workers, hence this data is not representative of all UN agency projects. UN agencies were therefore excluded from this analysis.

The BFCM proved to be an important tool, providing information on a continuous basis, to inform ongoing project implementation. The mechanism is particularly useful for detecting critical issues at an early stage of implementation, such as beneficiary targeting or registration problems, so that timely corrective action can be taken.
## BFCM Categories of Feedback and Complaints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback and complaint categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1- Positive feedback</td>
<td>The person is calling to express gratitude for a specific activity being implemented under the YHF-funded projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2- Request for information</td>
<td>The person is calling to request information on a specific YHF-funded project, or request assistance on how to receive goods/services provided by the YHF partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- Minor dissatisfaction</td>
<td>The person is calling to complain about minor issues related to receiving goods/services, including their quality. This can include long queues and/or waiting time, far distance from distribution points, broken items within a kit, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4- Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>The person is calling to complain about major issues related to receiving goods/services. This can include being on a beneficiary list but not receiving the goods, missing items from the delivered kits, being asked for money in exchange for goods/services by community leaders, registration committee or other project stakeholders, being asked to confirm receiving more assistance than the actual delivery by community leaders, registration committee or other project stakeholders, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5- Major breaches including breaches of codes of conduct</td>
<td>The person is calling to report fraud, corruption, aid diversion, abuse or sexual harassment. This can include being asked for money in exchange for goods/services by IP staff, being asked for favors in exchange of goods/services by any stakeholders, being subject to harassment, pressure of any kind by IP staff, witnessing or reporting large-scale diversion where goods of the entire project (or its large portion) are not going to the intended beneficiaries, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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