

Indicator		Target (in number, percentage, or relevant qualitative/quantitative scale)
<b>Principle 1: Inclusiveness</b>		
<b>1</b>	<b><i>Inclusive governance – size and composition of the Advisory Board</i></b>  Number and percentage of seats at the Advisory Board by type of actor (donor, INGO, NNGO, UN, government)	1(7%) HC; 1(7%) OCHA HoO; 4 (28%) UN; 4 (28%) NGOs; 4 (28%) donors  <u>Scoring scale:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> There is no equal representation of stakeholders (NGOs, UN Agencies and Donors).</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (NGOs, UN Agencies and Donors) has equal representation and has 1 seat.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (NGOs, UN Agencies and Donors) has equal representation and has more than 2 seats.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (NGOs, UN Agencies and Donors) has equal representation and has 2 or 4 seats.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (NGOs, UN Agencies and Donors) has equal representation and has 4 seats.</li> </ul>
<b>2</b>	<b><i>Inclusive programming – size and composition of strategic and technical review committees</i></b>  Number and percentage of organizations engaged in the development of allocation strategies, and the prioritization (strategic) and selection (technical) of projects through Review Committees broken down by type (INGO, NNGO, UN) and by cluster	The size of the Strategic Review Committees (SRC) may vary according to the size of the cluster, from 6 members (1 LNGO, 1 INGO, 1 UN, cluster coordinator, co-chair, HFU) to 11 members (3 LNGO, 3 INGO, 3 UN, cluster coordinator, co-chair), and is determined by cluster coordinators. OCHA Somalia HFU actively participates in, facilitates and supports the work of the SRC and may, at times, take part in decision-making. SRCs are gender-balanced.  <u>Scoring scale:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> There is no equal representation of stakeholders (INGOs, NNGOs, UN agencies, cluster coordinators) and OCHA is not playing an active role.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation and has 1 seat, but OCHA is not playing an active role.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation (1 seat) and OCHA is playing an active role.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation with 2 seats or more, but OCHA is not playing an active role.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Each of the stakeholder's type (INGOs, NNGOs, UN Agencies, OCHA, cluster coordinators) has equal representation with 2 seats or more and OCHA is playing an active role.</li> </ul>
<b>3</b>	<b><i>Inclusive implementation – CBPF funding is allocated to the best-positioned actors</i></b>  Amount and percentage of CBPF funding directly and indirectly allocated to eligible organizations (INGO, NNGO, UN, RC/RC) overall, as well as by sector and geographic area	2020 Allocation Principles <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Continued focus on life-saving humanitarian response with focus on, if and when possible, underserved and hard-to access areas;</li> <li>- Ensuring the centrality of protection in all SHF-funded interventions;</li> <li>- Prioritization of direct implementation through international and national non-governmental partners, accounting for at least 80% of available annual SHF funding;</li> <li>- Support for local partners by striving to channel at least 40% of available funding directly through national partners (if, when and where feasible);</li> <li>- Continue supporting integration of response across clusters and complementarity with other funding sources in support of a stronger collective response.</li> <li>- Support funding for pipelines, enabling programmes and other support services provided by the United Nations or NGOs, up to a maximum of 20% of annually available funds;</li> </ul> <u>Scoring scale:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> There is no alignment of allocations with the allocation principles.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> There is some alignment with the allocation principles (at least 3).</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> There is full alignment with the allocation principles (5), but percentages are significantly different (+/- 25%).</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> There is full alignment with the allocation principles (5), with 5% to 25% margin from suggested percentages.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> There is full alignment with the allocation principles (5) and percentages are within the 5% margin from the target for all categories.</li> </ul>

<p><b>4</b> <i><b>Inclusive engagement – outreach and investment in local capacity</b></i></p> <p>Amount and percentage of CBPF funding and HFU budget invested in supporting and promoting the capacity of local and national NGO partners within the scope of CBPF strategic objectives, broken down by type of investment</p>	<p>Six training rounds (with multiple sessions and locations) for partners focused on building their capacity to manage and implement SHF projects.</p> <p>Dedicated training sessions for newly eligible partners (minimum two).</p> <p>Individual partner sessions (on-demand, 10 partners/month).</p> <p>40% funding target for NNGOs (and associated partner-focused assurance activities) position SHF as supporter of localization of aid.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Limited or no planned activities took place.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Some planned activities took place (up to 50%).</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Most planned activities took place (between 50% and 100%), but partner feedback is not very positive (survey)</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> All planned activities took place (100%), with positive partner feedback.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Planned activities surpasses 150%, with positive partner feedback.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principle 2: Flexibility</b></p>	
<p><b>5</b> <i><b>Flexible assistance – CBPF funding for in-kind and in-cash assistance is appropriate</b></i></p> <p>Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated to in-kind and cash assistance (conditional, unconditional, restricted, unrestricted, sector-specific or multi-purpose cash transfers, as well as mixed in-kind and cash projects) by sector and geographic area</p>	<p>Cash as a response modality will be strategically prioritized and operationally considered, where appropriate.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Cash is not prioritized nor used.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Cash is prioritized but not used by clusters.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Cash is prioritized and used, but very modestly (up to 10%).</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Cash is considered, prioritized and used when considered viable, usage between 10% and 25% of grant value.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Cash is considered, prioritized and used when considered viable, usage above 25% of grant value</li> </ul>
<p><b>6</b> <i><b>Flexible operation – CBPF funding supports an enabling operational environment</b></i></p> <p>Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated to common services (logistics, security, coordination, needs assessments, etc.)</p>	<p>Support funding for pipelines, enabling programmes and other support services provided by UN agencies, funds and programmes, but also NGOs, up to a maximum of 20% of annually available funds.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> There is no funding made available for common services / enabling services.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, but sporadically, up to 5% of all allocations.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, but sporadically, up to 10% of all allocations.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, strategically, up to 10% of all allocations.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Funding made available for common services / enabling programmes, strategically, up to 20% of all allocations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>7</b> <i><b>Flexible allocation process – CBPF funding supports strategic planning and response to sudden onset emergencies</b></i></p> <p>Amount and percentage of CBPF funding allocated through standard and reserve allocations broken down by type of implementing partner, sector and geographic area</p>	<p>At least 75% of funds allocated through Standard modality and up to 25% kept in Reserve. The Fund responds to changes in humanitarian context, as well as based on funding situation allows.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> No Standard or no Reserve allocations.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Allocation modalities distribution is off target by more than 50% and not well justified.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Allocation modalities distribution is off target between 20% and 50% and not well justified.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Allocation modalities distribution is off target between 20% and 50%, but well-justified (contribution trends, sudden onset needs etc.)</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Allocation modalities distribution is within 20% margin.</li> </ul>

8	<p><b>Flexible implementation – CBPF funding is successfully reprogrammed at the right time to address operational and contextual changes</b></p> <p>Average number of days to process project revision requests</p>	<p>Project revision requests processed within 10 working days.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Revision requests not utilized or taking more than 30 days, on average.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Revision requests taking between 20 and 30 days, on average, with delays not well-justified.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Revision requests taking between 20 and 30 days, on average, with delays justified or due to partner inaction.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Revision requests taking between 10 and 20 days, on average</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> Revision requests processed within 10 days, on average.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Principle 3: Timeliness</b></p>		
9	<p><b>Timely allocations – allocation processes have an appropriate duration vis-à-vis the objectives of the allocation</b></p> <p>Average duration of the allocation process from launch of allocation strategy to HC approval of selected projects by allocation type (standard and reserve)</p>	<p>The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 50 days.</p> <p>The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 30 days.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale – Standard:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> The average duration of all launched standard allocations is higher than 99 days.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 71 to 99 days.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 61 to 70 days.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 51 to 60 days.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> The average duration of all launched standard allocations is 50 days or less.</li> </ul> <p><u>Scoring scale – Reserve:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is higher than 45 days.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 41 to 45 days.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 36 to 40 days.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 31 to 35 days.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> The average duration of all launched reserve allocations is 30 days or less.</li> </ul>
10	<p><b>Timely disbursements – payments are processed without delay</b></p> <p>Average number of calendar days from HC approval (EO clearance) of a proposal to first payment by type of allocation (standard/reserve) and type of implementing partner</p>	<p>10 calendar days (from EO clearance of grant agreement)</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment is higher than 40 calendar days.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 31 to 40 calendar days.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 21 to 30 calendar days.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 11 to 20 calendar days.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> The average duration from HC approval (EO clearance) to first payment 10 days or less.</li> </ul>
11	<p><b>Timely contributions – pledging and payment of contributions to CBPFs are timely and predictable</b></p> <p>Percentage of total yearly contributions received by quarter broken down by donor</p>	<p>Two thirds of annual contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> No contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> up to 15% of contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Between 15% and 33% of contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Between 33% and 66% of contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> More than two thirds (66%) of annual contributions committed before the end of the first half of the year.</li> </ul>

## Principle 4: Efficiency

12	<p><b>Efficient scale – CBPFs have an appropriate scale to support the delivery of the HRP</b></p> <p>Percentage of HRP funding requirements channelled through the CBPF compared to globally set target (15%)</p>	<p>SHF allocations amount to 10% of the received HRP funding.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> SHF allocations amount to less than 2.5% of the received HRP funding.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> SHF allocations amount to between 2.5% and 5% of the received HRP funding.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> SHF allocations amount to between 5% and 7.5% of the received HRP funding.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> SHF allocations amount to between 7.5% and 10% of the received HRP funding.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> SHF allocations amount to more than 10% of the received HRP funding.</li> </ul>
13	<p><b>Efficient prioritization – CBPF funding is prioritized in alignment with the HRP</b></p> <p>Proportion of CBPF funding allocated toward HRP priorities by sector of total HRP funding disaggregated by gender, age, and geographic area</p>	<p>All funded projects address HRP strategic priorities.</p> <p>At least 80% of value of funded projects is linked to HRP projects.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> No project addresses HRP strategic priorities, no project linked to HRP projects.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Up to 25% of projects address HRP strategic priorities and up to 20% of projects are linked to HRP projects.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Up to 50% of projects address HRP strategic priorities and up to 40% of projects are linked to HRP projects.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Up to 75% of projects address HRP strategic priorities and up to 60% of projects are linked to HRP projects.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> All or almost all projects address HRP strategic priorities and at least 80% of projects are linked to HRP projects.</li> </ul>
14	<p><b>Efficient coverage – CBPF funding reaches people in need</b></p> <p>Number and percentage of targeted people in need reported to have been reached by partners through the Fund's allocations (standard/reserve) disaggregated by gender, age, sector, and geographic area</p>	<p>100% of targeted people in need have reportedly been reached</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Less than 25% of targeted people have been reached.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Between 25% and 50% of targeted people have been reached.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Between 50% and 75% of targeted people have been reached.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Between 75% and 100% of targeted people have been reached.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> More than 100% of targeted people have been reached.</li> </ul>
15	<p><b>Efficient management – CBPF management is cost-efficient and context-appropriate</b></p> <p>Value and percentage of HFU operations (direct cost) in proportion to total value of contributions to the Fund (yearly)</p>	<p>HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account for less than 5% of overall utilization of funds (allocations + PSC + audit costs + MA charges + HFU budget execution)</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account more than 10% of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs)</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account between 8% and 10% of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account between 6% and 8% of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account between 5% and 6% of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> HFU operations costs (execution of cost-plan) account for less than 5% of overall utilization of funds (allocations + operations costs).</li> </ul>
16	<p><b>Efficient management – CBPF management is compliant with guidelines</b></p> <p>Level of compliance with management and operational</p>	<p>SHF Operational Manual updated based on the latest version of global CBPF guidelines by end Q1.</p> <p>Annual report and allocation papers compliant with global guidance documents.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> SHF Operational Manual not updated based on the latest version of global CBPF guidelines; and annual report and allocation papers not compliant with global guidance documents.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> SHF Operational Manual updated with significant delay, annual report and allocation papers partially compliant with global guidelines.</li> </ul>

	standards required by the CBPF Global Guidelines	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> SHF Operational Manual updated with reasonable delay (Q2); and/or annual report and allocation papers mostly compliant with global guidelines.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> SHF Operational Manual updated with minor delay and/or annual report and allocation papers almost fully compliant with global guidance documents.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> SHF Operational Manual updated based on the latest version of global CBPF guidelines by the end of the first quarter and annual report and allocation papers fully compliant with global guidance documents.</li> </ul>
<b>Principle 5: Accountability and Risk Management</b>		
<b>17</b>	<b>Accountability to affected people – CBPF allocations are accountable</b>  Amount and percentage of CBPF funding (included as a component of funded projects) allocated for activities to promote the participation of affected people	<p>All proposals are required to indicate the plan on the accountability to affected population (AAP). All monitoring instances include the consultation with beneficiaries component.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Less than 25% of project proposals indicate AAP and less than 25% of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries component.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Between 25% and 50% of project proposals indicate AAP and the same range of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries component.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Between 50% and 75% of project proposals indicate AAP and the same range of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries component.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Between 75% and 99% of project proposals indicate AAP and the same range of associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries component.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> All project proposals indicate AAP and all associated monitoring instances include consultation with beneficiaries component (if applicable).</li> </ul>
<b>18</b>	<b>Accountability and risk management for projects – CBPF funding is appropriately monitored</b>  Rate of completion of planned monitoring, reporting and auditing activities in accordance with operational modality applied to each grant	<p>100% compliance with operational modalities, as per OCHA assurance dashboard (may not be applicable for audits falling outside of the reporting time-frame).</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Less than 25% compliance with operational modalities.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> Between 25% and 50% compliance with operational modalities.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> Between 50% and 75% compliance with operational modalities.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> Between 75% and 99% compliance with operational modalities.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> 100% compliance with operational modalities, as per assurance dashboard.</li> </ul>
<b>19</b>	<b>Accountability and risk management of implementing partners – CBPF funding is allocated to partners with demonstrated capacity</b>  Number and type of implementing partners and amount and percentage of funding allocated by partner risk level (based on PCA and PI)	<p>The number of eligible partners increased by 5% in comparison to the number of new eligible partners in the previous year.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> The number of eligible partners decreases in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> The number of eligible partners does not increase in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> The number of eligible partners increases from 1% to 3% in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> The number of eligible partners increases from 3% to 5% in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> The number of eligible partners increases more than 5% in comparison to the number of eligible partners in the previous year.</li> </ul>
<b>20</b>	<b>Accountability and risk management of funding – appropriate oversight and assurances of funding channelled through CBPFs</b> Number and status of potential and confirmed cases of diversion by Fund	<p>Compliance with CBPFs SOPs on fraud management.</p> <p><u>Scoring scale:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>1 = very low:</b> Potential diversion/fraud cases not treated in compliance with CBPF SOPs.</li> <li>- <b>2 = low:</b> At least 50% potential diversion or fraud cases are treated in compliance with CBPF SOPs.</li> <li>- <b>3 = medium:</b> At least 75% potential diversion or fraud cases are treated in compliance with CBPF SOPs.</li> <li>- <b>4 = high:</b> At least 90% potential diversion or fraud cases are treated in compliance with CBPF SOPs.</li> <li>- <b>5 = very high:</b> All potential diversion or fraud cases are treated in compliance with CBPF SOPs.</li> </ul>