The survey received 67 responses, comprising 57 from Yemen Humanitarian Fund (YHF) partners, 5 from cluster representatives and 5 from donor representatives.

All cluster respondents confirmed that they were consulted during the development of YHF allocation strategies.

Two-thirds of respondents thought that the 2020 YHF allocation processes were transparent, and just over half thought that they were timely.

Eighty-four per cent of YHF partners and cluster representatives were satisfied with the support provided to them by the Fund.

Nearly 90 per cent of respondents found the YHF trainings useful.

Three-quarters of respondents stated that the YHF met its 2020 objectives.

Over 70 per cent of respondents agreed that 2020 YHF allocation priorities responded well to the urgent needs on the ground.

Nearly 90 per cent of respondents indicated that they were familiar with YHF resources.

All cluster representatives were appreciative of the YHF monitoring summaries shared via email.
**KEY RECOMMENDATIONS**

**TIMELY LAUNCH OF THE ALLOCATION PROCESSES**

Despite the Fund’s efforts to enable quick response to the urgent needs in Yemen, nearly half of the respondents indicated that the 2020 YHF allocation processes were not timely. This perception is likely a result of lengthy negotiations to define the 2020 COVID-19 response allocation priorities and delays in launching the 2020 standard allocation until November when sufficient funding was available. In addition, many respondents asked to make YHF allocations more predictable, which would allow partners to prepare for them better. Many respondents recommended that there should be two standard allocations in 2021 and that the first should be launched before mid-year. In response, the YHF initiated preliminary discussions with partners on the first allocation in April 2021.

**STRENGTHEN SUPPORT TO NATIONAL NGO PARTNERS**

Several respondents called for increased YHF funding and support to national NGOs (NNGO). Comments mostly included requests for strengthened support to national partners throughout the project cycle, providing additional capacity building for NNGOs, increasing the access of NNGOs to the Fund by making some YHF rules more flexible, and including field-level staff in the Strategic and Technical Review Committees. In response, the YHF organized a dialogue between NNGOs and the Fund in February 2021 to further discuss and understand how the Fund can best support NNGOs.

**ALLOW MORE TIME FOR PROPOSAL PREPARATION**

While the YHF strove in 2020 to achieve balance between the expectations to conclude allocation processes quickly and providing sufficient time to partners for proposal development and review, many partners still felt that the allocation timelines were too tight to submit high-quality proposals. These comments echoed respondents’ feedback in 2020. The YHF, in consultation with cluster coordinators, will bring this discussion to the Advisory Board for recommendation.

**PROVIDE BETTER GUIDANCE TO PARTNERS ON DEVELOPING PROPOSALS**

The additional trainings most frequently requested by partners were on proposal development. Moreover, many partners requested better guidance and support on developing high-quality proposals and greater consistency of feedback from the Strategic and Technical Review Committees on project submissions. To address this, the YHF will train partners on these topics and improve the feedback provided during the allocation processes.
BACKGROUND OF THE SURVEY

The YHF conducts annual stakeholder surveys to gain insights into stakeholders’ perceptions of the Fund’s work and to receive feedback for improvements. The survey focuses on the following five areas: (i) the performance of the YHF against its priorities; (ii) YHF allocation processes; (iii) the YHF project cycle and trainings; (iv) familiarity with YHF resources; and (v) support provided by the YHF.

The 2020 survey was conducted between 10 and 24 February 2021 using KoBo Toolbox. YHF partners, cluster representatives and Advisory Board members were invited to participate. The survey comprised quantitative and qualitative questions.

SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The 2020 YHF survey received 67 responses (compared to 95 in 2019) from all constituencies: 52 representatives of YHF eligible partners, 5 representatives of former YHF partners, 5 cluster representatives and 5 donor representatives.

---

**YHF PARTNERS**

- National NGOs: 54%
- International NGOs: 33%
- UN agencies: 11%
- Red Crescent Societies: 2%

---

**ROLE IN THE ORGANIZATION**

- Senior Manager: 41%
- Grant Manager: 19%
- Technical Staff: 30%
- Other: 5%

---

**EXPERIENCE WITH YHF**

- Less than 1 year: 12%
- 1 to 2 years: 30%
- More than 2 years: 58%

---

**ORGANIZATION TYPE**

- National NGOs: 54%
- International NGOs: 33%
- UN agencies: 11%
- Red Crescent Societies: 2%
YHF PERFORMANCE AGAINST ITS PRIORITIES

Some three-quarters of respondents indicated that the YHF met its 2020 objectives to a large extent or reasonably well. There were however some differences between the respondents' perceptions of meeting each of the objectives.

The YHF objective of promoting needs-based assistance in accordance with humanitarian principles had the highest proportion of positive answers, with 84 per cent indicating “to a large extent” or “reasonably well”.

The objectives of strengthening coordination and leadership primarily through the function of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and by leveraging the cluster system had 78 per cent positive answers; improving the relevance and coherence of the humanitarian response by strategically funding priorities as identified in the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) had 72 per cent positive answers; and supporting life-saving and life-sustaining activities while filling critical funding gaps had 71 per cent positive answers.

The objective of expanding the delivery of assistance in hard-to-reach areas by partnering with national and international NGOs stood out with the lowest proportion of positive answers (64 per cent). Thirty-four per cent of respondents indicated that the YHF met this objective insufficiently.

Seventy-one per cent of respondents indicated that YHF allocation priorities in 2020 responded rather well to the urgent needs on the ground. However, 27 per cent of respondents stated that YHF allocation priorities did not respond to the urgent needs on the ground well and 2 per cent stated that they did not respond to the urgent needs on the ground at all.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

• Explore how the YHF can better support the delivery of assistance in hard-to-reach areas.
• Continue to align the 2021 YHF allocation priorities with the most urgent needs on the ground.

STAKEHOLDER SURVEY RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERCEPTION OF HOW THE YHF MET ITS 2020 OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>(All respondents)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2020 YHF objectives</strong></td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote needs-based assistance in accordance</td>
<td><strong>To a large extent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with humanitarian principles</td>
<td><strong>22%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen coordination and leadership primarily</td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through the function of the HC and by leveraging</td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the cluster system</td>
<td><strong>20%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the relevance and coherence of the</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humanitarian response by strategically funding</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>priorities as identified in the HRP</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support life-saving and life-sustaining activities</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>while filling critical funding gaps</td>
<td><strong>13%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand the delivery of assistance in</td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hard-to-reach areas by partnering with national</td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and international NGOs</td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 In this question, on average four respondents answered “I do not know” and were excluded from the analysis.
2 In this question, four respondents answered “I do not know” and were excluded from the analysis.
YHF ALLOCATION PROCESSES

All cluster respondents stated that they were consulted by the YHF during the development of YHF allocation strategies. Furthermore, more than three-quarters\(^3\) of partners indicated that they were consulted by the clusters during the development of YHF cluster strategies and priorities.

**WAS YOUR ORGANIZATION CONSULTED BY CLUSTERS DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLUSTER ALLOCATION STRATEGIES AND PRIORITIES?**

(Respondents: YHF partners)

- 76% Yes
- 24% No

Fifty-one\(^4\) per cent of respondents indicated that the 2020 YHF allocation processes were very timely or quite timely. Unfortunately, a significant 49 per cent stated that they were not timely.

However, there were large differences in opinions between types of respondents. While 55 per cent of YHF partners indicated that 2020 YHF allocation processes were very timely or quite timely, only 20 per cent of cluster representatives and 40 per cent of donor representatives thought that these processes were quite timely, and none of them thought that they were very timely.

**PERCEPTION OF TIMELINESS OF THE 2020 YHF ALLOCATION PROCESSES**

(All respondents)

- 10% Very timely
- 41% Quite timely
- 41% Not very timely
- 8% Not timely at all

Two-thirds\(^5\) of respondents indicated that the 2020 YHF allocation processes were very transparent or quite transparent. However, about a third of respondents found that they were not transparent enough. The perception of transparency of YHF processes was very different among cluster and donor representatives. While most cluster respondents indicated that the YHF processes were very transparent, 60 per cent of donor representatives thought that they were not very transparent.

**PERCEPTION OF TRANSPARENCY OF THE 2020 YHF ALLOCATION PROCESSES**

(All respondents)

- 24% Very transparent
- 42% Quite transparent
- 26% Not very transparent
- 8% Not transparent at all

Eighty-three\(^6\) per cent of YHF partners indicated that YHF allocation strategy documents in 2020 were very clear or quite clear. Only 17 per cent of partners thought that they were not clear.

Respondents provided numerous suggestions for improving YHF allocation processes in 2021. The key feedback included:

- Providing more time for development and review of proposals.
- Making allocations more predictable, so partners can prepare themselves better.
- Providing better guidance for submitting projects.
- Increasing local NGOs’ access to the Fund by making some YHF rules more flexible.
- Providing more capacity building for national NGOs.
- Limiting funding to UN agencies while providing more funding to national NGOs.
- Providing feedback to partners on why some proposals were rejected.
- Making allocation processes more inclusive.

Half the YHF partners who participated in the Strategic and Technical Review Committees (STRC) indicated that the STRCs had a good balance between different stakeholders, but the other half found that the composition could be better. In contrast, the only two cluster respondents who participated in the STRCs thought that they had a good composition.

**DID THE COMPOSITION OF STRATEGIC AND TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEES HAVE A GOOD BALANCE BETWEEN DIFFERENT STAKEHOLDERS?**

(Respondents: 16 YHF partners who participated in STRCs)

- Yes
- No
- Partially

---

\(^3\) In this question, four respondents answered “I do not know” and were excluded from the analysis.

\(^4\) In this question, four respondents answered “I do not know” and were excluded from the analysis.

\(^5\) In this question, seven respondents answered “I do not know” and were excluded from the analysis.

\(^6\) In this question, five respondents answered “I do not know” and were excluded from the analysis.
Two-thirds of YHF partners who participated in the STRCs indicated that they were very effective in recommending the most suitable projects for funding. Another 27 per cent of YHF partners thought that they were quite effective and only 7 per cent thought that they were not very effective. The opinion of cluster respondents was similar. The two cluster representatives who participated in the STRCs thought that they had excellent or good outcomes.

Respondents made the following key suggestions to improve the STRC review processes in 2021:

- Increasing involvement of national NGOs in STRCs.
- Ensuring that STRC members do not side with international organizations.
- Including field-level staff in STRCs.
- Ensuring strong chairmanship of the STRCs to control bias of some STRC members.

Seventy-three per cent of YHF partners indicated that the feedback received from STRCs was very useful or quite useful. Another 15 per cent thought that the feedback was not very useful, while 4 per cent thought that it was not useful at all and 8 per cent did not receive feedback.


**FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS**

- Improve timeliness and predictability of YHF allocations.
- Provide better guidance to partners on development of proposals.
- Continue providing feedback to partners on the reasons for rejecting project proposals.
- Strengthen the technical capacity and decision-taking role of STRC members.
YHF PROJECT CYCLE AND TRAININGS

YHF partners identified timely disbursement of funds, proposal development, third-party monitoring, and proposal revisions as the most challenging processes in the YHF project cycle. Audits, project revisions, financial spot checks and understanding YHF rules and regulations were also identified as challenging for many partners. On the other hand, engaging with clusters, OCHA monitoring, as well as financial and narrative reporting were less challenging for partners.

WHAT ARE THE MOST CHALLENGING YHF PROCESSES FOR YOUR ORGANIZATION?

(Respondents: YHF partners)

- Timely disbursement of funds: 23%
- Proposal development: 22%
- Third-party monitoring: 18%
- Proposal revision process (addressing STRC/HFU comments): 17%
- Auditing: 14%
- Project revisions: 10%
- Financial spot checks: 12%
- Understanding YHF rules and regulations: 11%
- Engaging with clusters: 1%
- Other: 1%

An over 80 per cent of YHF partners who participated in the survey indicated that they attended YHF trainings in 2020. Moreover, most of them stated that they participated in more than one training.

HAVE YOU ATTENDED ANY YHF TRAININGS IN 2020?

(Respondents: YHF partners)

- 80% Yes
- 20% No

Of the respondents who participated in the trainings, nearly 90 per cent found them very useful or quite useful. In addition, all respondents apart from one stated that YHF should continue providing trainings on cross-cutting and thematic issues going beyond the project cycle management.

HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE USEFULNESS OF THE TRAININGS YOU ATTENDED?

- Very useful: 41%
- Quite useful: 48%
- Not very useful: 11%

The responses indicate that YHF partners were very interested in receiving more trainings on all subjects listed in the survey. The most frequently requested additional trainings were on proposal writing, followed by monitoring and project revisions.

WHICH PART OF THE YHF PROJECT CYCLE WOULD YOU LIKE MORE TRAINING ON IN 2021?

(Respondents: YHF partners)

- Proposal writing: 41%
- Monitoring: 38%
- Project revisions: 38%
- Financial spot checks: 35%
- Narrative reporting: 35%
- Financial reporting: 34%
- Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (BFCM): 33%
- Audits: 32%
- Use of Grant Management System (GMS): 30%

Participants also suggested other trainings that YHF could provide, including on post-distribution monitoring, procurement, advocacy and the methodology used by the YHF to calculate the Partner Performance Index.

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

- Increase focus on proposal writing, monitoring and project revisions in YHF trainings, and consider suggestions to add other thematic trainings.
- Continue providing trainings on cross-cutting and thematic issues going beyond project cycle management.
FAMILIARITY WITH YHF RESOURCES

On average, 88 per cent of respondents indicated that they were familiar with YHF resources. Familiarity with the YHF Operational Manual received the highest proportion of positive answers (96 per cent). It was closely followed by familiarity with the YHF’s Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (BFCM), which received 94 per cent positive answers.

Familiarity with the YHF website and visibility guidelines received 84 per cent of positive answers while familiarity with the YHF’s dedicated email to report complaints received 82 per cent positive answers, compared with only 50 per cent in 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILIARITY WITH YHF RESOURCES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you familiar with the YHF Operational Manual?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know that the YHF has a Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know that the YHF has its own webpage?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you familiar with the YHF Visibility Guidelines?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know that the YHF has a dedicated email to report complaints?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sixty per cent of cluster representatives stated that the YHF monitoring summaries shared via email are excellent and forty per cent stated that they are good.

HISTORY WITH YHF RESOURCES

(All respondents)

SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THE YHF

Eighty-four per cent of YHF partners and cluster representatives stated that the YHF provided them with excellent or good support. Only 8 per cent indicated that the YHF provided them with fair support and another 8 per cent that the YHF provided them with insufficient support.

Partners indicated that the YHF could further improve support by engaging with them more frequently and giving them more time for proposals writing and reviews, while cluster representatives indicated that the YHF could organize sessions for clusters to explain what is expected from them in YHF processes and explain how partner risk levels are derived.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SUPPORT YOU RECEIVED FROM THE YHF?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Respondents: YHF partners and cluster representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20 per cent of donor representatives indicated that the YHF’s ability to meet donors’ information needs is good, 60 per cent indicated that it is fair and 20 per cent that it is insufficient. The most frequent comments from donors included requests for more regular donor updates and meetings on the YHF.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE YHF’S ABILITY TO MEET YOUR INFORMATION NEEDS?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Respondents: Donor representatives)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS

- Engage with YHF partners more frequently and provide them with more time for proposal writing and reviews.
- Provide sessions for cluster coordinators on their roles in YHF processes.
- Provide more frequent YHF updates to donors.

THE YHF THANKS ALL RESPONDENTS FOR TAKING THE TIME TO COMPLETE THE SURVEY AND PROVIDE VALUABLE INPUTS ABOUT THE FUND’S WORK AND AREAS OF IMPROVEMENT.

Feedback: ochayemen@un.org  For more information: unocha.org/yemen/about-yhf
@YHF_Yemen  www.reliefweb.int