YEMEN HUMANITARIAN FUND

JANUARY-JUNE MONITORING REPORT 2020

Yemen Humanitarian Fund

Credit: ©OCHA
THE YHF THANKS ITS DONORS FOR THEIR GENEROUS SUPPORT IN 2020

CREDITS

This document was produced by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Yemen. OCHA Yemen wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its committed staff at headquarters and in the field in preparing this document.

For additional information, please contact:
yemenhpf@un.org
Twitter: @YHF_Yemen

The designations employed and the presentation of material on this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Secretariat of the United Nations concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.
The Yemen Humanitarian Fund (YHF) completed all planned monitoring visits from January to June 2020 despite access constraints and COVID-19 travel restrictions. 97 per cent of 8,158 beneficiaries interviewed indicated that they were satisfied with services they received through YHF-funded projects.

The Fund improved the monitoring coverage of its projects compared with 2019. The YHF Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism was launched and 674 beneficiaries provided feedback.

61 per cent of projects monitored demonstrated good performance and 34 per cent underperformed but this was justified by the operating context. Key challenges to monitoring included travel restrictions, bureaucratic impediments and the poor quality of some monitoring reports.
This report outlines details of the Yemen Humanitarian Fund (YHF) monitoring activities from January to June 2020, analyses monitoring results and provides a summary of key recommendations shared with partners. The report builds on two earlier YHF monitoring reports covering January 2018 to June 2019 and July to December 2019.

Despite access challenges, COVID-19-related travel restrictions and other constraints, the YHF conducted 62 monitoring visits, meeting all its monitoring requirements for this period. However, the YHF changed the modality of many monitoring missions from the OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) staff visits to monitoring by Third Party Monitoring (TPM) providers.

The results of the monitoring conducted between January and June 2020 indicated that while 61 per cent of projects monitored demonstrated good performance, 34 per cent underperformed but this was justified by the operational context, and 5 per cent underperformed and this was not justified by the context. The YHF took necessary follow-up actions on the monitoring results to ensure the most efficient and effective project delivery possible.

The YHF reached 8,158 people through remote call Beneficiary Verification Surveys (BVS). The surveys were conducted by trained data collectors according to structured questionnaires. The respondents were randomly selected from distribution lists and constituted a representative sample of project beneficiaries. Out of the 8,158 beneficiaries interviewed, 97 per cent expressed satisfaction with the services they received.

As part of its commitment to increase Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP), the YHF launched a Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (BFCM) in February 2020. The mechanism allows beneficiaries to directly call or send a text message to a dedicated toll-free phone number and provide complaints or feedback regarding YHF-funded projects. Between February and June 2020, feedback was received from 674 beneficiaries on 28 YHF-funded projects. The Fund shared the feedback received with Implementing Partners (IPs) and tracked the actions taken by partners until complaints were resolved. Most complaints received related to minor dissatisfaction with the assistance provided.

Some of the key challenges for YHF monitoring in 2020 included travel restrictions; continued bureaucratic impediments, such as the need for prolonged negotiations with national and sub-national authorities to secure travel permits for TPM contractors; inadequate technical skills demonstrated by some TPM monitors; some poor quality TPM reports; and some YHF partners being slow to provide support for monitoring visits.
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INTRODUCTION

During the period under review, Yemen continued to be the world’s worst humanitarian crisis, driven by conflict, economic collapse and the continuous breakdown of public institutions and services. An estimated 24.3 million people, 80 per cent of the entire population, required some form of humanitarian assistance. The situation in 2020 has been further exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic and severe underfunding of the humanitarian response. By August 2020, the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan (YHRP) was only 21 per cent funded, with US$ 712 million received out of the required $3.4 billion.

The YHF makes funding directly available to humanitarian partners operating in Yemen so they can deliver timely and effective life-saving assistance to those who need it most. Donor contributions to the YHF are unearmarked and are allocated by the Fund to eligible partners through an inclusive and transparent process in support of top-priority interventions set out in the YHRP.

In 2019, 24 donors contributed $169 million to the Fund, with 73 per cent of the funding coming from the top 5 donors: Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. These generous contributions, and the balance from 2018, allowed the YHF to allocate $239.4 million to 154 top-priority projects throughout Yemen in 2019. In line with the overall reduction of funding to YHRP in 2020, the fundraising target for the YHF was reduced to $100 million this year, of which $71.6 million was already contributed or pledged by August 2020.

Project monitoring is a critical part of the management of the YHF programme cycle and a key component of the Fund’s accountability framework. It enables the Fund to systematically assess progress made towards achieving the targets of YHF-funded projects, verify the accuracy of results reported by partners and provide assurance to stakeholders on the delivery of YHF-funded assistance to affected communities. YHF monitoring and reporting activities have the following key objectives:

- Verifying partners’ progress in delivering project outputs and activities, checking the use of resources as per the projects’ budget, and verifying partners’ internal monitoring and reporting systems.
- Seeking feedback from beneficiaries and verifying the beneficiary targeting process.
- Triangulating information collected through monitoring and other means, identifying gaps and trends in humanitarian operations, as well as reflecting on best practices and lessons learned.
- Using findings and recommendations for results management, risk mitigation and public information.
- Strengthening partnership and coordination between OCHA, IPs, local authorities and affected communities.

Interview with a displaced person who benefited from health and nutrition services provided by a mobile team in IDPs site, AlMukha district, Taiz Governorate.

Photo by: Abdullah Albakri @SAWT
The YHF’s monitoring requirements for each project are defined by the operational modalities outlined in the Fund’s Operational Manual. The monitoring requirements are determined by the type of implementing partner and its assessed risk level, the duration of project activities and the size of the project budget. 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 the projects it funds.

Once the monitoring requirements are defined, the Fund develops a detailed monitoring plan, which includes the planned dates of each monitoring mission. The YHF continuously adjusts these planned dates depending on the current status of each project. For instance, a change of project end date due to a receipt of No-Cost Extension, a change in the operating environment, or delays in obtaining the necessary sub-agreements from the authorities, will result in the revisions of monitoring dates. This allows the Fund to monitor projects at the optimal times in their cycle.

During the period under review, the Fund conducted 62 monitoring visits, which included 44 visits planned in the first half of 2020 and 18 visits that were either additional or required in 2019 but delayed due to operational constraints¹. Despite access challenges, COVID-19-related travel limitations and other constraints, the YHF was able to meet all its monitoring requirements in this period, which is an improvement on 2019.

Since the travel restrictions were imposed in response to the COVID-19 outbreak, OCHA staff have been unable to conduct field monitoring visits in person. Consequently, the YHF adjusted the modality of these visits to TPM, which allowed the Fund to continue meeting its monitoring requirements. This change resulted in a larger proportion of TPM compared with OCHA HFU staff monitoring in 2020 than in previous years. Nevertheless, the Fund retained a direct connection with the beneficiaries of YHF-funded projects through remote call monitoring and through the BFCM, which supplemented the outcomes of TPM.

¹ Several more monitoring missions were initiated in the reporting period but are not part of this report as the reports were not finalized by early July.
MONITORING

Based on monitoring requirements, the YHF identifies appropriate field monitoring modalities and organizes field visits for each project. The field monitoring is supplemented by information that is gathered through the phone-based BVS and the BFCM.

Field site monitoring

The YHF field site visits are done by HFU staff with the support of clusters or by two externally contracted TPM service providers. The field site visits include desk reviews of project documents, discussions with partners in preparation for the mission, visits to project sites to observe the project implementation, and discussions with beneficiaries and other stakeholders to gather further insights into the project delivery.

Between January and June 2020, YHF conducted 62 monitoring visits to 461 projects implemented by: 29 national non-governmental organizations (NNGOs), 14 international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), 2 UN Agencies and 1 Red Crescent Society (RCS). A significant majority of the monitoring visits (73 per cent) covered projects implemented by NNGOs and approximately 87 per cent of the projects monitored were implemented by organizations assessed as medium or high-risk partners.

Out of the 62 monitoring visits, 48 (77 per cent) were conducted by TPM contractors and 14 (23 per cent) were conducted by OCHA YHF staff. The proportion of monitoring visits conducted by TPM contractors in the reporting period increased compared with the previous period due to travel restrictions on OCHA staff. The key findings of the field site monitoring are presented in sections 4 and 5.

Remote call Beneficiary Verification Surveys

Towards the end of 2018, the YHF added remote call Beneficiary Verification Surveys (BVS) as one of the monitoring modalities. The BVS allows the YHF to collect substantial quantitative and qualitative monitoring information directly from YHF-funded project beneficiaries. The BVS is conducted by trained data collectors from a call centre operated by YHF’s TPM service provider. The data collectors use a structured questionnaire designed to survey the delivery of a specific type of assistance via telephone interviews. The respondents are randomly selected from the distribution lists and constitute a representative sample of all project beneficiaries.

1 Some projects have to be monitored more than once, hence the number of monitoring missions is higher than the number of monitored projects.
Since the launch of the BVS, 29,748 beneficiaries have been randomly selected and interviewed regarding various types of assistance received from 66 YHF-funded projects. Out of these, 8,158 were surveyed between January and June 2020. The collected data allows YHF staff to verify that beneficiaries received assistance and assess their overall level of satisfaction. The findings are mainly used to further analyse and complement the observations made in field monitoring reports. In addition, BVS data is periodically analysed to generate information on the overall level of beneficiary satisfaction. The summary of BVS findings between January and June 2020 is presented in section 4.

**Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism**

As part of its commitment to increase AAP, the YHF launched a Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism (BFCM) in February 2020, which is administered by its TPM service provider. The mechanism allows a beneficiary 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 feedback or complaints received from beneficiaries are classified into five categories: i) positive feedback; ii) request for information; iii) minor dissatisfaction; iv) dissatisfaction such as not receiving assistance or complaints on the quality of services; and v) major breaches such as breach of code of conduct, mismanagement of assistance, fraud or corruption-related complaints. Please see Annex I for descriptions of the types of feedback and complaints under each category.

Between February and June 2020, feedback was received from 674 beneficiaries regarding 28 projects implemented by 21 partners. Most of the feedback, 644 (96 per cent) were direct calls to the toll-free number, 18 were messages received via WhatsApp and 12 were messages received via SMS.

More than half (56 per cent) of feedback related to 24 projects implemented by NGOs, 27 per cent related to 6 projects implemented by INGOs and 17 per cent related 2 projects implemented by RCS. No feedback was received on UN projects.

YHF shares the feedback received through the BFCM with IPs and tracks the actions taken by partners until complaints are resolved. In addition, YHF undertakes periodic reviews and analyses of feedback and reports to relevant stakeholders on it. The summary of feedback received between February and June 2020 is presented in section 4.
Utilization of monitoring findings

Monitoring information gathered through field site visits, BVS and BFCM from January to June 2020 was used to review project implementation and results achieved, identify key challenges and capture lessons learned. As a result, 389 recommendations and action points were prepared and shared with the relevant implementing partners to inform ongoing implementation and future project design. In addition, YHF conducted periodic reviews and analyses of all the monitoring information and shared the findings with cluster coordinators and OCHA hubs.

Moreover, the YHF uses monitoring findings to assess overall project performance, which is the basis for assigning the Partner Performance Index and periodically reviewing partner risk levels.

Project implementation performance

Assessment of project implementation performance is done by thoroughly reviewing the following key aspects of project implementation: adherence to established cluster standards and codes of conduct; implementation progress against workplan and set targets; quality of internal project monitoring and reporting systems; AAP; and mainstreaming of cross-cutting themes. Based on the outcome of the review, each component receives a score and by taking weighted average scores, projects receive performance ratings.

Each monitoring visit assigns one of the five implementation performance rating:

- 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 work plan 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.

Between January and June 2020, 61 per cent of the monitored projects received a rating of “good performance”, 34 per cent of projects received a rating of “underperforming but justified”, and 5 per cent of projects received a rating of “underperforming and not justified”. No projects received a rating of “outstanding performance” or “no performance” during this period.

Overall, the proportion of projects which received a rating of “good performance” remained similar as in the previous period (July to December 2019). However, the proportion of projects with “good performance” increased since the first half of 2019, which can be attributed to the improved quality of recommendations provided earlier in the year and the close follow up by the HFU team on recommendations and action points.
The proportion of project implementations rated as “good performance” was the highest for high-risk projects (66 per cent) followed by low-risk projects (63 per cent). The performance of medium-risk projects was the lowest with only 56 per cent of monitored projects rated as “good performance”. While there is no direct evidence explaining why the monitored high-risk projects performed better than the low-risk projects, some informed assumptions can be made. Since all monitored high-risk projects were implemented by NNGOs, they may have faced less bureaucratic impediments and less access constraints than the monitored low-risk projects, which were implemented by INGOs. Moreover, high-risk partners tend to exert more effort to conform to YHF rules and regulations than low-risk partners and appear to have more flexibility in overcoming operational challenges.

All monitored UN and RCS projects received a “good performance” rating, while NGO project performance was lower with 67 per cent of NNGO and 43 per cent of INGO projects receiving a “good performance” ratings.

Common findings across clusters

Nearly a third of the 46 projects monitored were multi-cluster. In total, the monitored projects had 72 cluster components: 23 Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) components, 19 Health components, 10 Food Security and Agriculture (FSA) components, 9 Nutrition components, 6 Education components, 3 Shelter, Non-Food Items (NFIs) and Camp Coordination and Camp Management1 (CCCM) components, and 2 Protection components.

The following are commonly observed monitoring findings across clusters. Many of these findings are similar to the findings reported through the YHF monitoring reports for 2018 and 2019, as well as through the HRP accountability tools developed by clusters. The fact that these challenges persist underlines the complex operating environment in Yemen and that many actions may be beyond the capacity of IPs to address. These challenges include:

- Bureaucratic impediments such as delays in signing sub-agreements, delays in visa and work permits for international staff and restrictions on movement permits significantly affected IPs’ ability to deliver timely assistance and adequately monitor implementation.
- Lack of full control of beneficiary selection criteria, including beneficiary identification, registration and verification by IPs (interference by other stakeholders).
- Some beneficiary registration committee members, particularly community leaders, requesting payment from beneficiaries for humanitarian assistance.
- Lack of appropriate feedback and complaints mechanisms in various project locations, beneficiaries lacking knowledge about such mechanisms, or IP’s lack of proper tracking systems for documenting feedback and the actions taken.
- Inadequate information sharing by IPs, resulting in a low level of beneficiary awareness about available support.
- Poor internal project monitoring and tracking systems with IPs, including lack of timely post-distribution monitoring or no post-distribution monitoring.

---

1 As of 2020, CCCM separated from Shelter and NFIs and became an independent cluster. However, since this report covers monitoring of projects approved in 2019, Shelter, NFIs and CCCM is presented as one cluster.

### PROPORTION OF CLUSTER COMPONENTS WITHIN MONITORED PROJECTS*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cluster Components</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WASH</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTH</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD SECURITY AND AGRICULTURE</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUTRITION</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHELTER &amp; NON-FOOD ITEMS</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROTECTION</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*One project monitored may include more than 1 cluster, which is why the total does not amount to 100%.
Findings from Beneficiary Verification Surveys

The YHF received feedback from 8,158 beneficiaries through the remote call BVS between January and June 2020. The feedback indicated that 97 per cent of beneficiaries were satisfied with the assistance they received through YHF-funded projects.

According to feedback received, beneficiaries were most satisfied with dignity kits, food assistance, NFIs and shelter kits. They were slightly less satisfied with cash assistance, delivery kits and hygiene kits. The main reasons for dissatisfaction were the quantity of assistance received being insufficient to meet the household needs, items missing from, and poor-quality items included in, assistance kits.

Ceramic water filters stand out with the highest level of dissatisfaction (7.2 per cent). According to monitoring findings, low durability of ceramic water filters was the main reason for dissatisfaction.

Findings from Beneficiary Feedback and Complaints Mechanism

The YHF received 674 feedback/complaints through the BFCM between February and June 2020. Sixty-two per cent of the feedback was negative and was categorized as follows: 337 indicating minor dissatisfaction, 61 indicating major dissatisfaction and 17 major breaches. The remaining 38 per cent of feedback included 254 requests for information and 5 positive messages.

INGOs received the highest level of beneficiary dissatisfaction. Over 80 per cent of all feedback received on INGO projects expressed minor or major dissatisfaction. In comparison, 46 per cent and 66 per cent of all feedback received on NNGO and RCS projects expressed minor or major dissatisfaction respectively. Moreover, the only five positive messages received were in relation to NNGO projects.
However, while NNGOs received 16 complaints classified as major breaches (4 per cent of all feedback received on NNGO projects), INGOs received only 1 complaint classified as a major breach, and RCS received none.

The BFCM proved to be an essential 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.

All feedback and complaints received, except for major breaches, are automatically shared with partners for their review. Partners are required to take corrective actions on each item of feedback and report on them using an online platform specifically designed for managing feedback. When a complaint constituting a major breach is received, it is submitted to the YHF first before being shared with the partner in question. The YHF reviews such complaints, sometimes contacts the beneficiary to obtain additional information, and establishes a list of recommended actions to address the complaint. The YHF then shares it with the partner for further review and action and tracks the case until it is resolved.

Out of 17 complaints that were classified as a major breach, 16\(^3\) were in connection with three NNGO projects. They related to requests made to beneficiaries to pay community representatives for assistance or beneficiaries being excluded from distribution lists and replaced by others.

The YHF thoroughly reviewed each of these cases and requested IPs to investigate them, report back to the Fund and undertake corrective measures. Upon follow up, the YHF concluded that all cases had been addressed and sufficient preventive measures implemented to avoid similar breaches in the future. In addition, the Fund strengthened the monitoring and oversight activities of these three projects. It should also be noted that, upon investigation, none of the cases were directly related to alleged fraud.

### FEEDBACK AND COMPLAINTS BY PARTNER TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partner</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NNGO</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGO</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCS</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Subsequent follow up on the remaining one complaint indicated that it was not related to a YHF-funded project.
OVERVIEW OF
CLUSTER SPECIFIC FINDINGS
Overview of cluster specific findings

WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE

A total of 31 field visits were conducted to 23 projects with WASH components. The main activities monitored included: rehabilitation and maintenance of water schemes; construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of sanitation systems; construction, rehabilitation and desludging of family latrines; operationalization of water supply systems and provision of capacity building for operation and maintenance of water systems; water chlorination and water quality surveillance activities; distribution of hygiene kits and hygiene promotion activities including training of Community Health Volunteers (CHVs) in hygiene promotion; and provision of water trucking services.

Fifty-five per cent of monitoring visits to projects with WASH components awarded a rating of "good performance", 39 per cent awarded "underperforming but justified" and 6 per cent awarded "underperforming and not justified". The proportion of WASH components that received "good performance" increased from 43 per cent in the second half of 2019 to 55 per cent in the first half of 2020. Moreover, the proportion of those categorized as "underperforming and not justified" decreased from 14 per cent in the second half of 2019 to 7 per cent in the first half of 2020.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Water wells were not covered exposing the wells to pollution and leaving community members, especially children, at risk of falling down the well.
- Poor installation of water pipes resulted in the waste of water due to leakages.
- Lack of proper drainage at water collection points resulted in pollution due to stagnant water.
- Some hygiene kits distributed did not include all the required items or fewer items than specified.
- Beneficiaries indicated that ceramic water filters did not last long.
- Quality of some sewer systems and rehabilitated latrines was poor.
- Water supply points for some supply systems were installed in locations a long way from where beneficiaries live.
- Local stakeholders requested payments during the beneficiary registration process for hygiene kits.
Overview of cluster specific findings

HEALTH

A total of 28 monitoring visits were conducted to 19 projects with Health components. The main activities monitored included: provision of general primary, secondary and referral health services; provision of health services through supported Medical Mobile Teams; provision of reproductive health and immunization services, including support for cold chain systems; support to Diarrhoea Treatment Centres (DTC) and Oral Rehydration Corners (ORC); provision of medical supplies and equipment to targeted Health Facilities (HFs); provision of support to targeted HFs; and incentives to health workers.

Fifty-four per cent of monitoring visits to projects with Health components awarded a rating of "good performance", 39 per cent awarded "underperforming but justified" and 7 per cent awarded "underperforming and not justified". The proportion of Health projects that were categorized as "good performance" decreased from 73 per cent in the second half of 2019 to 54 per cent in the first half of 2020.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

• HF’s received operational costs and incentives for fewer months than originally planned due to bureaucratic and other operational constraints.
• In some HFs, delays in setting up ORCs and DTCs and population movements due to conflict resulted in fewer cholera cases treated than were targeted.
• Immunization services in some HFs were not tracked properly due to the lack of vaccine cards. In addition, due to the lack of referral cards, HFs used phone calls to refer cases to another HF’s putting the quality of the service and service tracking activities at risk.
• WASH facilities in some HFs were out of use due to a lack of running water.
• Damaged or dysfunctional medical equipment was provided to some HFs and some equipment provided to HF’s was not used due to a lack of electricity.
• Medical supplies were stored in a poor and unsafe manner in some HFs due to the lack of storage facilities.
• In some HF’s the health workers and CHVs received inadequate training and in some of the HF’s the CHVs services were not adequately tracked and recorded.
• There was inadequate coordination with District Health Officers (DHOs) and other stakeholders during the identification of targeted HF’s and implementation of activities.
• Beneficiaries complained that key HF staff were absent from the facilities during service hours.

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE
OF MONITORED PROJECTS WITH HEALTH COMPONENTS
January - June 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of cluster specific findings

FOOD SECURITY AND AGRICULTURE

A total of 16 field monitoring visits were conducted to 10 projects with FSA components. The main activities monitored were delivery of food and cash/voucher assistance to beneficiaries. In addition to verifying the delivery of assistance to those targeted, monitoring examined the process of beneficiary registration and verification, and attempted to assess the level of beneficiary satisfaction.

Sixty-three per cent of projects with FSA components awarded a rating of “good performance” and 37 per cent awarded “underperforming but justified”. The performance of monitored FSA projects in the first half of 2020 was lower than in the second half of 2019 when all FSA projects received “good performance”.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Local authorities interfered resulting in IPs having limited or no control over beneficiary registration and verification activities, which mainly affected targeting processes.
- Some registration committee members requested money from beneficiaries and refused to register people who refused to pay.
- Some distribution sites were poorly selected and were far away from IDP sites, which resulted in beneficiaries incurring transport costs.
- Some food items, such as oil and wheat flour, provided by contracted food suppliers were of poor quality.
- Some beneficiaries received wheat flour, which was damaged by moisture due to poor storage facilities.
- Some beneficiaries were dissatisfied because they had to wait a long time to receive assistance and, at times, were treated badly by the distribution staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A total of 13 field visits were conducted to 9 projects with Nutrition components. The main activities monitored included: setup of Outpatient Therapeutic Programme (OTP) points and provision of maternal and child nutrition services; provision of cash/voucher assistance to transport Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) referral cases to Therapeutic Treatment Centres (TTC); establishment of Infant and Young Child Feeding centres in nutrition service provision sites; supplies and equipment support to targeted facilities; incentive and operational support to targeted facilities.

Fifty-four per cent of monitoring visits to projects with Nutrition components awarded a rating of “good performance” and 46 per cent awarded “underperforming but justified”. The performance of monitored Nutrition projects in the first half of 2020 was lower than in the second half of 2019 when 63 per cent of nutrition projects received “good performance”. On the other hand, the proportion of projects rated “underperforming and not justified” decreased from 25 per cent in the second half of 2019 to zero per cent in the first half of 2020.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- In some facilities the Community Nutrition Volunteers (CNVs) did not receive proper training on Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) screening and oedema checking.
- Inadequate tracking and documentation systems in some facilities led to discrepancies in reporting project achievements.
- The coverage of malnutrition screening was affected due to hiring fewer CNVs than planned.
- Nutrition supplies were stored in an unsafe and disorderly manner.
Overview of cluster specific findings

EDUCATION

A total of 11 field visits were carried out to 6 projects with Education components. The main activities monitored included: construction of Temporary Learning Spaces (TLCs); rehabilitation of schools; provision of cleaning materials; provision and maintenance of school desks and other materials; provision of teacher kits and incentives for teachers in targeted schools; provision of school supplies for students; and community mobilization activities to promote enrolment of children to schools.

Eighty-two per cent of the monitored project implementations received a rating of "good performance". By comparison, in the second half of 2019, only one project with Education component was monitored and was rated "good performance".

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Some local authority officers interfered in the identification of target schools and disrupted rehabilitation activities.
- There were delays in the construction of TLCs.
- The support provided to schools did not match the needs.
- Rehabilitation activities were of poor quality and incomplete.
- The quality of items in student kits was poor.
- School WASH facilities were not used due to the lack of running water.
- Bags for students and teachers were distributed at the end of the school year.
Overview of cluster specific findings

SHELTER AND NON-FOOD ITEMS

A total of 7 field visits were conducted to 3 projects with Shelter/NFI/CCCM components. The main activities monitored included distribution of in-kind NFI and emergency shelter kits; cash assistance for construction and upgrading of emergency shelters; construction and maintenance of emergency shelters and upgrading of family shelters.

Twenty-nine per cent of monitoring visits to projects with Shelter/NFIs/CCCM components awarded the rating of “good performance” and 71 per cent rated “underperforming but justified”. The performance of monitored Shelter/NFIs/CCCM projects in the first half of 2020 was lower than in the second half of 2019 when 75 per cent of Shelter/NFIs/CCCM projects were awarded “good performance”.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Interference by local authorities resulted in IPs having limited or no control over beneficiary registration and verification activities, which mainly affected targeting processes.
- Some registration committee members requested money from beneficiaries for registration and refused assistance to those who refused to pay.
- The quality of some items, such as blanket and mattresses, in NFI kits was poor.
- Delays by Shelter and NFI Cluster in approving the transitional shelter design resulted in a huge delay in the construction of transitional shelters.
- Some items in the NFI kits were not used by beneficiaries as they were not relevant to their needs.
- Beneficiaries did not receive the full contents of NFI kits.
Overview of cluster specific findings

PROTECTION

Four field visits were conducted to two projects with Protection components. The main activities monitored included provision of legal assistance with civil documentation and other legal matters; provision of protection cash assistance for targeted beneficiaries; mine risk awareness activities; establishing Community-Based Child Protection Committees and providing training; protection case management and referral services; and provision of Psychosocial Support Services (PSS).

All monitoring visits to projects with Protection components awarded the rating of "underperforming but justified".

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) were set-up in unsafe location that put children at risk of car accidents.
- Established CFS were found without playground materials installed.
- The quality of mine-risk training was poor and did not include visual materials.
- Legal assistance activities were inadequately implemented.
- The referral systems were weak and there was inadequate coordination with other sectors.
- Some children with urgent protection needs were left unsupported.
# FEEDBACK AND COMPLAINTS CATEGORIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback/complaint categories</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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>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>Minor dissatisfaction</td>
<td>The person is calling to complain about minor issues on goods/services. This can include long queues, distance from distribution points, broken items within a kit, long waiting times, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major dissatisfaction</td>
<td>The person is calling to complain about major issues with goods/services. This can include being on a beneficiary list but not receiving goods, items missing from kits etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major breaches including breach of codes of conduct, mismanagement, fraud etc.</td>
<td>The person is calling to report fraud, corruption, aid diversion, abuse or sexual harassment. This can include being asked for payment to be included on beneficiary lists, being asked to confirm receiving more assistance than distributed, goods not going to the intended beneficiaries, being asked for favors in exchange for goods/services etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>