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The Yemen Humanitarian Fund (YHF) is the largest Country-Based Pooled Fund (CBPF) in the world. Donor contributions are unearmarked and allocated to eligible partners through an inclusive and transparent process in support of priorities set out in the Yemen Humanitarian Response Plan (YHRP). In 2019 alone, 24 generous donors contributed $168.4 million while the YHF supported 154 projects amounting to $239.4 million including a carry-over from 2018.

This monitoring report provides an overview of YHF projects monitored between July-December 2019 and builds on the previous annual monitoring report for 2018-June 2019. During the period under review, YHF monitoring encountered several challenges that significantly affected its ability to conduct timely monitoring which in turn affected the quality and coverage of the project monitoring activities.

YHF’s Third Party Monitoring (TPM) visits were constrained by bureaucratic impediments, including prolonged negotiations with the de facto authorities to obtain permits, interference in the use of monitoring tools and requests to be present during monitoring activities. These affected YHF’s monitoring scope and coverage. In addition, delays by partners to respond to requests by the TPM also affected timely implementation of monitoring activities. The lack of adequate technical capacity by TPM monitors also affected the quality of the monitoring and its use by the various stakeholders.
OVERVIEW OF MONITORING COVERAGE

Field Site Monitoring
In 2019, YHF conducted a total of 122 monitoring visits to 90 projects implemented by 46 YHF partners. Out of these, 57 monitoring visits were conducted between July to December. The monitoring covered a total of 48 projects contracted by 36 YHF partners: 25 National NGOs (NNGOs), 9 International NGOs (INOs), 1 UN Agency and 1 Red Crescent. Overall, 25 monitoring visits (43 per cent) were conducted by YHF staff while the rest were conducted by TPM contractors. Most of the monitoring visits (65 per cent) covered projects implemented by National NGOs (NNGOs) and approximately 70 per cent of the projects monitored were medium or high-risk projects.

Remote Call Monitoring (RCM) and Beneficiary Verification Surveys (BVS)
Towards the end of 2018, YHF added Remote Call Monitoring (RCM) as one of the monitoring modalities to enable YHF gather key information directly from assisted beneficiaries. RCM has been used to conduct Beneficiary Verification Surveys (BVS) 21,324 targeted beneficiaries have been interviewed in 2019 regarding the various types of assistance they received from 56 YHF projects. The last section of this report will provide an analysis of this mechanism.
Information gathered from monitoring observations are used to identify gaps and challenges in project implementation and capture relevant lessons, which will be used to rate overall project implementation performance. These findings are mainly used to develop key recommendations and action points that will be shared with the partners as part of informing ongoing project implementation, and with other key stakeholders such as national and sub-national cluster coordinators and OCHA hubs to ensure that key actors are kept informed. Overall, 343 recommendations/action points from 57 monitoring visits (average 7 per monitoring visit) were shared with the respective partners implementing the monitored projects.

**Overview of Project Implementation Performance**

Assessment of project implementation performance is done through thoroughly assessing and scoring key aspects such as adherence to established cluster standards and code of conducts; implementation progress against workplan and set targets; project monitoring and Accountability to Affected People (AAP), and mainstreaming of cross-cutting themes. Based on the overall weighted average score, projects receive one of the five performance rating: "Outstanding performance", "Good performance", "Underperforming but justified", "Underperforming and not justified", "No performance".

As shown in the figure below, the proportion of projects which received a rating of "good performance" increased from 52 per cent for the period January to June 2019 to 65 per cent in the second half of 2019. This may be explained by the improved quality of recommendations provided earlier in the year and the follow-up by the HFU team on the use of recommendations and action points which are believed to contribute to enhancing the overall implementation performance.

**OVERALL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE RATING (JAN - DECEMBER 2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>July - December</th>
<th>January - June</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following graphs highlight partners’ implementation performance by risk level and by partner type. ‘0’ per cent indicates that no project received this score.
**OVERVIEW OF PROGRAMMATIC FINDINGS**

**Common findings across clusters**

Overall, 17 per cent of the projects monitored between July and December 2019 were multi-sector projects. Out of the 48 projects monitored, 13 (27 per cent) had health and WASH components, 12 projects (25 per cent) had FSAC components, and only 1 (2 per cent) had Education components. The graph below summarizes the proportion of cluster components within monitored projects.

The following are common findings across clusters identified through field monitoring and continue to be similar to observations made during January-June 2019:

- Bureaucratic impediments such as delays in signing sub-agreements, delays in visa/work permit for international staff and movement permits significantly affected the partners’ ability to timely deliver assistance and adequately monitor project implementation.
- Lack of full control of beneficiary selection criteria, including beneficiary identification, registration and verification by the IP (interference by other stakeholders) impacted who received assistance.
- Lack of appropriate feedback and complaints mechanism in various implementation locations or lack of knowledge by beneficiaries on the availability of mechanisms put in place by partners, or lack of proper tracking system to document feedback and the actions taken by the partners.
- Low level of awareness by beneficiaries on available supports including information on project entitlements due to inadequate sharing of information by the partner.
- Poor project monitoring and tracking, including PDMs not being conducted timely or not conducted at all.

![Proportion of Cluster Components](image-url)
BVS is conducted from call centres operated by TPM contractors. Trained call centre operators used structured questionnaires to conduct survey interviews with beneficiaries that were randomly selected from distribution lists. In 2019, 57 BVS were conducted for 52 projects and a total of 21,324 targeted beneficiaries were interviewed to gather feedback on the assistance received. Health, nutrition and some protection projects were not included under this mechanism for confidentiality reasons. The RCM included the following services received:

- Cash assistance including livelihood conditional/unconditional livelihood cash assistance, protection cash assistance, rental subsidy, etc.
- Food distribution (in kind and or voucher)
- Distribution of agricultural inputs
- In kind NFIs and ES items distribution
- Distribution of hygiene kits
- Distribution of water filters
- Cash for work distribution

Overall, 97 per cent of beneficiaries randomly selected and interviewed confirmed that they received the various types of assistance. According to the BVS, beneficiaries who did not receive the assistance are those who had left the target area before a distribution took place and few who did not receive a message regarding the distribution and as a result missed it. The BVS in general indicates that most beneficiaries were satisfied with the assistance they received from YHF projects (see the figure below). Those few who were not satisfied with the assistance received noted that the quantity of assistance received was not enough to meet household needs and that the quality of some of the items needed to improve. In addition to using BVS findings to further analyze and complement observations from TPM field visits, YHF utilizes such feedback to prepare actionable recommendations for partners and follow up on their implementation to ensure that subsequent project activities adequately address beneficiary needs and expectations.

### Overview of Beneficiary Satisfaction from RCM/BVS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF ASSISTANCE</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash*</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food**</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIs &amp; Shelter</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene kits</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water filters</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash for Work</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery kits</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*conditional, un conditional, protection, rental subsidy etc  **in kind and voucher
OVERVIEW OF CLUSTER SPECIFIC FINDINGS
Overview of cluster specific findings

FOOD SECURITY AND AGRICULTURE

A total of 14 monitoring field visits were conducted to 12 projects with Food Security and Agriculture components. The main activities monitored included:

- Conditional and unconditional livelihood cash/voucher assistance to beneficiaries.
- Distribution of livelihood inputs such as agricultural inputs and fishery kits.

In addition to verifying the delivery of the assistance, the monitoring reviewed the process of beneficiary registration, verification, the actual distribution process and systematically attempted to assess the level of beneficiary satisfaction. Overall, all the monitored projects with food security and agriculture sector activities received a rating of “Good performance”. 

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE OF MONITORED PROJECTS WITH FSAC COMPONENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>0%</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

WATER, SANITATION & HYGIENE

A total of 14 field visits were carried out to 13 projects with WASH components. The main activities monitored included:

- Rehabilitation and maintenance of water supply systems.
- Construction, rehabilitation and maintenance of sanitation systems and support to sanitation activities.
- Construction of latrines.
- Operationalisation of water supply systems.
- Water chlorination and water quality supervision activities.
- Distribution of Hygiene Kits.

As it can be seen from the graph below, 6 (43 percent) of the projects monitored demonstrated good implementation performance and no project received a rating of outstanding performance or no performance.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Lack of regular supervision and maintenance generators by partners disrupting water supply to beneficiaries.
- Targeted water supply systems found dysfunctional due to delays by the partners to install solar panels.
- Low coverage of hygiene awareness campaigns.
- Late conduct of monitoring activities and poor implementation tracking and documentation system.
- Gender aspects disregarded in construction and allocation of latrines to households which in turn led women preferring open defecation than sharing latrines.
- Induction workshop conducted late, at the end of the project.
- Poor and unsafe quality of constructed latrines.
- Water tanks installed far from residential areas.
- Payment request by local stakeholders during beneficiary registration for the provision of hygiene kits.

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE OF MONITORED PROJECTS WITH WASH COMPONENTS

JULY - DECEMBER, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of cluster specific findings

HEALTH

A total of 15 monitoring visits were carried out to 13 projects having Health components, almost three-quarters of which were seen to be performing well. The main activities monitored included:

- Health services provided by supported health facilities (HFs).
- Support to DTC and ORC.
- Provision of medical supplies and equipment to targeted HFs.
- Provision of incentive and other operational support to targeted HFs.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Supported HFs lacked a tracking system to capture CHVs activities.
- Lack of adherence to established standards in running DTC and ORC including lack of adequate infection control measures.
- Water tanks provided to HFs not functioning as not timely connected to the water network.
- Inadequate coordination with DHOs and other stakeholders during identification of targeted HFs.
- Some key facilities relevant for cholera treatments such as hand washing facilities, laundry rooms, incinerators were not working in the targeted HFs.
- Beneficiaries complaining that they received insufficient guidance on the use of some medicines provided by the supported HFs.
Overview of cluster specific findings

NUTRITION

A total of 8 field visits were conducted to 6 projects with a nutrition component. The main activities monitored included:

- Provision of malnutrition treatment services by targeted facilities.
- Provision of supplies and equipment support to targeted facilities.
- Provision of incentive and operational support to targeted facilities.

Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance

- Post-facto monitoring found out that nutrition supplements provided to HFs being sold by HF staff after the project ended and beneficiaries prevented from using complaint mechanisms.
- Supported facilities not fully open during the working hours.

SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE OF MONITORED PROJECTS WITH NUTRITION COMPONENTS

JULY - DECEMBER, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>13%</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

**SHELTER AND NON-FOOD ITEMS**

A total of 4 field visits were carried out to 4 projects with shelter/NFI/CCCM activities. The main activities monitored included:
- Distribution of in-kind NFIs.
- Cash/voucher assistance for NFIs or for emergency shelter.
- Cash assistance for rental subsidy.
- Construction and maintenance of emergency shelters.

**Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance**
- Distribution of winterization kits conducted after the winter season had passed.
- Beneficiaries not receiving the full content of the NFI kits.
- Poor quality NFIs distributed to beneficiaries who expressed a high level of dissatisfaction.
- NFIs distributed far from the target areas forcing beneficiaries to pay for transportation.

**SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE OF MONITORED PROJECTS WITH SHELTER AND NFI COMPONENTS**

<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>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*JULY - DECEMBER, 2019*
Overview of cluster specific findings

**PROTECTION**

A total of 12 field visits were carried out to 8 projects with protection components. The main activities monitored included:

- Functionality of community centres.
- Availability and functionality of referral services.
- Distribution of protection cash assistance.
- Provision of legal assistance.

**Summary of key findings associated with poor implementation performance**

- Inefficient coordination with relevant local stakeholders resulting in considerable delay in providing legal assistance such as processing IDs for beneficiaries.
- Weak referral systems and inadequate coordination with other sectors.

**SUMMARY OF IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE OF MONITORED PROJECTS WITH PROTECTION COMPONENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outstanding performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good performance</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>50%</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

EDUCATION

Only one monitoring visit conducted to a project with education sector components and its overall implementation performance rated as “Good Performance”. The activities monitored included:

- Provision of new desks and repairing of damaged desks in targeted schools
- Provision of school supplies and basic learning materials for students
- Provision of training for MOE staff and School Council members

<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>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming but justified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underperforming and not justified</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No performance</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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