



UNITED NATIONS

Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs  
occupied Palestinian territory

# WASH CLUSTER PROJECT PREPARATION HRF GUIDANCE 2011

The objective of the HRF is to provide the Humanitarian Country Team in the OPt with a rapid response funding mechanism to meet short-term emergency needs of vulnerable communities. The HRF provides initial funding

that will enable implementing partners to respond to an emergency in a timely manner. HRF oPt has approximately 5-7 million US\$ that can be used to meet HRF/ HC/HCT objectives. The priorities of the HRF are twofold:

1. To support rapid response needed at the onset of emergencies before mainstream responses come on line. Normally these responses would seek to provide lifesaving interventions and/or prevent further erosion of livelihood assets and coping mechanisms of the affected communities;
2. To strategically fill gaps in funding or within a cluster response plan. This can include supporting projects for which funding is delayed or filling gaps between two funding cycles to prevent major impact on peoples' lives such as, maintaining crucial provision of basic humanitarian delivery or initiating responses to prevent further deterioration in their livelihoods. The use of HRF resources under this priority should not impact on the ability to deliver on priority

The main focus issues for WASH in oPt is to ensure improved household water quality monitoring and treatment (in situ), increased storage capacity at household and municipal level, preventing seepage of contaminated waters into drinking water sources, education

and advocacy in efficient and safe water use. The process for reviewing projects begins with OCHA and the relevant cluster lead undertaking a preliminary appraisal that it fits into one of the criteria and includes a technical review.

## WASH HRF OBJECTIVES:

1. The projects should aim to provide 'immediate life-saving support, and prevent the deterioration of the humanitarian conditions
2. or exacerbation of the environmental situation.
3. Ideally, partners should developed projects in line with the Cluster Response Plan when such a plans exist and on the basis of agreed identified needs as outlined in the Needs Analysis Framework. In case of sudden onset emergencies, when no cluster response plan yet exists, partners should still consult with cluster leads on the definition of priorities.
4. Response should be so designed as to provide immediate support, minimize aid dependency and maximize use of local assets. Priority humanitarian response projects should emphasis assistance to refugees, IDPs, women, children and other vulnerable groups.

**Objective<sup>1</sup>:** Projects should seek to ensure that they primarily match the eligibility criteria for consideration, after which a set of selection criteria defines the projects to be put through for potential selection.

<sup>1</sup> Cluster Response Plan which would be formulated after the National Workshops, would comprise the agreed and finalized objectives. The response approach outlined here is based on the NAF circulated earlier.

## ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

---

- a. The project must fit within one of the two priorities for the HRF.
- b. The appealing NGO must demonstrate the capacity to accomplish the project in a timely manner.
- c. The Cluster Lead and OCHA must be assured that the project is well coordinated within the cluster and does not duplicate or interfere with other organizations' activities.
- d. Applicants must be registered NGO's and INGO's in oPt, or UN Agencies.
- e. Agency has attempted, and not found an alternative source of funding
- f. Achievable for completion in 2-5 months (see Timeline above for exceptions)
- g. The funding range is between USD \$50,000 and up to \$250,000. There are restrictions on the percentage of a funding grant which can be assigned to staffing costs and administrative costs. Ideally, at least 80% of the funding should be dedicated to direct project inputs. The Humanitarian Coordinator may make an exception to this funding amount, with the approval of the Advisory Board. Funding should ideally not cover the entire project costs; the implementing partner is encouraged to contribute to the project with its own resources or other donor funding.
- h. Where appropriate, fitting within WASH cluster CAP 2011 Critical Vulnerabilities Criteria; Water Scarcity (WB), Water Quality (Gaza)
- i. Focus on areas of socio-economic deprivation and communities/households with limited coping capacities
- j. Where other wider interventions and support cannot take place until gaps in service have been provided
- k. Where there are no other proposed interventions proposed by the municipality or agency
- l. The project should not be a response to chronic social problems or long-term development needs.

## Selection Criteria

The project should consider the four main requirements, as well as take guidance from the following list of most critical vulnerabilities for prioritisation:

- a. Addressing vulnerable groups
- b. Environmental Protection
- c. Ensuring equitable benefits in cost effective manner
- d. Addressing cross-cutting issues

## Critical Vulnerabilities

During the identification and prioritization of CAP projects the following key areas were identified that needed further attention, assistance and funding:

### Gaza

- Key Concern : Water Quality
- Communities receiving bad quality water from the private water vendors
- Projects directly contributing to improving quality or safe storage of drinking water
- Links with strategic response to UNEP report
- Focus on water quality deteriorated areas where access clean to safe water is limited, and continue supporting the identified localities and communities until sustainable alternatives introduce
- Target those localities and communities with bad drinking water supplies from the private vendors in Gaza.
- Target high density populations susceptible to repeated wastewater pollution incidents
- Target populations in low income-high density housing where sewage or water tankers cannot enter
- 20% or more of Households within areas are not served (within serviced areas)
- Focus on priority areas of Khan Younis, Rafah and North Gaza where nitrate and chloride levels are most prevalent, and

where water resources (water table) are lowest.

## Area C

- Key Concern: Water Scarcity
- Projects contributing to providing adequate and affordable water
- Increasing resilience and alleviating the risk of displacement ( Area C)
- Communities accessing less than 60 litres per capita per day
- Communities paying more than 20 NIS / cubic meter of water
- Communities that access less than 30 lpcpd and pay more than 20NIS/cu.m would be at grave risk of displacement.
- Communities subjected to demolitions of domestic water storage or supply facilities (classified as highly vulnerable as per the water scarcity framework)
- 20% of Households within areas that are not served (within serviced areas)

## Cross-cutting Issues

- Target the most vulnerable in the affected areas, especially female-, elderly-, and child-headed households, widows, families with more than five children of school age according to WASH cluster joint assessment.
- Support provision of safe water and sanitation in schools, 'child-friendly spaces' and communal facilities
- Provide WASH-related NFIs including soap, culturally acceptable sanitary items to those living on deteriorated hygienic environment
- Support community-based hygiene promotion using C4D, BCC and other methods.
- Develop integrated WASH related activities within identified localities and communities in order to maximize the intervention benefits

## Location of Projects

- In order to enable an equal distribution of funding support for both critical areas, projects for all areas in Gaza and West Bank

will be considered. Focus will be on projects in Area C of the West Bank, East Jerusalem, areas behind the barrier, Gaza strip and the buffer zone in the Gaza strip.

## Process

- Ideally agencies can discuss project proposals with the WASH Cluster and OCHA field unit in the respective area (North , Centre, South West Bank units and Gaza unit) , undertake joint field visits, and seek guidance prior to community selection, technical and community assessments, and prior to the formulation of project proposals
- Submission should be sent directly by the applying agency to OCHA (abdel-haq@un.org)

## Timeline

- The minimum amount of time between a completed project proposal being submitted to OCHA/cluster lead and the applicant agency receiving confirmation from the HC that the project will receive funding is four to five days. HRF funding recipients. The release of the funding to the agency's bank account is handled by OCHA Geneva and can take four weeks from the date the agreement was signed. In no emergency situations, a project processing could take 10-15 days.
- The project should support humanitarian operations between 2 – 5 months. Exceptions to this time period may be made by the HC in writing following a request by the implementing partner and approval of the HRF Review Board.
- Funding applicable until 31 December for phase 1. Phase 2 to start in 1 January
- Funding will cover project activities for no longer than a five-month period. In case of necessity, the implementing partner may request a no-cost extension by submitting a written request detailing the reasons for the request. This must be submitted to OCHA at least two weeks prior to the planned end date of the project and will then be forwarded to the HRF Review Board for approval. A written response will

be provided by OCHA to the implementing partner. The time limitations of donors will be a consideration for extension of projects.

### **Budgetary Requirements**

- Each project should not exceed a budget threshold of \$50,000-250,000, ( including support/administration costs)
- Funding is not to be used for the purchase of capital assets (vehicles, communications equipment, office equipment and office furniture). Funding of staff/personnel and rental of equipment costs should be limited to the additional resources required by the agency to implement the project.
- Ideally, 80% of the budget should be allocated to direct inputs
- Funding should ideally not cover the entire project costs; the implementing partner is encouraged to contribute to the project with its own resources or other donor funding

HRF implementing partners have a responsibility to undertake monitoring and evaluation of the project and the standard final report format includes a section on monitoring and evaluation which must be completed. OCHA shall monitor and evaluate the HRF as a whole and the development of a logical framework shall assist in this purpose. In addition OCHA HRF team, together with the relevant OCHA field office and in consultation with the Cluster Lead shall undertake independent monitoring and evaluation of HRF projects being implemented in the field.