

# *Occupied Palestinian Territory* **Humanitarian Fund** **Operational Manual**

*January 2017*

## Table of Contents

1. Acronyms.....	3
2. Introduction.....	4
<b>2.1 Purpose.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.2 Scope.....</b>	<b>4</b>
3. Objectives of the <i>oPt</i> HF.....	4
4. Governance and management.....	5
5. Allocation criteria, parameters and modalities.....	9
<b>5.1 Eligibility.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>5.2 Allocation criteria.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5.3 Allocation parameters.....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>5.4 Allocation modalities.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>5.5 Start date and eligibility of expenditure.....</b>	<b>14</b>
5. Revision request.....	15
6. Additional information.....	15
7. Accountability framework.....	16
3. Performance management.....	22

## 1. Acronyms

AB	Advisory Board
CBPF	Country-based Pooled Fund
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CN	Concept Note
ERC	Emergency Response Coordinator
GMS	Grant Management System
FCS	Funding Coordination Section
FTS	Financial Tracking Service
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HFU	Humanitarian Financing Unit
HPC	Humanitarian Program Cycle
HQ	Headquarters
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
ICCT	Inter-Cluster Coordination Team
IOM	International Organization for Migration
MA	Managing Agent
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
M&R	Monitoring and Reporting
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
NCE	No-Cost Extension
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PP	Project Proposal
PUNO	Participating United Nations Organization
RC	Review Committee
SAA	Standard Administrative Arrangement
SRC	Strategic Review Committee
TOR	Terms of Reference
TRC	Technical Review Committee

## 2. Introduction

1. The Operational Manual for the *occupied Palestinian Territory (oPt)* Humanitarian Fund (*oPt HF*) is issued by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) and endorsed by the Advisory Board to set the general direction and programmatic focus of the *oPt* Humanitarian Fund (hereafter “*oPt HF*” or “the Fund”).
2. The HC and the Advisory Board will revisit this Manual on an annual basis or as needed to adjust the general direction and programmatic focus of the Fund, thereby ensuring its relevance and effectiveness.

### 2.1 Purpose

3. The purpose of the *oPt HF* Operational Manual is to describe the governance arrangements, objective, allocation modalities, and accountability mechanisms of the Fund, as well as to detail the roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved.
4. Under the direction of the HC, the *oPt HF* aims to support the timely disbursement of funds to the most critical humanitarian needs as defined by the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP).
5. In this regards, this Manual will provide guidance to implementing partners and facilitate the role of OCHA, members of the Review Committees, and cluster/sectoral experts.

### 2.2 Scope

6. The *oPt HF* Operational Manual defines the country-specific regulations that govern the *oPt HF*. It is designed within the framework provided by the Operational Handbook for Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs), which describes the global set of rules that apply to all CBPFs worldwide, and adapts specific aspects of these global guidelines to the humanitarian context in the country.
7. Adherence to the guidance provided in the two documents is mandatory so as to ensure standard and transparent processes.

## 3. Objectives of the *oPt HF*

8. The *oPt HF* will be primarily aligned to support the delivery of strategic humanitarian response identified under the HRP while retaining the flexibility to allocate funds to unforeseen events or special requirements. The *oPt HF* will reinforce the leadership and coordination role of the HC by driving funding to needs-based priority sectors and geographic areas. The *oPt HF* will also aim for a more inclusive approach by working with a variety of implementing partners in a complex operational environment. The *oPt HF* has the following main objectives:
  - i. Support life-saving and life-sustaining activities while filling critical funding gaps;
  - ii. Promote needs-based assistance in accordance with humanitarian principles;
  - iii. Strengthen coordination and leadership primarily through the function of the HC and by leveraging the cluster system;
  - iv. Improve the relevance and coherence of humanitarian response by strategically funding priorities as identified under the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP);
  - v. Expand the delivery of assistance in hard-to-reach areas by partnering with national and international NGOs.
9. Further, the *oPt HF* aims to ensure that humanitarian needs are addressed in a collaborative manner, fostering cooperation and coordination within and between clusters and humanitarian organizations. As such, the *oPt HF* contributes to improving needs assessments, enhancing the HRP as the strategic planning document for humanitarian action, strengthening coordination mechanisms, in particular the cluster system, and improving accountability through an enhanced monitoring and reporting framework.

10. Interventions supported by the *oPt HF* are to be consistent with the core humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence.

#### 4. Governance and management

11. The activities of the *oPt HF* will be carried out under the overall stewardship of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC). The HC will be supported by an Advisory Board and an OCHA-led Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) fulfilling the *oPt HF*'s secretariat functions. The *oPt HF* Advisory Board will be chaired by the HC and will welcome the senior-level participation of donors, UN organizations (in their capacity as cluster lead agencies) and NGO representatives. Cluster coordinators play a key role in prioritization as well as project review at both a strategic and technical level.

##### 4.1 The Humanitarian Coordinator (HC)

12. The overall management of the Fund on behalf of the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) will rest with the HC, supported by an OCHA-led HFU and advised by the *oPt HF* Advisory Board. Key responsibilities of the HC are:
- i. Approves the *oPt HF* Operational Manual, which outlines the Fund's scope and objectives; programmatic focus; governance structures and membership; allocation modalities and processes; accountability mechanisms; and operational modalities;
  - ii. Chairs the Advisory Board and provides strategic direction for the Fund;
  - iii. Leads country-level resource mobilization for the Fund supported by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), OCHA Country Office and in coordination with relevant OCHA entities at headquarters;
  - iv. Approves the use of and defines the strategic focus and amounts of fund allocations;
  - v. Ensures that the Advisory Board and the review committee(s) are functioning in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the Handbook;
  - vi. Makes final decisions on projects recommended for funding. This responsibility is exclusive to the HC and cannot be delegated. Funding decisions can be made at the discretion of the HC, without a recommendation from the Advisory Board, for circumstances which require an immediate response. In addition, the HC has the authority to overrule recommendations from the review committee(s);
  - vii. Approves projects and initiates disbursement;
  - viii. Ensures complementary use of *oPt HF* funding with other funding sources, including the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF);
  - ix. Leads the process of closing the *oPt HF*.

##### 4.2 The *oPt HF* Advisory Board (AB)

13. The *oPt HF* Advisory Board (AB) will support the HC in developing an overall strategy and overseeing the performance of the Fund. It will advise the HC on strategic and policy issues and ensure the views of donors, UN agencies and the NGO community are represented. The AB will be consulted in the development of allocation strategies in line with HRP and will serve as a forum to share information on funding coverage to strengthen donor coordination. The AB will also provide a forum for representatives and the HC to discuss funding priorities in line with the HRP.
14. Key functions of AB are:
- i. *Strategic focus and fund allocation:* The AB should support the HC in ensuring that the main objectives of the Fund are met. The AB should review and advise the HC on strategic elements of the Fund such as the allocation strategies and the operational manual. The AB also advises on fund allocation to appropriate clusters and priorities. The AB shall advise the HC in setting funding targets and support resource mobilization efforts;

- ii. *Risk management*: The AB supports the HC and the OCHA Country Office in undertaking periodic risk analyses and reviewing a risk management plan of the Fund in accordance with the Accountability Framework contained in this Operational Manual;
  - iii. *Transparency of overall process*: The AB should monitor fund processes with the objective of ensuring that all stakeholders are treated fairly and that the management of the Fund abides by established policies;
  - iv. *Review of operational activities*: The AB monitors the operational performance of the Fund, providing advice to the HC.
15. The membership of the AB for *oPt HF* is:
- Humanitarian Coordinator (Chairperson)
  - Nine donor representatives (contributing donors)
  - One participating UN Agency representatives
  - Two NGO representatives (one for international NGOs and one for National NGOs)
  - OCHA Head of Office

The names of the organizations represented in the AB and a rotation plan will be determined by the HC in consultation with the HCT. The AB will meet at least two times a year. The HC may call for ad-hoc meetings if required.

#### 4.3 OCHA Head of Office (HoO)

16. The HoO is responsible for the effective management of the Fund in accordance to CBPF Policy Instruction and the Handbook. The responsibilities of the HoO with respect to the *oPt HF* are to:
- i. Support and advise the HC on strategic issues and resource mobilization;
  - ii. Supervise the OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) and ensure that the HFU is well integrated and coordinated with other units of the OCHA Country Office and sub-offices;
  - iii. Ensure that OCHA has the capacity to fulfil its accountability requirements, including risk management and minimum operational modalities;
  - iv. Promote active involvement of existing coordination structures in *oPt HF* processes and ensure that the Fund scope and objectives as outlined in the Operational Manual and/or allocation papers are aligned with the HRP;
  - v. Approve project no-cost extensions within the scope of the delegation of authority granted by the HC;
  - vi. Interface with headquarters on policy issues related to the *oPt HF*;
  - vii. Act as a permanent member of the AB.

#### 4.4 OCHA headquarters

17. Relevant units at OCHA headquarters have the following functions:
- i. Carry out and support active resource mobilization;
  - ii. Receive, administer and manage contributions from donors;
  - iii. Disburse funds to partners in accordance with the decisions of the HC;
  - iv. Provide periodic financial reports on the *oPt HF* to the HC, contributing donors and the *oPt HF* AB;
  - v. Provide the HC and the *oPt HF* AB with funding updates of donor commitments and disbursements transferred to partners, as well as other financial information related to the *oPt HF*;
  - vi. Provide policy and guidance to ensure the Fund is in line with OCHA's global guidelines.

#### 4.5 OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU)

18. The HFU under the overall supervision of the OCHA Head of Office will ensure adequate and efficient management of the *oPt HF*.

19. In support of the HC and *oPt HF* AB , and with the assistance of relevant units at OCHA headquarters, the HFU will undertake the following tasks:

*Management of oPt HF operations and policy advice to the HC:*

- i. Advise the HC and OCHA HoO on fund strategies and any other policy matters related to *oPt HF*;
- ii. Facilitate the development of the *oPt HF* scope and objectives and/or allocation strategy paper;
- iii. Ensure timely communication to partners on *oPt HF* standard allocation calendar of activities;
- iv. Engage with *oPt HF* donors and coordinate with other humanitarian donors in the country;
- v. Draft the resource mobilization strategy and support its implementation in coordination with headquarters resource mobilization efforts;
- vi. Support HC and HoO efforts to link the fund with the Humanitarian Programme Cycle (HPC) by promoting allocations in alignment with the HRPs;
- vii. Provide technical advice to the HC and *oPt HF* Advisory Board on the allocation process, project implementation and monitoring;
- viii. Support resource mobilization for the *oPt HF*;
- ix. Produce reports, analysis and other documents as necessary to support decision-making, coordination, communication and resource mobilization activities;
- x. Promote the complementary use of the *oPt HF* with funding from other sources, in particular the CERF;
- xi. Perform secretariat functions for the *oPt HF* Advisory Board;
- xii. Facilitate public information sharing with all stakeholders.

*Project Cycle Management:*

- i. Facilitate and train stakeholders on the use of the Grant Management System (GMS);
- ii. Ensure compliance with processes, systems, templates and tools as defined in the Handbook for CBPFs as well as *oPt HF* procedures;
- iii. Provide support to all *oPt HF* recipients throughout the allocation process and promote a feedback system for continuous learning;
- iv. Coordinate and facilitate all activities associated with the strategic review (project prioritization);
- v. Coordinate and facilitate all activities associated with the technical review, as a member of the Review Committees;
- vi. Oversee project review and approval processes including administrative aspects of selected projects;
- vii. Ensure follow up of fund disbursement and refunding;
- viii. Ensure narrative and financial reporting compliance;
- ix. Manage project revision requests (e.g. follow-up and support on budget revision, reprogramming, no-cost extensions, etc.);
- x. Provide oversight to the entire funding cycle from the opening of an allocation to closure of projects;
- xi. Ensure Financial Tracking Service (FTS) reporting as required.

*Implementation of the oPt HF Accountability Framework:*

- i. Support and advise the HC and OCHA HoO in the development and implementation of the Accountability Framework;
- ii. Coordinate and develop systems for capacity and performance assessments, risk management, monitoring, and reporting on behalf of the HC;
- iii. Ensure compliance with the minimum requirements described in the operational modalities of the Handbook;
- iv. Ensure compliance with audit requirements and follow up recommendations stemming from audits and monitoring findings;
- v. Facilitate periodic external evaluations in line with the global agreements on evaluation requirements for CBPFs;

- vi. Compile the consolidated annual report of *oPt HF* operations.

#### 4.6 Cluster Coordinators and Co-coordinators

- 20. Each cluster in the process of *oPt HF* will be coordinated by representatives from a cluster lead UN agency if applicable.
- 21. Cluster coordinators support *oPt HF* at two levels: (i) at a *strategic level*, cluster leads should ensure that there are linkages between the fund, the HRP and cluster strategies, by providing inputs to the HFU to inform Allocation Papers; and (ii) at an *operational level*, cluster coordinators should provide technical expertise to the process of project prioritization and to the technical review of projects.
- 22. The Cluster coordinator will undertake the following activities in relation to the *oPt HF*:
  - i. Facilitate all *oPt HF* related processes in consultation with cluster partners;
  - ii. Establish needs-based priorities for *oPt HF* funding in consultation with cluster partners;
  - iii. Ensure cross-cluster coordination and information sharing;
  - iv. Lead a process to transparently identify, review and recommend priority humanitarian projects for funding based on agreed overall cluster priorities and strategies and document these processes;
  - v. Defend cluster strategies and proposal during *oPt HF* allocation rounds;
  - vi. Ensure quality and timely submissions of all related cluster materials;
  - vii. Promote the systematic use of relevant standard indicators for projects;
  - viii. Participate in field monitoring visits to support technical assessment of implemented projects according to the provisions of the accountability framework endorsed by the HC;
  - ix. Review and recommend revision requests when technical or strategic input is required;
  - x. Train and build capacity of cluster partners (national and international) on *CoPt HF* procedures.

#### 4.7 Review Committees (Strategic and Technical)

- 23. *oPt HF* allocations include two types of project review: 1) a *strategic review* of project proposals in relation to the Allocation Paper determined by the HC and the Advisory Board, and 2) a *technical review (in each cluster)* which assesses the technical soundness and quality of project proposals. Both reviews are discharged by respective review committees operating separately by cluster. The committees are composed of cluster coordinators, representatives of the INGO and NNGO forums (AIDA and PNGO), OCHA and representatives of UN agencies.
- 24. Key elements of review committees include:
  - i. Review committees should be established through a consultative process with a limited number of cluster members. The review committees should, to the extent possible, have different compositions for each of their functions.
  - ii. When delivering the strategic function, the respective review committee should equitably represent the members of the cluster and be knowledgeable of humanitarian operations. The strategic review committee assesses projects based on a criteria determined at the time of allocation development (scorecards).
  - iii. When delivering the technical function, the respective review committee should be composed of a small group of technical experts to review project proposals. The technical review committee provides in-depth technical comments to strengthen the proposal.
  - iv. Members of the review committee involved in the technical review should be selected based on demonstrated technical knowledge of the specific sector/cluster. A small group of experts will allow for detailed deliberation on technical aspects of project proposals. Specialized advisors should provide support and inputs to the technical review process.



- v. Members of the respective review committees should be nominated from the active members of the relevant sectors/clusters. The committees should ensure an equitable representation of UN and NGOs. OCHA will support review committees in discharging their functions.

#### 4.8 Implementing partners

25. In relation to the *oPt HF*, implementing partners have the following responsibilities:
  - i. **Application:** Implementing partners must familiarize themselves with *oPt HF* processes and seek advice from the OCHA Country Office (i.e. HFU) before applying for funding. In close collaboration with the OCHA Country Office and clusters, the applicant partner develops and submits a project proposal and budget to the Fund (through the GMS) providing all necessary supporting documents, within the given deadlines, and in a responsive manner.
  - ii. **Implementation:** After the approval process, the implementing partner signs a grant agreement which specifies the terms and conditions applicable to the approved project. Implementing partners commit to comply with all the requirements defined in the grant agreement. Grant agreements may be modified to accommodate necessary changes in projects (see section 6 for details on revision requests).
  - iii. **Monitoring:** Implementing partners must have robust internal monitoring and reporting procedures in place. Implementing partners shall facilitate the monitoring of the projects in collaboration with the OCHA Country Office, cluster coordinators and other relevant parties. The OCHA Country Office and headquarters reserve the right to organize visits with partners, external experts or donors to review completed or on-going project activities.
  - iv. **Reporting:** The partner shall provide narrative and financial reports in line with the reporting requirements stipulated in the grant agreement or otherwise agreed in the accountability framework of the fund. In addition, any constraints (e.g. financial, logistical, security) that may lead to significant changes to the project must be communicated to the HC and/or OCHA immediately.

## 5. Allocation criteria, parameters and modalities

### 5.1 Eligibility

26. Donor contributions to the *oPt HF* will be utilized to fund projects carried out by:
  - UN Organizations (UNOs) "***including the International Organization for Migration (IOM)***"
  - National and international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and organizations of the Red Cross/Red Crescent movement ***registered with the government of the state of Palestine and / or Israel.***

#### UN eligibility:

27. In order to become eligible for funding from the *oPt HF*, UN agencies must fill out the Registration Form on the Grants Management System of the Fund (<http://cbpf.unocha.org>). UN agencies are required to provide name and contact information for the focal point(s) and the legal representative of the organization, address of main office, and bank information.
28. Once the registration and due diligence form (as applicable for UN agencies) duly filled out has been submitted, OCHA will proceed with its review and approval.

#### NGO eligibility:

29. OCHA will carry out a due diligence process and an assessment of the capacity of potential NGO implementing partners. Partners that meet all the due diligence requirements will undergo the capacity assessment to determine eligibility. The assessment is aimed at determining whether the NGO has a sufficient level of capacity in terms of institutional, managerial, financial and technical expertise. This

analysis establishes eligibility to receive funding from the *oPt HF*. The methodology of this process is outlined in this Manual (chapter on Accountability Framework).

## 5.2 Allocation criteria

30. The review and approval of project proposals is made in accordance with the programmatic framework and focus described above and on the basis of the following criteria:
  - i. Partner eligibility and capacity: verified through a due diligence and capacity assessment process;
  - ii. Access: accessibility and/or physical presence in areas of operation; the location of the project is clearly identified;
  - iii. Strategic relevance: clear linkage to HRP strategic and sectoral objectives, compliance with the terms of the call for proposals as described in the allocation paper, and alignment of activities with areas of special focus of the Fund;
  - iv. Needs-based: the needs are explained and documented, and beneficiaries are clearly described;
  - v. Appropriateness: the activities are adequate to respond to the identified needs;
  - vi. Technical soundness and cost effectiveness: the proposal meets technical requirements to implement the planned activities; the budget is fair, proportionate in relation to the context, and adequate to achieve the stated objectives;
  - vii. Risk management: assumptions and risks are comprehensively and clearly spelled out, along with risk management strategies;
  - viii. Monitoring: a realistic monitoring and reporting strategy is developed in the proposal.
  - ix. Time criticality: In accordance with the cluster/ sector strategies, the allocations will prioritize time sensitive activities, i.e. activities that are most urgent in nature and require immediate response that cannot be postponed.
  - x. Priority in the HRP: Top priority projects in the HRP will be given precedence for funding by the *oPt HF* over normal priority ones unless solid evidence-based justification is provided by the cluster/ sector to explain how a normal priority project has shifted ranking in the HRP and should be prioritized by the *oPt HF*.
  - xi. Complementarity with other funding: Proposal recommending activities that have received funding from other sources should be weighted more favorably than activities that have no other funding, unless justified by the cluster/ sector with solid needs analysis. Cluster/ sector partners will be requested to provide most up to date funding update on FTS.
  - xii. Gender mainstreaming: Projects with gender code of 2 in the HRP should be weighted more favourably in the vetting process.
  - xiii. Value for Money: Projects that can demonstrate the most 'value for money' (e.g. maximum outcome and beneficiary reach for each dollar invested and effectiveness of the intervention) relative to the project budget should be prioritized.
  - xiv. Within its overall objectives and priorities, the fund will support NGOs as a key element in making the cluster system more effective through effective partnerships. The fund will base its partnership with National NGOs on equality, transparency, a result-oriented approach, responsibility and complementarity

## 5.3 Allocation parameters

31. *oPt HF* allocation parameters are defined based on the Operational Handbook for CBPFs and are as follows:
  - i. Project duration: maximum 12 months;
  - ii. Grant amount: the maximum allowable amount will be determined and disbursed in tranches on the basis of project duration, partner capacity and risk levels, and in line with OCHA's global guidelines for CBPFs (see annex 1);
  - iii. The total budget for ongoing projects for the same partner should not exceed USD 1 million.

- iv. Implementing partners can request project revisions and/or no-cost extension to re-program and/or extend the duration of the grant.

#### 5.4 Allocation Types

- The *oPt HF* will have two options in terms of fund allocation modalities. A standard allocation will be issued on a periodic basis at the discretion of the HC and linked to the priorities of the HRP. US\$ 2 million will be kept as reserve to respond to unforeseen emergencies until the 3rd quarter of the year, after that the reserve can be reduced to US\$1 million by the end of the year.
- In order that fund make a significant impact, the fund will work to reach an appropriate scale equivalent to 15 per cent of the funding requirements of humanitarian response plans (HRP).

##### 5.4.1 Standard allocation strategy and workflow

32. At the centre of the standard allocation is a strategy developed based on the agreed priorities of the HRP. The HC, supported by the HFU, should utilize existing coordination mechanisms to establish a process that produces credible and unbiased information to develop the strategy. The analysis that supports the development of the strategy should be evidence-based and with references to verifiable data. This process results in an allocation paper which summarizes the analysis, strategy and intent of the standard allocation. The priorities of the allocation strategy paper should be as precise as possible to allow for effective prioritization by clusters. Efforts should be made to seek complementarity with existing funding channels.
33. The HC, in consultation with the AB, is responsible for launching standard allocations on a periodic basis, according to needs and to the availability of sufficient funding to safeguard the reserve allocation modality, .
34. The standard allocation will be announced through an allocation paper issued by the HC in consultation with the Advisory Board. OCHA will facilitate the drafting of the allocation paper, seeking inputs from the inter-sector working group as required. The allocation strategy paper includes information on:
  - Humanitarian context , showing how the priorities for the allocation have been chosen; and cluster performance in terms of funding
  - Allocation strategy and related priorities;
  - Total amount to be allocated by Cluster/theme;
  - Criteria for project prioritization which will be assessed for during the strategic and technical reviews.
  - Allocation Timeline from release of Allocation Paper to Disbursement.
35. The development of the allocation strategy paper is supported by OCHA through the HFU. The draft will be shared with the clusters and Inter-Cluster Coordination for inputs, and presented to the HC and AB for approval.
36. Steps of the standard allocation process include:
  - i. Submission of projects;
  - ii. Strategic review and recommendation of projects pre-selected in each cluster envelope;
  - iii. HC preliminary endorsement and AB consultation;
  - iv. Technical and financial review;
  - v. Final approval by HC;
  - vi. Preparation of Grant Agreements and disbursement.
37. The following table provides a snapshot of the workflow for the standard allocation. There are two types of project review: a strategic review of project proposals to ensure alignment with HF priorities and a technical review to determine the soundness and quality of proposals. The strategic and technical reviews will be

discharged by respective Review Committees operating separately by cluster. Review Committees should be established through a consultative process with a limited number of cluster members.

**Table 1: Standard allocation workflow (with indicative number of days)**

<b>Step 1</b> Submission of proposal (18 days)	1.1 Development and launch of Allocation Strategy	* Clusters * OCHA * HC * AB	-
	1.2 Submission of full project proposal	* Implementing partner	
	1.3 General check by HFU (eligibility of partner in case of suspension, compliance with template, duplication of proposal, etc.)	* HFU	2 working days
<b>Step 2</b> Strategic review (8 days)	2.1 Review Committees/Sector Core Groups use Scorecards for projects in their respective clusters/sectors. Review Board (RB) finalizes shortlist for recommendation to the HC.	* Review Committees/Sector Core Groups * HFU * CCs * RB	8 working days (3-4 working days for sectors, 3-4 working days for RB)
	2.2 Review Committees/Sector Core Groups use Scorecards for projects in their respective clusters/sectors. Review Board (RB) finalizes shortlist for recommendation to the HC.		
<b>Step 3</b> HC preliminary approval and AB consultation (3 days)	3.1 Projects shortlisted are submitted to the HC for approval (this step can happen together with the step below - 3.2 - as part of a meeting)	* HC * HFU	2 working days
	3.2 Projects approved by HC are shared with AB for consultation (whilst simultaneously pushed forward for technical review or development of full proposal by partner). AB has 1 working day to object/comment	* AB * HFU	1 working day
<b>Step 4</b> Technical and financial review (10 days)	4.1 Financial and technical review	* OCHA (HFU and FCS Finance Unit) * Review Committees/Sector Core Group * Gender Advisor	10 working days
	4.2 Consolidation of financial and technical comments and submission to partner	* HFU	
	4.3 Revision of proposal - max 3 times	* IPs	
<b>Step 5</b> Final approval by HC (7 days)	5.1 HFU prepares draft Grant Agreement and decides start date in consultation with partner, and consequent reporting timeline	* HFU	1 working day
	5.2 HC approves project and signs Grant Agreement; approved projects are shared with the AB for information	* HC	2 working days

	<b>5.3</b> Grant Agreement is shared with IP for counter-signature (date marks start of eligibility, and earliest possible date for start of project implementation)	* IPs	2 working days
	<b>5.4</b> Grant Agreement is signed by OCHA EO	* OCHA FCS Finance Unit * OCHA ASB	2 working days
<b>Step 6</b> Disbursement (10 days)	<b>6.1</b> Following OCHA EO signature, first tranche of funding is disbursed to the partner	* OCHA FCS Finance Unit	10 working days

#### 5.4.2 Reserve allocation strategy and workflow

38. The realigned HF will enable the HC to more effectively target the most critical humanitarian needs and funding gaps in the humanitarian response. The allocation strategy will only take effect when the oPt HF exceeds the reserve in at least 2 million, then reserve allocation modality would be activated.
39. The reserve allocation is intended for rapid and flexible allocation of funds in the event of unforeseen circumstances, emergencies, or contextually relevant needs. The reserve will be used to provide an immediate response in areas not within the HRP as well as regions not prioritised in the standard allocation where need has been demonstrated. Reserve allocations are designed to be quicker than the standard allocation process. Proposals can be accepted either on a rolling basis, and are considered on a first-come-first-served basis, or based on the decision of the HC to trigger a reserve allocation. The necessity and size of the reserve allocation will be decided by the Advisory Board.
40. Steps of the reserve allocation process:
- Submission of projects and review of strategic relevance;
  - Technical and financial review;
  - Endorsement and final approval by HC;
  - Disbursement.

**Table 2: Reserve allocation workflow (with indicative number of days)**

<b>Step 1</b> Submission of proposal (4 working days)	<b>1.1</b> Submission of proposal	* Implementing partner	
	<b>1.2</b> General check by HFU (eligibility of partner in case of suspension, compliance with template, duplication of proposal, etc.)	* HFU	1 working day
	<b>1.3</b> Review of strategic relevance using simple scorecard	* HFU * Review Board	2 working days
	<b>1.4</b> Submission for technical review	* HFU	1 working day

<b>Step 2</b> Technical and financial review (Up to 8 working days)	2.1 Financial and technical review	* OCHA (HFU and FCS Finance Unit) * Review Committees/Sector Core Group * Gender Advisor	8 working days
	2.2 Consolidation of financial and technical comments and submission to partner	* HFU	
	2.3 Revision of proposal - max 3 times	* IPs	
<b>Step 3</b> Final approval by HC (up to 8 working days)	3.1 HC approves project	* HC	2 working days
	3.2 Project approved by HC is shared with AB for information; AB has 1 working day to comment, if needed	* HFU	1 working day
	3.3 HFU prepares draft Grant Agreement and decides start date in consultation with partner, and consequent reporting timeline	* HFU	In parallel with above
	3.4 HC signs Grant Agreement	* HC	1 working day
	3.5 Grant Agreement is shared with IP for counter-signature (date marks start of eligibility, and earliest possible date for start of project implementation)	* IP	2 working days
	3.6 Grant Agreement is signed by OCHA Executive Office	* OCHA FCS Finance Unit * OCHA ASB	2 working days
<b>Step 4</b> Disbursement (10 working days)	4.1 Following OCHA EO signature, first tranche of funding is disbursed to the partner	* OCHA FCS Finance Unit	10 working days

### 5.5 Start date and eligibility of expenditure

41. The HFU will liaise with the implementing partner to determine the start date of the project. The earliest possible start date of the project is the date of signature of the grant agreement by the partner. The agreed upon start date will be included in the grant agreement. If the signature of the grant agreement occurs after the agreed upon start date, the date of the signature of the grant agreement takes precedence. The HC can then sign the grant agreement.
42. Upon signature by the HC, the HFU notifies the partner that the project has been approved, and sends the agreement for counter signature. Once the partner has countersigned, the agreement will be sent to OCHA in New York for the final signature. Eligibility of expenditures will be determined by the date of implementing partner's signature of the grant agreement (this process will be done through GMS).

## 5 Revision request

43. Significant deviations from the original project objectives, including changes in the geographic location of the project, the target population, or the scope of project activities will be assessed on case-by-case basis. Variations of all forms must be brought to the fund manager's attention with clear and strong justification. Revision requests need to be supported by cluster coordinators and approved by the HC.
44. No-Cost Extension (NCE) requests will be considered on a case-by-case basis, depending on the reasons justifying the request. NCE requests can be approved by Head of OCHA if delegated by the HC.
45. Implementing partners are authorized to make budget variations not exceeding fifteen (15) per cent on budget categories of the approved project budget. However any cost increase to the "Staff and other Personnel Costs" category should be approved in writing by OCHA. Any variations exceeding 15 per cent on any one budget category shall be subject to prior consultations with OCHA and approval by the HC
46. Under no circumstances should budget revisions increase the total budget originally approved by the HC.
47. Revision requests are submitted and processed through the GMS.

## 6 Additional information

48. Periodic updates and annual report: To ensure continuous and sufficient information sharing to stakeholders, OCHA will generate periodic dashboards and one annual report on the achievements, challenges and funding trends of the oPt HF, which will be available on oPt HF's website. These reports will not disclose information that may put implementing partners or affected population at risk.
49. Complaint mechanism: The following email address, [HFoptcomplaint@ochaopt.org](mailto:HFoptcomplaint@ochaopt.org), is available to receive feedback from stakeholders who believe they have been treated incorrectly or unfairly during any of the opt HF processes. OCHA will compile, review, address and (if necessary) raise the issues to the HC, who will then take a decision on necessary action. Please send any complaints to [HFoptcomplaint@ochaopt.org](mailto:HFoptcomplaint@ochaopt.org) with the subject line "oPt HF COMPLAINT".
50. Relevant OCHA policies and guidelines on CPBFs can be found at <http://www.unocha.org/what-we-do/humanitarian-financing/cbpf-global-guidelines> and <http://www.ochaopt.org/erf.aspx>

### Contacts:

#### Head of Office:

David Carden  
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs  
occupied Palestinian territory  
Landline: 972 (0) 25829962  
Mobile: 972 (0) 543311801  
Email: [carden@un.org](mailto:carden@un.org)



## Humanitarian Fund Manager:

Saad Abdel-Haq  
 Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs  
 occupied Palestinian territory  
 Landline: +972 (0)599 418 342  
 Mobile: +972 (0)54 33 11 815  
 Email: [abdel-haq@un.org](mailto:abdel-haq@un.org)

## 7 Accountability framework

Accountability of the *oPt HF* is articulated on two levels: first, the ability of the Fund to achieve its objectives as a humanitarian financing mechanism. The HC is responsible for establishing a process which produces high quality allocation strategies, selects appropriate and qualified implementing partners, monitors implementation and verifies that reported results are genuine and match those of approved project agreements. This is captured in a logical framework of the application template that enables the HC to assess the results of the *oPt HF* in the short, medium and long term.

Secondly, accountability relates to the ability of individual implementing partners to achieve expected project outputs and outcomes. Implementing partners are ultimately responsible for project activities, project outputs and for reporting accurately on results.

The Accountability Framework aims to provide an overview of the four pillars of accountability under the *oPt HF*; including risk management, capacity and performance assessment of implementing partners, monitoring and reporting, and project auditing. The Framework defines how and when partners will be assessed and selected as *oPt HF* partners, what will be monitored and reported on, how and when audits will be carried out, who is responsible for each pillar of accountability, what key actions will be taken, and what resources are necessary for ensuring overall accountability.



To this end, OCHA prepares an Accountability Framework consisting of four pillars that enables the HC to ensure that implementing partners are delivering intended programmatic results; the *oPt HF* is managed responsibly and according to established guidelines; and ultimately that the *oPt HF* is achieving its main objectives. The pillars include:

- i. Fund level risk management
- ii. Partner capacity and performance assessment
- iii. Monitoring and Reporting (financial and programmatic)
- iv. Audits

Accountability is the foundation for effective CBPF management. It is exercised through a set of different components that enable the HC, mandated by the ERC, to ensure that: (i) implementing partners are delivering intended programmatic results; (ii) the CBPF is managed responsibly and according to established guidelines; and ultimately (iii) the CBPF is achieving its main objectives.

### i. Fund level risk management

At the fund level, an analysis of the risks that might prevent the *oPt HF* from achieving its objectives has been carried out, in consultation with key stakeholders. Identified risks have been analysed and categorized in terms of severity according to relative likelihood and potential impact on fund objectives. Mitigation strategies have been



designed, and assigned to specific stakeholders. This analysis represents a management tool which enables the HC, supported by the AB, to ensure strategic decision making and guarantee that the oPt HF remains relevant in the context in which it is operating. The framework consolidates all activities and functions that mitigate key risks under one umbrella, and spells out the residual risks to enable informed decision-making based on an understanding of potential consequences. Identified risks and associated mitigation strategies will be regularly reviewed and monitored by the HC in consultation with the AB.

**Table 3. Risk analysis and mitigation matrix**

Risk (From most to least critical)	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigation strategy	Timeframe	Risk owners	Cost of mitigation (US\$)
<p><b>1. Risk category Political</b> As result of the Israeli policies Operational risks associated to Israeli policies</p> <p><i>Risk drivers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Palestinians are not allowed to develop 60% of the West Bank, in particular no building is permitted in these areas. Accumulated impact of the blockade and the access restriction in Gaza.</li> <li>• Heavy militarized operational context in Gaza</li> <li>• Israel government measures against UN agencies</li> </ul>						
1. Risk 1 The confiscation of trucks and cargo or the demolition of assistance	4	2	<b>Reduce Risk – Establish appropriate risk management mechanisms to reduce the likelihood and impact on achieving oPt HF objectives. IPs and suppliers coordinate to arrange a delivery time when risk of obstructed movement or harassment at its lowest</b>	Ongoing	oPt HF IPs	TBC
2. Risk 2 Settler violence	3	2	<b>Accept Risk-</b> As part of the HCT Policy and Operational Framework for Addressing Impediments to Humanitarian Action in Area C the following will be implemented a. <b>Monitoring and reporting</b>	Ongoing	OCHA ACU HC HF Donors IPs associates ns HCT LTF	TBC

			<b>b. Coordination with Israeli authorities (military and civilian)</b> <b>c. Public and Private Advocacy</b> <b>d. Material response</b> <b>e. Legal aid</b> <b>f. Alternative programming modalities</b> ( <i>use of high OR low visibility and other strategies, in close consultation with communities. Such measures should be considered temporary mitigation measures, rather a sustainable longer-term strategy</i> )			
<b>Risk 3 Demolition of delivered assistant confiscation of aid</b>	4	2	<b>Same as above</b>	Ongoing	Same as above	TBC
<b>Risk 4 Arrest of humanitarian workers while delivering relief items.</b>	3	2	<b>Same as above</b>	Ongoing	Same as above	TBC
<b>Risk 5 Violence between Israeli army and militants in and around Gaza strip</b>	3	2	<b>Accept Risk –</b> If access is granted, clusters lead to work with NGOs to update the needs and redirect the assistance to the most argent needs.	Immediately	· Cluster coordinat ors · IPS	TBC
<b>2. Risk category Hazard risks Natural , political instability, armed conflict</b> <b>Risk drivers:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Storm / winter</li> </ul>						
<b>Risk 6 Winter storm , snow , floods</b>	3	2	<b>Accept Risk</b> clusters lead to work with NGOs to update the needs and redirect the assistance to the	Immediately	Cluster coordinat ors · NGOs	TBC

			most argent needs.			
<b>3. Risk Category strategic Hazards :Strategic relevance of the HF</b> <i>Risk drivers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Lack of access to international humanitarian funding</b></li> <li>• <b>Donors fatigue</b></li> </ul>						
<i>Risk 7 Programmatic inertia ( funding fuel and water scarcity projects every year)</i>	4	2	<b>Reduce Risk –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Make sure that NGOs with the help of cluster coordinators develop a robust exit strategy for each funded project.</li> <li>· Link HF funded project with cluster response</li> </ul>	Immediately	IPS · Cluster coordinators · HC	TBC
<i>Risk 8 Not reaching the funding target</i>	4	2	<b>Accept Risk:</b> Develop a three years plan for the fund with a clear ToR and objectives based on available data from HNO, CHAP, NAF ect..	Jan –Dec 2017	HF · AB	TBC
<i>Risk 9 access restrictions and mobility within the oPt (Gaza Strip , East Jerusalem, areas near the settlements, areas behind the barrier)</i>	5	2	<b>Reduce Risk –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· <b>HFU</b> management structure allows for considerable remote management and good communication technology to link up.</li> <li>· OCHA field staff with permits takes on responsibilities for monitoring HF projects.</li> </ul>	Ongoing	HF AB OCHA field units	TBC
<b>4. Risk Category strategic: Governance of management of the fund Adherence to political and decisions, internal controls and oversight.</b> <i>Risk drivers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Fatigue of NGOs / UN participating in the review board</b></li> </ul>						
<i>Risk 10 Weak participation of the</i>	3	2	<b>Reduce Risk –</b>	Each year	RB · HC	TBC

funds governing bodies (AB, Clusters, pool of experts)			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· HF to rotate the review board members on regular basis</li> <li>· Provide more clarity to the review board terms of reference and their added value</li> </ul>		·HF	
<b>5. Risk Category strategic : Internal Derived from access limitations imposed on OCHA staff</b> <i>Risk drivers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Israel Difficult relations between UN and the GoI</b></li> </ul>						
<i>Risk</i> Insufficient monitoring of projects in Gaza strip and areas behind the barrier due to lack of permits for WB ID holders	4	2	<b>Reduce Risk –</b> Delegate monitoring responsibility to OCHA field units and cluster coordinators	Continue from previous years	Field Coordination unit	TBC
<b>6. Risk Category strategic: partnership The hosting country is not favouring the work of OCHA in the occupied territory. coordination among partners</b> <i>Risk drivers:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Israeli policies</b></li> </ul>						
<i>Risk 12</i> Difficult working relationship with hosting country	4	4	<b>Reduce Risk –</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Increase advocacy to the host country as to the negative impact of restricting the delivery of humanitarian assistant.</li> <li>· Remind the host country to their obligations under international law to facilitate the delivery of aid.</li> </ul>	Ongoing	HF AB OCHA	TBC
<i>Risk 13</i> lack of coordination from partners and duplication in assistance.	2	2	<b>Accept Risk –</b> Holding meetings with the partners to explain the importance of cooperation and overcome the encountered problems. Establishing trustful relations with	When needed	IPS HF	TBC

			partners and diversify activates with deferent partners			
<b>Risk 14: lack of cooperation from the end beneficiaries.</b>	1	2	<b>Accept Risk</b> – Intensifying the awareness activities to promote the beneficiaries awareness towards the importance of humanitarian assistance	When needed	IPs	TBC

## ii. Partner capacity and performance assessment

At the partner level, the *oPt HF* has devised a context-appropriate approach to assess the capacity of each NGO implementing partner that wants to be eligible for funding. The assessment aims at determining whether the NGO has a sufficient level of capacity in terms of institutional, managerial, financial and technical expertise. The HC, in consultation with the AB, has determined the threshold for eligibility. Eligible NGOs are categorized according to a specific risk rating which determines the minimum standard of operational modalities applicable to the partner. The principle is that the higher the risk the more stringent assurance mechanisms will apply. The system encourages improvements in capacity as partners can migrate to lower risk levels through good performance and by addressing capacity weaknesses. The score bands of each risk level (high, medium, low) are determined by the HC in consultation with the AB.

The process of determining partner eligibility is comprised of two steps:

### 1. Registration and Due Diligence

Prospective implementing partners are required to undergo a process of registration and due diligence on the Grants Management System.

As part of this process, NGO partners are asked to: (i) fill out the due diligence and registration form online, (ii) submit five signed and dated due diligence declarations, (iii) a bank statement (or a letter signed by the bank holding an account)<sup>1</sup>, and (iv) identification documents (copy of passport or Identity Card) and curriculum vitae (CV) of the legal representative of the organization.

UN agencies are only required to fill out three sections of the registration form online: contact details of the focal person; contact details of the legal representative (Country Representative); and bank information. All other requirements do not apply.

### 2. Capacity assessment

Partners that meet all the due diligence requirements will undergo a process of capacity assessment. They will be required to submit documents listed in Annex 2, and the OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit, with support from Cluster Coordinators and members, will assess their capacity based on the following areas:

- Governance and institutional capacity.

<sup>1</sup> Name of the organization and the name of the Account Holder must be exactly the same.

- Technical and response capacity.
- Funding capacity.
- Coordination and partnership capacity.
- Financial management capacity.
- Monitoring capacity.

Based upon these categories, partners' capacity will be scored. It has been decided by the HC that organizations that score less than 30% will be deemed ineligible. The OCHA HFU will provide feedback to ineligible organizations on the areas for improvement. Ineligible organizations can re-apply for capacity assessment after six months of the date of rejection.

### 3. Performance management

Partner capacity assessments reflect the capacity of a partner at one particular point in time. The capacity of an organization develops over time, as does the risk that the organization poses to OCHA.HFU will update the assessment of partner's capacity over time. HFU analyzes partner performance throughout project implementation and will track and score partner's performance in relation to the following areas:

- Quality and timeliness of submissions of project documents (proposals, budget and concept notes);
- Quality and timeliness of implementation against approved targets;
- Quality and timeliness of reporting;
- Frequency, timeliness and justification of project revision requests;
- Quality of financial management;
- Audit findings; (see Annex 7 of the Operational Handbook for CBPFs, Performance management tool).

Once a grant is received from *oPt HF*, HFU will start review and analyse the partners' performance throughout project implementation. The scores assigned to the partner in each of these factors will be summarized in a Partner Performance Index (PI). The average on the PI for each of the projects implemented during the year will give the annual partner's PI. The PI will impact on the risk level determined through the initial capacity assessment, and result in an improvement or deterioration of the risk level. The PI will also be applicable for UN agency implemented projects.

#### iii. Risk-based management and Operational Modalities

The risk rating of NGO implementing partners has a direct impact on how *oPt HF* grant is managed and how accountability is exercised in practice through the risk rating of implementing partners. In total, the assurance mechanisms that are used to manage grants vary depending on four factors:

1. Type of implementing partner (i.e. UN agency, NGO).
2. Partner risk level (in the case of NGOs).
3. Value of the project.
4. Duration of the project.

These variations define the "operational modalities" applied by HFU as minimum standard to HFs, and consist of adjusting the following elements for projects implemented by NGOs:

- Disbursement policy (i.e. number and percentage of disbursements).
- Funding ceiling.
- Field monitoring visits.
- Financial spot checks.

- Narrative reporting requirements.
- Financial reporting requirements.
- Partner audit

In the case of projects implemented by NGOs, the operational modalities illustrated in Annex 1 – Operational Modalities for the oPt HF - will be used.

Through the aforementioned accountability mechanisms, the HC will aim to safeguard programmatic and financial management of CBPFs. Compliance measures as annexed in the operational Handbook enables the HC to address noncompliance with the legal terms agreed between the fund and the recipient organization, especially related to the following types of situations:

- Overdue financial or narrative reports;
- Non refund of unspent funds;
- Critical (high risk) audit findings/qualified audit opinion (especially on lack of critical internal controls, serious weaknesses in internal controls, lack of bank reconciliation; lack of double-entry accounting system; lack of supporting documents);
- Critical findings from monitoring and financial spot checks;
- Violation of humanitarian principles and code of conduct;
- Indication of possible fraud, corruption or misuse of funds.

When a partner does not comply with the requirements described in this handbook and reflected in the contractual agreement or violates any other obligations stemming from the contractual agreement OCHA will progressively take corrective actions commonly referred to as compliance measures.

The general principle underpinning the application of compliance measures is that whenever a partner does not comply with requirements stemming from the accountability framework described above or relevant contractual agreement, the HC, through OCHA, will take progressive actions to address partners' behavior. Amicable solutions will be pursued to the extent possible.

#### **iv. Monitoring and Reporting (financial and programmatic)**

Implementing partners to *oPt HF* are expected to have adequate internal mechanisms for project management, reporting and monitoring. The capacity of each organization will be verified during the capacity assessment, during the project approval process and finally during the monitoring and reporting phase. Project performance information is effectively generated through internal mechanisms developed by implementing partners. CBPFs require reporting so as to ensure that activities carried out are on track to reach proposed project objectives. To the extent possible, UN agencies, IOM and NGOs are treated equally in relation to their reporting requirements.

The role of *oPt HF* management is to collect, organize and provide quality control of the information that has been generated through these mechanisms. The *oPt HF* will design context-appropriate monitoring methodologies and apply them based on the Operational Modalities. The HC will be responsible for ensuring that a representative sample of projects funded under a *oPt HF* are effectively monitored through appropriate monitoring modalities. The HFU is further responsible for coordinating monitoring efforts and ensuring that monitoring of projects is carried out.

*The monitoring methodology adopted in the context of the oPt HF field site monitoring* directly carried out by OCHA HFU and supported by clusters and OHCA field coordination units.

Field monitoring visits will, collect information that:

- Makes an assessment of the timeliness of the overall project implementation;
- Verifies reported results;
- Assesses progress on key project activities.

As there are limitations to what can be observed through site visits, additional information will still need to be collected through other means. Like progress reports and financial spot checks might be carried out if necessary, the monitoring results will also feed into the *partner's Performance Index (PI)*

Reporting is required so as to ensure that activities carried out are on track to reach proposed project objectives. To the extent possible, UN agencies, IOM and NGOs are treated equally in relation to their reporting requirements. Narrative and financial reporting requirements for NGOs are determined according to the Operational Modalities described in the operational handbook (page 29). UN agencies will submit an interim financial statement to reflect expenditure incurred for project activities up to 31 December of each year by the 31 January of the following year. Interim financial statements will be submitted every calendar year until the submission of the final financial statement. Upon completion of the project a final financial statement covering the period between inception and completion of the project will be due no later than 30 June of the following year. Financial statements for UN agencies, IOM and NGOs are collected through the GMS.

UN agencies will submit a final narrative report within two months of completion of the project. If the duration of the project is between 7-12 months, UN agencies will also submit a progress narrative report to reflect achievements at midpoint of the project implementation. Narrative reports for UN agencies, including IOM and NGOs will be submitted through the Grant Management System (GMS) and will follow the templates available online.

## v. Audits

UN agencies including IOM are subject to internal oversight audit systems and other mechanisms established by their respective governing bodies. All NGOs partners receiving funds from oPt HF are subject to external audit by the fund. The external audit is an oversight mechanism and an essential component of the accountability framework. It enhances the transparency and sound financial management of resources allocated through CBPFs. External audits allow the HC to obtain evidence-based assurances on the use of funds transferred to NGOs. In particular, external audits help to mitigate financial risks; including misuse of resources and fraud; identify weaknesses in financial and operational management and recommend critical improvements; identify ineligible expenditures. External audit findings provide essential feedback to the partner and the system, promoting continuous improvement of NGO financial and operational management and performance, and enabling the HC to make better informed funding decisions.

HFU will maintain a Long-Term Agreement to audit all the projects implemented by NGOs.

### Annex 1 – Operational Modalities for the oPt HF

Risk level	Project duration (months)	Project value (thousand USD)	Maximum amount per project (thousand USD)	Disbursements (in % of total)	Financial reporting			Narrative reporting		Monitoring		Audit
					For disbursements	31 January	Final	Progress	Final	Field visit	Financial spot check	
H	Less than 7	< 250		60-40	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (1 mid)	Yes	1	1	As per plan
		> 250	500	50-50	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (1 mid)	Yes	1	1	
	Between 7-12	< 250		40-40-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes(2)	Yes	1	1	
		> 250	800	40-30-30	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (2-3*)	Yes	1-2**	1	
M	Less than 7	< 250		100	-	Yes	Yes	Yes (1 mid)	Yes	-	-	
		> 250	700	80-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes(1 mid)	Yes	1	-	
	Between 7-12	< 250		80-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (1 mid)	Yes	0-1**	-	
		> 250	1.200	60-40	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes(1 mid)	Yes	1	0-1	
L	Less than 7	< 400		100	-	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	
		> 400		80-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-	-	



Between 7-12	< 400		100	-	Yes	Yes	Yes (1 mid)	Yes	-	-
	> 400		80-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes (1 mid)	Yes	1	1 / partner

\* Three progress reports are only required for projects of 10 months or more.  
\*\* Additional field visits are only required for projects of 10 months or more.

## Annex 2

**List of documents, as required by the Pre-assessment questionnaire of CBPF Partner Capacity Assessment Tool:**
**1. Organizational information:**

- National registration documents
- Most recent bank statement or a letter signed and stamped by the bank holding an account that can receive US\$
- Governance documents: constitution, trust deed or equivalent document; list of members of Board of Trustees and/or Board of Directors with short bios; governance policies
- Organization's mission statement, strategic framework, and/or logical framework
- Biography or CV, and copy of Passport or Identity Card (1st page only) of NGO Director / person ultimately responsible within organisation (i.e. Secretary General or Executive Director for international NGOs)
- Organogram of the organization in the country (and of global management structure for international NGOs) showing positions and names of staff members
- List of staff members and positions (country-specific only)
- Annual reports for the last 3 years
- Annual statements for the last 3 financial years
- Annual workplans and budgets for the last 3 years (country-specific only)
- Reports from a) external audits of financial statements for the last 3 financial years, and b) external audits of projects completed in the last 12 months
- Reports from external and internal evaluations, reviews and studies undertaken in the last three years by the organization in the country
- List of previous and ongoing projects implemented in the country over the last 3 years with funding per project; reports from a sample of these projects
- List and contact details of previous and current donors for the last 3 years (country-specific only)
- List and contact details of previous and current implementing partners for the last 3 years, and projects implemented (country-specific only)

- Reference and/or letters of recommendation (from donors, partners, government, etc.)
- Membership certificates of coordination bodies in country

## 2. Policies and manuals:

- Procurement and logistics policy
- Human resource policy
- Finance and administration policy
- Programme planning policy
- Monitoring and evaluation policy
- Security, safety and access policy
- Child protection policy
- Gender, HIV/AIDS, and/or Environment policy
- Sub-granting policy (or equivalent documents describing systems for capacity assessment, proposal selection, financial and programmatic monitoring and reporting of Implementing Partners)
- Code of conduct (signed by an authorized official of the organization)

## 3. Due diligence declarations (please use templates provided by OCHA):

- Declaration of any Previous or Pending Legal Processes or Investigations (signed copy); in case of previous or pending legal processes, please provide detailed explanation and relevant supporting documentation
  - Declaration of Non-Support for a United Nations Designated Entity (signed copy)
  - Declaration of Recognition and Support of/for any United Nations Compliance Activity(ies) (signed copy)
  - Declaration of Conflict of Interest
  - Other (please specify)
- Gender policy.
  - Child protection policy.