

Contents

I. Overview/Background	2
II. Allocation Strategy	2
A. SHF Positioning 2016.....	3
B. Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)	3
C. Guiding principles and strategies	3
D. SHF Strategic Priorities for the first 2016 Allocation	5
E. Prioritization of projects.....	11
III. Timeline and Procedure	12
IV. Contacts	12
V. Complaints Mechanism	12
VI. Annexes	13
Annex 1: List of acronyms	13
Annex 2: List of eligible partners with risk levels.....	14
Annex 3: SRC scorecard	17
Annex 4: Indicative percentages on budget categories	19

I. Overview/Background

1. The purpose of this document is to outline the strategic objectives of the first standard allocation of the Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SHF) for 2016.¹ The paper summarizes the analysis, strategy and intent of the first allocation.
2. The prioritisation process started at the field level where priority activities and localities were discussed in several coordination structures across the country. The results were compiled and brought to the IASC sector coordinators for consultation with partners at Khartoum level. Afterwards, the SHF Technical Unit has compiled funding and funding intentions from different humanitarian and development donors and funding mechanisms in order to allow for complementarity and avoid overlap.
3. The following foreseen contributions contribute to this allocation

Donors	Amount in US\$	Amount in original currency
Carry-Over 2015	4,161,104	
Denmark	2,896,787	
UK (DFID)	9,312,321	£6,500,000
Ireland (Irish Aid)	3,278,689	€3,000,000
Netherlands	6,557,377	€6,000,000
Norway	5,794,414	NOK 50,000,000
Sweden (SIDA)	7,045,561	SEK 60,000,000
Switzerland	987,167	CHF 1,000,000
Total (approx)		
	40,033,420	
AA fee	358,723	1% of deposits
SHF OCHA dir cost	1,040,640	
Reserve for Em	7,726,811	20% of total available with \$1.65 in bank account
MA fee for this alloc	1,514,455	7% on NGO part ie 70% of total
Safety margin	-	10 % (\$3m) of Reserve for Em not available right away
Total available for alloc		
	29,392,790	

Given that several contributions are not confirmed and a currency risk exists, the proposition is to hold back 3 million USD, which is 10% of the envelope available for allocation, till all commitments have been confirmed.

4. Partners seeking funding from the SHF 2016 first round allocation must adhere to the guiding principles and strategic objectives outlined in this paper. Funding decisions will be made based on this. Proposals not in line with this paper will not be considered for funding.
5. The allocation strategy is a strategic document and does not include information on processes. Please refer to the [SHF Operational Manual](#) for process related issues on [HumanitarianResponse.info](#).

II. Allocation Strategy

¹ In 2016, the Sudan Common Humanitarian Fund (CHF) changed its name into Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SHF).

A. SHF Positioning 2016

The 2016 SHF positioning contains an overarching strategic positioning that guides all 2016 allocations.

B. Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP)

Under the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator, the SHF first standard allocation for 2016 is based on the 2015 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP), as agreed by the Humanitarian Country Team, as a temporary bridging solution until the 2016 HRP is finalised.

The four mutually-reinforcing strategic objectives developed to guide humanitarian actions in 2015 are as follows: 1) To provide emergency relief to people affected by conflict and disaster; 2) To provide humanitarian protection to affected populations; and 3) To reduce food insecurity and malnutrition [below emergency levels across Sudan]; and 4) To strengthen resilience and facilitate durable solutions for conflict-affected people, including voluntary return and integration. The above strategic objectives aim to: (i) ensure coherence with needs-assessment findings; (ii) emphasise cross-cutting issues, in particular humanitarian protection and resilience; (iii) enhance links between operational and strategic objectives; and (iv) facilitate multi-sector responses.

C. Guiding principles and strategies

1. Accountability to Affected Populations

The SHF is committed to ensuring that funded projects adhere to the highest possible quality standards, including the internationally accepted standards for accountability to affected populations embodied by the five IASC Commitments to Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP): (i) Leadership and Governance, (ii) Transparency and Information Sharing, (iii) Feedback and Complaints, (iv) Participation, (v) Design, Monitoring, and Evaluation.

As a funding mechanism primarily interacting with affected populations at the field level through implementing partners, the SHF ensures AAP by promoting funding to partners that actively deliver on AAP commitments throughout all phases of the programme cycle, while providing them with the guidance, incentive, and oversight to do so appropriately.

Consult the SHF 2016 Accountability to Affected Populations Framework and AAP Guidance sheet for more detail (see: [Sudan HF 2016 Accountability to Affected Populations Framework](#) and [Sudan HF 2016 Accountability to Affected Populations Guidance Sheet](#)) for more detail. The AAP framework developed by the Sudan HF further outlines the SHF's role and approach to AAP, establishing how the SHF currently aligns with the IASC Commitments to AAP and providing a springboard for staff and implementing partners to better understand and enhance their own responsibilities to affected populations.

2. Do No Harm

No matter how impartial the intentions of humanitarian actors, humanitarian assistance does not operate in isolation from the surrounding environment. With ongoing social, political and economic complexities dominating the contexts in which SHF funded projects operate, Sudan is a particularly challenging setting for humanitarian activity. As such, the SHF takes great care to adhere to a Do No Harm approach to providing humanitarian assistance in order to minimize the inadvertent harm or negative consequences aid programmes may have on the local community. Such measures are critical to preventing aid from indirectly exacerbating the conflict or even being used as an instrument of war. The SHF does this by ensuring that projects selected for funding:

- Demonstrate a careful understanding of the impact or potential impact of aid on the local situation, including how assistance will affect the economy of the conflict and how resources could be manipulated or misused by rebel forces;
- Are mindful not to aggravate the roots of a conflict or undermine the state's responsibility for social welfare and security by working in close collaboration with local authorities whenever possible; and
- Demonstrate SMARTER ways of working– including those that offer more sustainable, cost effective solutions to chronic critical needs.

3. Gender mainstreaming

The first 2016 SHF allocation will continue to strengthen gender mainstreaming ensuring that impact of all projects on women, girls, boys and men are considered at every stage of the project cycle — from planning to implementation and evaluation.

This allows to:

- Meet the needs and priorities of the population in a more targeted manner, based on how women, girls, boys and men have been affected by the crisis
- Ensure that all people affected by a crisis are acknowledged and that all their needs and vulnerabilities are taken into account
- Facilitate the design of more appropriate and effective response

The Inter Agency Steering Committee (IASC) Gender Marker coding system will be used to measure the extent to which gender equality has been integrated into project design. Projects scoring high on the gender marker code signify that the project has made significant efforts to address gender mainstreaming in its respective sector. Exceptions to this requirement must be defended with the intent to build awareness and capacity to ensure the project can achieve the required gender marker during the project period.

The SHF guidelines for assessing gender and equality programming in SHF proposals (see: [Sudan HF 2016 Guidelines for reviewing gender issues](#)) will be used and serves as guidance.

4. Environmental Impact

The SHF will continue to raise awareness on, and where possible mitigate the impact on the local environment of SHF supported projects. Proposals will be coded according to the IASC Environment Marker.

As a minimum to qualify for SHF funding, proposals must discuss the potential impact on the local environment of the project.

Please refer to the Environment Marker and Guidance Note (see: [Sudan HF 2016 Environment Marker and Guidance Note](#)) for more information.

5. Ensuring Value for Money

To ensure Value for Money (VfM) from the operational aspect the SHF technical unit will issue budget guidelines per sector complete with guidance on allowable indirect and direct costs, acceptable costs for staffing, and average costs per activity/beneficiary in collaboration with IASC sector coordinators.

6. Sustainable project strategies

The SHF in Sudan operates in a context with varying types of needs. While new emergencies are still taking place, other people in need have been in a protracted situation for more than ten years. The SHF requests partners to adapt their project strategy to type of needs that the project is addressing. Projects addressing emergency needs should include early recovery strategies as soon as possible. Projects addressing people in protracted situations should link with more durable solutions and resilience strategies. Each project is required to explain what is intended at the end of the project duration relating to exit strategies or the absence of those. Examples of relevant activities per sector can be found on pages 60 to 65 of the recent [Guidance Note on Inter-Cluster Early Recovery](#).

7. Equal partnerships - consortiums

The SHF prioritizes partnerships between organizations to ensure effective coverage of needs, enhance coordination between organisations and reduce transaction costs for the fund. The model put forward is the “lead provider model” or “lead contractor model” in which the organisation (NGO) that submits the project subcontracts other partners and is accountable to the SHF. Specific conditions that apply for this allocation are that:

- The indirect costs of the project are shared equally between service delivering organisations in line with their direct programme costs.
- The “Lead provider” is allowed to budget costs for the management of the consortium including staffing, monitoring and other directly related costs as long as they are reasonable and verifiable.
- All consortium partners have to be defined at the time of submission of the project.
- It is recommended that the “Lead provider” an organisation is that has experience in working with other partners.

- A consortium steering group should be created to ensure quarterly meetings with all participant organisations.
- To ensure comprehensive approaches, IASC sector coordinators are invited to facilitate the establishment of consortia.

8. Multi-sectoriality

The SHF continues to promote multi-sectorial projects which were introduced during the second allocation of 2015. Multi-sector projects are means to ensure that needs are addressed in a comprehensive manner in a location. A multi-sectorial project would consist of several sectors addressing a target group of beneficiaries in a common location, thereby promoting synergy and increasing impact, as well as enhancing VfM.

Multi-sectoriality is also ensured by having partners in different sectors focusing on a number of common locations that are of high priority for each of them and ensuring coordination at the field level.

D. SHF Strategic Priorities for the first 2016 Allocation

An overview of the funding envelopes can be found in the below table:

Case for funding	Amount in million USD
Darfur/South Kordofan/West Kordofan/Blue Nile (incl. common pipelines)	20.69
South Kordofan IDP consortium pilot	2.5
Nutrition/EI Nino in Eastern Sudan	2.0
South Sudanese refugees	2.5
Common services	1.7
Reserve for Emergencies	7.7
Total:	37.1

The first 2016 allocation focuses in the first place on new and recent IDP and refugee arrivals, while also allowing to address some high priority needs of people in need in protracted situations, returnees and populations in need of mitigation and early response to EI Nino induced needs.

1. Darfur/South Kordofan/ West Kordofan/Blue Nile

While relatively little new displacement occurred in the second half of 2015, significant new displacement is taking place early 2016, particularly in the Jebel Marra area. Addressing critical gaps in response to new displacement is a primary focus of this allocation and localities around the Jebel Marra are consequently highly prioritised in this allocation.

The case of new displacement in North Darfur State resulting from the Jebel Marra crisis is presented to the CERF secretariat for Rapid Response funding. Given that most people affected by this conflict seem to have fled to North Darfur, projects that show complementarity with CERF funding will be supported in this allocation. While access to potential new displaced in areas in or near the Jebel Marra in Central Darfur is currently difficult, it remains important to support (existing) humanitarian interventions in the area.

The responses can also include support to people in protracted situation which are present in the same locations/camps as newly displaced in this case will also draw upon existing services (such as provision of safe water, sanitary, educational, and health facilities). Substantial needs are present to a situation of vulnerable host populations and IDPs in East Darfur state affected by repeated conflict situations.

All sectors are requested to address needs through projects in the following commonly prioritised localities:

Sortony in Kabkabiya locality – North Darfur (new displacement)

Tawilla – North Darfur (new displacement)

Nertiti – Central Darfur (new displacement)

Rokoro (including Fanga Suk) – Central Darfur (new and recent displacement – opening of access)

Kutum – North Darfur (recent displacement and vulnerable host populations)

Sheiria – East Darfur (returnees and vulnerable host populations)

One area with a high number of returnees has been prioritised by all sectors.

Umm Baru, Orchi/AbuLeha/AnaBaji villages – North Darfur (returnees)

This allocation focuses on 5 localities which were prioritised by most IASC sectors and have a high Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) score. This will ensure an integrated response in these key localities, while allowing sectors to address critical gaps in other localities, as detailed in the sector specific sections below. Projects including of localities not specified as common prioritised localities or localities prioritised under the concerned sectors will not be considered.

Localities possibly affected by El Nino are highlighted in blue and the response to populations affected by El Nino is integrated in this allocation.

To allow addressing sector-specific gaps, a number of additional localities will have secondary priority for this allocation (see scoring matrix in [Annex 3: SRC scorecard](#)). The below table lists the priority activities for each sector and additional sector-specific localities that implementing partners are able to address through submitted projects.

Cluster prioritisation strategies

Education: \$1,900,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

The Education sector will make all efforts to maintain children's access to safe learning spaces in the most affected localities. The response will focus in areas with new displacements and consider IDP camps/settlements with protracted caseloads.

As a consequence of the current conflict and insecurity, it is imperative to provide recreational, learning opportunities and ensure psychosocial and emotional wellbeing of girls and boys. Partners will provide improved psychosocial support to the children in the classrooms. Psychosocial programming strengthens children's coping mechanisms to mitigate the effects of war and displacement. This model focuses on wellness, effective child friendly communication, interpersonal and community resourcefulness, social adaptation and resiliency in the context of war, displacement and protracted crisis.

Provision of teaching and recreational supplies, water and sanitation facilities and construction of temporary learning spaces will remain an essential part of emergency education response plan. The schools will continue to provide instruction in health and hygiene promotion which is important for prevention of disease in conditions of high density living such as IDP settlements.

Sector will continue to work with other life-saving sectors to continue multi-sectoral/integrated program approach towards provision of services in safe learning spaces. The inter-sector aspects were highly considered while prioritizing geographical areas for the education response. WASH, Food Security, Health and Protection sectors will be encouraged for inclusive initiatives and assistance to school going children and their families.

The window of core pipeline had increased sector's ability to effectively respond to the sudden and on-set emergencies in Darfur and Kordofan last year, therefore procurement of essential supplies for the core pipeline will be part of education response.

Additional geographic priorities:

North Darfur: [Zamzam IDP camp](#)

East Darfur: Abu Karinka, Adila

Blue Nile: [El Damazine](#), [El Roseires](#)

Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Items: \$2,450,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

1. Minimal human dignity and privacy and shelter from the elements restored to women, men, girls and boys by ensuring timely procurement of ES/NFIs and provision of appropriate life-saving emergency shelter and non- food items to new and recent IDPs and returnees(refugee/IDP)
2. Appropriate emergency shelter and non-food items provided to IDPs who have not been assisted immediately following displacement due to lack of access.
3. Appropriate emergency shelter and non-food items provided to vulnerable protracted IDPs who have not received basic shelter construction material or renewal NFIs or due to lack of funding in 2015

Additional remark: The ES/NFI sector is allowed to use up to 50% of its envelope for procurement.

Additional geographic priorities:

North Darfur: Mellit (Abassi Camp), [Dar El Salam](#) (Um Derasia IDP Gathering, Shadad IDP Camp, Shangal Tobey IDP camp), [Zamzam camp](#), Um Baru

South Darfur: Um Dafog, Rahad El Berdi, Niteaga

East Darfur: Ed Daein

Blue Nile State: [Bau](#), [El Kurmuk](#), [EL Roseires](#)

While for other sectors, pipeline procurement should not surpass the 30% of the sector envelope for Darfur, the NFI pipeline has a large share in the project costs. The ESNFI sector is allowed to propose up to 50 percent to core pipelines.

Food Security and Livelihoods: \$2,840,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

1. Protection of livestock assets through provision of community-based veterinary services
2. Provision of Quality-Declared drought tolerant and early maturing seeds to enable production of own food and ensure self-reliance
3. Promotion of community seed broadcasting and management of pasture and forage seeds
4. Provision of on-job-training to farmers (during inputs distribution) and pastoralists for improved production techniques and productivity outcomes

Beneficiaries include newly displaced persons, returnees and vulnerable host communities and pastoral and farming communities affected by El Nino.

Additional geographic priorities:

North Darfur: [Dar El Salam](#), Mellit, [Umm Keddada](#), [El Kuma](#), [Kalimendo](#) for activity 1, 2 and 3

East Darfur: Yassin for activity 1 and 2.

For the jointly prioritised localities in Central Darfur, activities 1 and 2 are needed.

Um Barru in North Darfur for activity 1, 2, 3 and 4.

Health: \$3,650,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

The health services in conflict affected states are strained due to underfunding and inadequate human resources for health. The health sector partners have agreed to focus on protracted caseload by ensuring continuity in delivery of health services and also address the needs of new displacements in accessible locations. The health sector strategies to address humanitarian health needs are provision of primary health care including maternal and child health, strengthening of capacities in emergency preparedness and response to public health risk or events, monitoring the disease trends by maintaining the surveillance systems, capacity building of health care and health education and promotion.

The health priority interventions for the SHF include provision of basic minimum package of primary health care services, including maternal and child health, emergency referral services, trauma care, training of human resources for health, and monitor the service delivery. The initial response to public health threats such as an outbreak or alert investigation or rumour verification will be supported. The basic minimum package of primary

health care services includes treatment of common diseases, referral of complicated cases, drug disbursement, antenatal care, immunization, health promotion and growth monitoring.

Additional geographic priorities:

North Darfur: [El Fasher \(including Zamzam Camp\)](#), [Dar El Salam](#), [El Sireaf](#), [Mellit](#), [Saraf Omra](#)

East Darfur: [Abu Karinka](#), [Ed Daein](#), [Yassin](#), [El Ferdous](#)

Central Darfur: [Bindisi](#), [Zalingei](#), [Umm Dukhun](#), [Azum](#), [Mukjar](#)

West Darfur: [Kereinik](#), [El Geneina](#), [Beida](#), [Kulbus](#)

South Darfur: [Bielel](#), [Niteaga](#), [El Salam](#), [Gereida](#), [Ed El Fursan](#), [Katayla](#), [Nyala North](#), [Kalma Camp](#)

Blue Nile and Kordofans: [Bau](#), [El Kurmuk](#), [EL Roseires](#), [Abyei](#)

Nutrition: \$3,700,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

The nutrition sector focuses on provision of life saving and preventive activities in localities with identified as top priorities by sub national and national level partners consultations.

The following are priority activities for SHF first round allocation

- Treatment of severely acutely malnourished (SAM) girls and boys under age five including inpatient management supplies
- Administrative (support) cost of Case management of moderate acute malnourished (MAM) girls and boys of 6-59 months and Targeted Supplementary Feeding Program (TSFP) for wasted PLW
- Micronutrient supplements for girls and boys under five and PLW
- Provision of education and counselling for mothers/care takers of girls and boys under five in Infant and Young Child feeding (IYCF) practices, and hygiene and sanitation
- Training (capacity building) activities that improve response capacity, Monitoring and reporting
- In addition reasonable amount of the portion of sector allocation should cover the procurement Ready to use therapeutic Food (RUTF) and Therapeutic Milk

Additional geographic priorities:

North Darfur: [Ailliet](#), [Dar El Salam](#) and [Shengil Tobaya](#), [El Fasher \(Zamzam, Korma and rural El Fasher\)](#), [El Malha](#), [El Taweisha](#), [Mellit](#), [Umm Keddada](#)

South Darfur: [Alwehda](#), [El Salam](#), [Kalma Camp](#), [Kass](#), [Katayla](#), [Marshang](#), [Rahad El Berdi](#)

East Darfur: [Abu Jabra](#), [Assalaya](#), [El Ferdous](#), [Yassin](#)

South Kordofan: [Al Tadamon](#)

West Kordofan: [Wad Banda](#)

Blue Nile: [Al Tadamon](#), [EL Roseires](#)

Protection: \$2,350,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

1. Provide rapid response to emergency protection needs among newly displaced population

- Identification, and referral/direct protection support of people with special needs
- Provision of community protection emergency kits
- Emergency Child Protection life-saving interventions
- Family Tracing and Reunification
- DDR

2. Support community-based capacities to protect people at risk, whether newly or protracted IDPs

- Strengthen community-based protection networks, and ensure they can fulfil basic protection functions (identification of vulnerable people, alert and referral, and information dissemination)
- Community-based child protection
- Support GBV referral mechanisms
- Women centers with activities including rehabilitation, awareness-raising on GBV/RH/ and HIV/AIDS

3. Contribute to the prevention of protection risks faced by IDPs
 - Child Protection monitoring
 - Raise awareness of key protection messages among displaced and host communities (men, women, girls and boys, teachers). Topics will cover, GBV, RH, and HIV/AIDS
 - Development of IEC materials, and work with local media TV/ radio program, and train media personnel on GBV related issues and related national and international events including 16 days of activism
 - Procurement and distribution of basic personal hygiene kits
 - Land release (mine action)
 - Mine risk education
4. Support to protection service providers and institutions
 - Clinical management of rape (CMR) training/ refresher training for the medical personal, and social workers including paralegal
 - Youth training on GBV manual in emergency settings including; (GBV mainstreaming, GBV guidelines lines and manuals, peace building, GBV reporting)

Projects with activities across two or more protection subsectors will be priorities, provided submitting organisations can demonstrate sufficient expertise in the various areas of work

Additional geographic priorities:

South Kordofan: Abu Kashola (mine action only), Dellami, Dilling, Leri, Talodi
 Blue Nile: Al Tadamon, Bau, El Kurmuk, El Roseires

Water, Sanitation and Hygiene: \$3,800,000

Sector strategy/priorities:

After the review of the 2015 response, the WASH sector partners agreed to key strategies so as to improve the quality and effectiveness of WASH programming. The protracted displacement strategy developed in late 2015 forms the basis of WASH implementation (every partner is expected to refer to). All sector interventions will be preceded with a WASH vulnerability study; this will be conducted through specialized support to IOM linking with their current functions of DTM. The study will identify key persons that require WASH direct support. Community based operation and maintenance of WASH services with specific focus on cost sharing and cost savings will be an integral part of the WASH response. In protracted displacement camps, the emphasis will on maintaining WASH services within the current level unless new displacements take place. Given the depleting ground water resources and a further exacerbation by El Nino phenomenon in many camps with high IDPs concentration, new drilling will not be funded under the first round allocation. Emphasis will be put on replacing diesel powered systems with solar systems. New latrine construction/replacement of filled latrines will only be funded for new arrivals and extremely vulnerable segments of the target population. Market based programming will be applied for WASH services. Each partner will conduct a quick market analysis to identify available materials for construction, they will be required to submit to the State sector this quick analysis. Limited funding will be allocated for transportation of materials since partners are encouraged to purchase materials on site (especially local materials and some WASH NFIs). Every drilling effort shall precede a hydrogeological study. Analysis of ground water monitoring will be emphasis due to the current El Nino impact. Only areas without sufficient ground water monitoring equipment will be funded under first round allocation.

Additional geographic priorities:

Central Darfur: Umm Dukhun
 North Darfur (recent displacement, returnees and vulnerable host populations): Zamzam, El Tina, Kornoi
 East Darfur (returnees and vulnerable host populations): Abu Karinka
 West Darfur: Kulbus
 South Darfur: Kass camp, Kalma camp

Returnees – Umm Baru

To respond to critical needs in areas of return and to ensure maximum impact and VfM, all IASC sectors will respond to the needs of returnees through an area-based approach. The RRR IASC sector will be responsible for

coordinating analysis on return and reintegration data, trends and needs and for identifying the village to be prioritised using a multi-sectoral and early recovery approach. The other IASC sectors will allocate funds for 1 project in their technical area of expertise to be implemented in the selected return village/locality.

Selection and implementation of the individual projects will be done under each respective sector. The coordination of these multi-sectoral return and reintegration interventions will be done in the RRR (Khartoum, North Darfur) where relevant sector coordinators will attend to ensure a smooth implementation and holistic approach to return and reintegration.

Blue Nile

Projects submitted for Blue Nile are required to detail a monitoring plan and clearly specify how they will achieve access (please describe this in the section 'link with the allocation strategy'). The minimum requirement will be that monitoring teams from Khartoum offices can perform supervision visits.

Core pipelines

Projects to procure items for core pipelines will be part of the competitive process of this allocation within the above mentioned envelopes per sector and taking into account that 70% of funding should go directly to NGOs. All projects need to describe and list items that are expected from common pipelines in their budgets as per the SHF Operational Manual.

As specific criteria for evaluation the Strategic Review Committees should take into account:

- *Complementarity of the pipeline* with other funding and lead agency funding. First, important economies of scale are realized when different contributions are grouped into one order, not with just one SHF contribution. Second, investment of core funds of the lead agency means they also believe in the added value of the pipeline.
- *Clear focus/strategy of the pipeline* meaning that it should have a very limited number of items that are clearly benefitting all partners for their projects. It should be clear what the added-value is of purchasing those items, including: quality, timeliness, and standardisation. Pipeline projects need clear indicators to measure value added. Items should not overlap within the sector or between sectors.
- *Access to SHF partners*. All partners should be aware of the process to access pipeline items.
- *Transparency and decision mechanisms*. The status of the pipeline should be shared regularly within the IASC sector and all partners should know what the decision mechanisms are for attributing pipeline items, e.g. criteria for decision, whether the decision is taken by the sector or by the agency, and quantities allocated to each partner.

5. South Kordofan IDP protection pilot consortium (\$2.5 million)

In line with the second strategic objective of the 2015 HRP "To provide humanitarian protection to affected populations", the response to IDP needs in this area is aimed to be carried-out by a multi-sectorial NGO consortium under the lead of Protection. This means that an organization with protection activities leads the consortium in which it includes responses to fill critical gaps in other sectors but ensuring protection is mainstreamed throughout all sectors.

Localities to address IDP needs are 3 adjacent localities in the 'eastern corridor' of the South Kordofan state prioritised by the Protection IASC sector and other sectors, namely **Abu Jabaiha, Rashad and El Abassya**. The total envelope for IDPs is **\$2.5 million** of which \$500,000 is reserved for protection.

6. Eastern Sudan IDP nutrition pilot consortium to El Nino affected localities (\$2.0 million)

In line with the third strategic objective of the 2015 HRP "To reduce food insecurity and malnutrition below emergency levels across Sudan" and the Sudan El Nino Mitigation and Preparedness Plan, consortia projects (maximum 2) lead by nutrition partners and including livelihood, health and water and sanitation needs are requested for Eastern Sudan (Gedaref, Kassala and Red Sea states). The projects should include mitigation measures determined in the Sudan El Nino Mitigation and Response plan. SAM and GAM rates for the localities should exceed emergency rates. Support to common pipeline procurement for nutrition can be included.

7. South Sudanese refugees (\$2.5 million)

While the rate of new arrivals slowed, substantial needs remain for recent arrivals in South Kordofan, West Kordofan and White Nile State. In South Kordofan, projects should focus on **Kadugli** and **Talodi** localities. In

West Kordofan, projects should focus on the **Kharassana** locality and on **Babanussa** locality. For White Nile State, the responses should complement the CERF rapid response 2016 underfunded grant by increasing availability of basic services in **Ei Salam** and **Ei Jabalian**.

The foreseen envelope under this allocation is **\$2,500,000**.

8. Common Services (\$1.7 million)

- Security Services: UNDSS is invited to present a proposal for \$0.6 million (\$200,000 for Khartoum and \$400,000 for Darfur). For 2017, UNDSS related budgets will be cost-shared by UN agencies. It will be UNDSS's responsibility to table this at the UNCT in 2016.
- Sector M&R officers: \$600,000 has already been agreed by the HC on positive advice of the Advisory Board. A revision exercise on the M&R officers set-up will be conducted mid 2016 ahead of the 2016 OCHA budgeting exercise. No funding for sector coordinators will be included in this allocation in line with the positioning of the SHF.
- IOM can submit a project for \$0.5 million for displacement and return tracking to complement the intended donor funding. Minimum half of the project has to be focused on return tracking.
- No humanitarian air services will be supported as only critical funding gaps will be funded.

9. Reserve for Emergencies

From the total projected incoming contributions minus Administrative Agent fee OCHA direct costs, \$7.7 million (20%) will be set aside for the Reserve for Emergencies. \$3 million of that amount is conditioned to the actual receipt of the listed donor contributions.

Priority responses envisaged are for increasing displacement in Darfur and needs related to sudden climatological changes without being limited to these scenarios. Both the process for application and the criteria for this Reserve for Emergencies can be found in the SHF Operational Manual.

E. Prioritization of projects

1. Project eligibility criteria:

- UN agencies/IOM as well as NGOs (international and national) that are listed as eligible partners (see [Annex 2: List of eligible partners](#)) can submit concept notes under this allocation. All eligible partners can submit project proposals that target case 1 (Darfur). Under case 2 (West and South Kordofan states for IDPs) only NGO consortia can apply. Implementing partners of common services are predetermined.
- A minimum budget floor of \$150,000 for projects is required for high and medium risk partners, and \$300,000 for low risk partners.
- Project duration is no longer than 12 months.
- The main target localities of the project should be the commonly specified localities or those per sector.
- A similar project is already funded by another donor/funding mechanism in the same locality
Projects including of localities not specified as common prioritised localities or localities prioritised under the concerned sectors will not be considered.

2. Criteria for project prioritization (Strategic Review Committee-SRC):

On top of the more generic project prioritization criteria (see: [Annex 3: SRC scorecard](#)), the following criteria will be added for this allocation:

- Partners already established in the targeted locality are prioritised.
- Strategy includes sustainable project strategies.
- Multi-sectorial projects are prioritized.
- Consortia are prioritised.

A separate scorecard will be used for core pipeline projects.

3. Criteria to select projects after initial scoring at (Strategic Review Committee – SRC):

After the initial ranking, projects may still be excluded but only based on the following criteria:

- Coverage of the same location by a higher scored project
- To reach the target of 70% going to NGOs
- To have one project on returnees

- Within the protection sector, the selection of projects should ensure that funding is made available across all subsectors, with due consideration given to identified needs

4. Criteria for technical review of projects:

- Projects will be reviewed to include the following cross-cutting themes; Accountability to Affected Populations, Do No Harm, gender and environment markers and the sustainability of project strategies.

III. Timeline and Procedure

Dates	Activity	Stakeholders involved
Feb 28	Advisory Board adopts allocation paper	AB, SHF TU
Feb 29 – Mar 14	Call for concept notes. Deadline for submission on 14 March midnight.	SHF TU, SCs, Partners
Mar 15	General check by SHF TU and concept notes send out to sectors	SHF TU
Mar 16 - 24	SRCs and recommendation of projects to SHF TU Preparation 16 -20 Mar, SRC meetings 21-22 Mar (SRC report)	SRCs, SCs
Mar 27 - 29	Check of sector recommendations by SHF TU	SHF TU
Mar 30 – Apr 3	Share sector recommendations with Advisory Board & review by the Advisory Board	SHF TU, AB
Apr 4-5	HC pre-approval of the projects	HC, SHF TU
Apr 6 - 11	Call for full project proposals	SHF TU, SCs, Partners
Apr 12 - 26	Financial and technical review process	SHF TU, FMU, SCs
Apr 27 - 28	Allocation letters & HC final Approval	SHF TU, HC
May 2 - May 16	Contracting and disbursement	FMU

Procedures are in line with the SHF Operational Manual dated February 2016.

Projects determined under the Common Services section will follow a Reserve process. Partners will be guided by the SHF Technical Unit for their submission.

IV. Contacts

Name	Title	Contact Number	Email
Bavo Christiaens	Pooled Fund Manager OCHA	+249 (0) 91 217 0422	christiaens@un.org
Randa Merghani	Humanitarian Financing Officer OCHA	+249 (0) 91 2160 419	merghani@un.org
Elizabeth Whitehead	Head of FMU UNDP	+249 (0) 9 662 10923	elizabeth.whitehead@undp.org

V. Complaints Mechanism

The complaint mechanism is specified in the SHF Operational Manual.

VI. Annexes

Annex 1: List of acronyms

AA	Administrative Agent
AAP	Accountability to Affected Populations
AB	Advisory Board
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
FMU	Financing Management Unit (UNDP)
FSL	Food Security and Livelihoods
GMS	Grant Management System (OCHA)
GBV	Gender Based Violence
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HF	Humanitarian Financing
HNO	Humanitarian Needs Overview
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IASC	Inter-Agency Steering Committee
IGA	Income Generating Activities
IDP	Internally Displace People
ISCG	Inter Sector Coordination Group
GBV	Gender Based Violence
MA	Managing Agent
M&R	Monitoring and Reporting
PRG	Programmatic Review Group
RRR	Recovery, Returns and Reintegration
SC	Sector Coordinator
SHF	Sudan Humanitarian Fund
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Realistic, Time-bound
SRC	Strategic Review Committee
TRC	Technical Review Group
TU	Technical Unit
VfM	Value for Money

Annex 2: List of eligible partners with risk levels



Sudan
Humanitarian
Fund

NGO Partners Eligible for Direct SHF 2016 Funding

with HACT Micro-Assessment Risk Ratings

as of 24 February 2016

#	NGO/ INGO	NAME of Eligible Partner Organization	Acronym	HACT Risk Rating*
1	INGO	Adventist Development and Relief Agency Int'l	ADRA	Low **
2	NGO	Almanar Voluntary Organization	Al Manar	Low **
3	NGO	Almassar Charity Organization For Nomads	Al Massar	Low **
4	NGO	Alsalam Org for Rehabilitation and Development	AORD	Low
5	NGO	Alshroog Organization for social Development	ALSHROOG	Medium **
6	INGO	American Refugee Committee	ARC	Low
7	NGO	Anhar for Peace Development Organization	ANHAR	Medium **
8	INGO	Association for Aid and Relief, Japan	AAR	Low
9	NGO	Azza Women Association	Azza	Medium **
10	NGO	Business and Professional Women Organization	BPWO	Low **
11	INGO	Care International Switzerland In Sudan	CIS	Low **
12	INGO	Catholic Agency for Overseas Development	CAFOD	Low **
13	INGO	Catholic Relief Services	CRS	Low **
14	INGO	Comitato di Coordin delle Org per il Servizio Volont	COSV	Low
15	INGO	Concern Worldwide	Concern	Low **
16	INGO	Cooperazione Internazionale	COOPI	Low **
17	INGO	Danish Refugee Council	DRC	Low
18	NGO	Dar Elsalam Development Association	DDA	Medium **
19	INGO	Deutsche Welthungerhilfe e. V	GAA	Low
20	NGO	El Ruhama For Dev And Humanitarian Aid	El Ruhama	Medium **
21	NGO	Elazhar Org for Disaster Prev & Sustainable Dvlp	NADA	High **
22	INGO	Emergency	EMERGENCY	Medium **
23	NGO	Friends Of Peace And Development Organization	FPDO	Medium **
24	NGO	Global Aid Hand	GAH	Low
25	INGO	GOAL	GOAL	Low
26	NGO	Great Family Organization	GFO	Low **
27	INGO	Help age International UK	HAI UK	Low **
28	NGO	Humanitarian Aid and Development Org	HADO	Medium **
29	INGO	International Aid Services	IAS	Low
30	INGO	International Medical Corps	IMC	Low
31	INGO	International Relief and Development	IRD	Low **
32	INGO	Intersos Humanitarian Aid Organisation	INTERSOS	Low **
33	INGO	Islamic Relief Worldwide	IRW	Low **
34	NGO	Jasmar Human Security Organization	JASMAR	Low **
35	INGO	Johanniter Unfallhilfe E.V.	Johanniter	Low **
36	NGO	Kebkabiya Small Holders Charitable Society	KSHCS	Medium **
37	INGO	Kuwaiti Patients Helping Fund	KPHF	Low **
38	NGO	Local Action Organization	LAO	Medium **
39	INGO	Mercy Corps Scotland	MCS	Low
40	NGO	Mubadiroon Orga For Prevention Of Disasters	MUBADIROON	Low **

41	NGO	National Demining Units Organization	NDU	High	**
42	INGO	Norwegian Church Aid	NCA	Low	
43	INGO	Norwegian Refugee Council	NRC	Low	**
44	NGO	Org for Voluntary Humanitarian Assistance	ASSIST	Medium	**
45	INGO	Oxfam America	Oxfam - US	Low	
46	INGO	Panhealth Care Organization	PCO	Medium	**
47	NGO	Peace Bridge Association	PBA	Medium	**
48	INGO	Plan International	Plan	Low	**
49	INGO	Practical Action	PA	Low	
50	INGO	Redr-Engineers For Disaster Relief Ltd.	RedR	Low	
51	NGO	Rehaid Elfursan Rural Development Net	RDN	Medium	**
52	INGO	Relief International	RI	Low	**
53	NGO	Rufaid Health Foundation	RHF	Medium	**
54	NGO	Rural Community Development Organization	RCDO	High	**
55	INGO	Save the Children - Sweden	SCS	Low	**
56	NGO	Sawa Sudan for Dev & Humanitarian Aid	SSDHA	High	**
57	NGO	SEEMA Cntr for Train.and Prot of Women and Child's Rights	SEEMA	Medium	**
58	NGO	Sibro Organization For Development	Sibro	Medium	
59	NGO	Social Solidarity Organization	SSO	High	**
60	NGO	Sudan Open Learning Organisation	SOLO	Medium	**
61	NGO	Sudanese Development Call Organization	NIDDA	Low	
62	NGO	Sudanese Org for Rehabilitation & Construction	SORC	High	**
63	NGO	Sudanese Red Crescent Society	SRCS	Low	**
64	NGO	Sudanese Women's General Union	SWGU	Low	
65	NGO	Sustainable Action Group	SAG	Low	**
66	NGO	Talawiet Organization for Development	TOD	Low	
67	NGO	Tawasol Al-Amal Charity Org For The Disabled	Tawsol	Medium	**
68	INGO	Tearfund	Tearfund	Low	**
69	INGO	Terre Des Hommes	TDH	Low	**
70	INGO	Triangle Génération Humanitaire	TGH	Low	
71	NGO	Trust Rehabilitation and Dev Organization	TDO	High	**
72	NGO	Turath Organization for Human Development	TOHD	High	**
73	INGO	United Methodist Committee On Relief	UMCOR	Low	
74	NGO	United Peace Organization	UPO	Low	**
75	NGO	Vet-Care Organization	VCO	Low	**
76	INGO	Vétérinaires Sans Frontières - Germany	VSF	Low	**
77	INGO	War Child Canada	WCC	Low	
78	NGO	White Hand Organization For Development	WHOD	High	**
79	NGO	Women Org for Development & Capacity Building	LABENA	Medium	**
80	INGO	World Relief	WR	Low	
81	INGO	World Vision International	WV	Low	**
82	NGO	ZAWD - Org for Humanitarian Affairs and Dev	ZAWD	Medium	**
83	INGO	Zuid Oost Azie Refugee Care	ZOA	Low	

2016 Nominated Partners

Eligibility Pending Capacity Assessment Results

	<u>NGO/ INGO</u>	<u>NAME of Nominated Partner Organization</u>	<u>Acronym</u>	<u>Nominating Sect</u>	<u>Risk Rating*</u>
1	NGO	Agricultural Technology Transfer Society	ATTS	FSL	High
2	NGO	CAFA Development Organization	CAFA	Health	High
3	NGO	Cooperation for Development Organization	CDO	Health	High
4	NGO	Darfur Development and Reconstruction Agency	DDRA	FSL	High
5	NGO	Emergency Relief Rehabilitation and Development Agency	ERRADA	Education	High
6	NGO	Human Appeal international - Sudan	HAI	Education & WA	High
7	INGO	People Organization for Development and Rehabilitation	PODR	NFI	High
8	NGO	Saeker Voluntary Organization	SVO	Health	High
9	NGO	Sanad Charity Foundation	SCF	RMS	High
10	NGO	Sudanese Popular Committee for Rehabilitation	SPCR	NFI	High
11	NGO	Trabut Charitable Foundation	TCF	NFI	High
12	NGO	Zulfa Development and Peace Organization	ZDPO	Health	High
		Ineligible			
13	INGO	Near East Foundation	NEF	WASH	

HACT Micro-Assessment and the Purpose of the Risk Rating

1. The Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfer (HACT) micro-assessment risk rating is an analysis of an NGO Partner's financial management capacity to manage funds and activities related to management of funds flow, staffing, accounting policies and procedures, audit activities (internal and external), reporting and monitoring, and information systems.
2. The micro-assessment **does not assess** an NGOs technical ability to implement project activities.
3. Allocation decisions **will not** be based on an NGO Partner's risk rating.
4. The risk rating will only be used to determine the Operational Modality, and Assurance Activities for the NGO Partner, once fully phased in.

Risk Rating Methodology

5. The Risk Ratings are based on a third party micro-assessment.
6. An ** indicates that the rating is conditional, pending the completion of the micro-assessment.
7. NGO Partners nominated in 2015 and later, and not previously a CHF direct implementing partner are conditionally rated high risk, pending the completion of the micro-assessment.

Annex 3: SRC scorecard

Category Questions					
					CN = CONCEPT NOTE
A Eligibility					Yes/No
B Strategic relevance					35
C Programmatic relevance					25
D Cost effectiveness					15
E Management and monitoring					15
F Engagement with coordination					10
G Previous performance					Yes/No
B Strategic relevance		Weighting	C Programmatic relevance		Weighting
B1	The proposed project strategy is in line with the sector strategies	30	C1	CN clearly defines humanitarian needs (fully 5 pts, average 2 pts, not clearly 0 pts) and describes needs identification process (fully 5 pts, average 2 pts, not clearly 0 pts)	10
B2	CN activities take place one of the in the commonly prioritised localities (commonly prioritised loc = 25pts; others 0 pts)	25	C2	Beneficiaries are clearly defined and described (fully 2.5 pts, not completely 0 pts), and the number of beneficiaries is clearly explained (fully 2.5 pts, not completely 0 pts)	5
B3	CN includes sustainable project strategies in accordance with the type of needs addressed. (fully 10 pts, somehow 5 pts, not 0 pts)	10	C3	CN clearly links objectives to outputs and activities. (fully 10 pts, somehow 5 pts, not 0 pts)	10
			C4	Project is multi-sector (can be through inclusion of indicators of other sectors) (3 points per sector up to maximum 9 pts)	9
			C5	Project is a consortium as defined in this allocation paper (10 pts if YES, not 0 pts)	10
			C6	Sufficient attention is given to Gender (6 points for 2b, 4 points for 2a, 1 point for 1 and n/a, 0 otherwise)	6
Total weighting score		65	Total weighting score		50
E Management and monitoring		Weighting	F Engagement with coordination		Weighting
E1	CN indicators are SMART: Specific (3 pts), Measurable (3 pts), Achievable (3 pts), Realistic (3 pts) Time-bound (3 pts)	15	F1	Partner actively participates in national (fully 5 pts, somehow 2 pts, not 0 pts) and/or sub-national (fully 5 pts, somehow 2 pts, not 0 pts) sector coordination of activity area	10
E2	Partner is already established in locality (5 pts if Yes, 3 points if present in some of the project localities, 0 points if not)	5	F2	Partner has previous experience in the thematic area. (10 pts for strong experience, 5 pts for medium experience, 0 pts for no experience)	10
Total weighting score		20	Total weighting score		20
D Cost effectiveness			D Cost effectiveness		Weighting
D1	Cost per beneficiary is in line with sector benchmarks (fully 10 pts, somehow 5 pts, not 0 pts)		D2	The budget is aligned with the activities and outputs (fully 10 pts, somehow 5 pts, not 0 pts)	10
A1	Partner is UN agency/IOM or on the partner eligibility list?		A2	Is CN budget above min ceiling for the partner (based on risk level)?	
A3	Project duration is maximum 12 months?		A4	Does the CN only target localities prioritised in the allocation?	
A5	No project funded or intended by other donors covers the same?				

Category Questions for common pipelines

Category Questions for common pipelines					
					CN = CONCEPT NOTE
A	Eligibility			Yes/No	
B	Strategic relevance			35	
C	Programmatic relevance			25	
D	Cost effectiveness			15	
E	Management and monitoring			15	
F	Engagement with coordination			10	
G	Previous performance			Yes/No	
<hr/>					
B Strategic relevance		Weighting	C Programmatic relevance		Weighting
B1	Clear focus/strategy of the pipeline (clear 35 pts, mostly clear 20 pts, not very clear 10 pts, not clear 0 pts)	35	C1	Access to SHF partners (fully 15 pts, somehow 7 pts, not 0 pts)	15
			C2	Transparency and decision mechanisms (fully 10 pts, somehow 5 pts, not 0 pts)	10
Total weighting score		35	Total weighting score		25
<hr/>					
E Management and monitoring		Weighting	F Engagement with coordination		Weighting
E1	Pipeline projects shows clear indicators to measure value added (clear 15 pts, somehow 7 pts, not 0 pts)	15	F1	complementarity of the pipeline with other funding and lead agency funding (clear complementarity 10 pts, somehow 5 pts, not 0 pts)	10
Total weighting score		15	Total weighting score		10

Annex 4: Indicative percentages on budget categories

IASC sector	Staff costs	General Operating and Other Direct Costs
Education	14%	10%
Non-food items and Emergency Shelter	24%	10%
Food security and Livelihood	16%	10%
Health	38%	10%
Nutrition	33%	10%
Protection	23%	10%
Refugee Multi-sector	17%	10%
Water Sanitation and Hygiene	21%	10%