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1. **Acronyms**

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

1. The Turkey Humanitarian Pooled Fund (hereafter “HPF Turkey”) is a multi-donor country based pooled fund established in 2014 following UN Security Resolutions 2139 and 2165 in view of the magnitude and complexity of the Syria crisis. The HPF supports projects and activities in line with priorities and objectives that are part of the Strategic Response Plan (SRP). It aims to provide flexible and timely resources to partners thereby expanding the delivery of humanitarian assistance, increasing humanitarian access, and strengthening partnerships with local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

2. The Operational Manual for the Humanitarian Pooled Fund in Turkey (hereafter “HPF Turkey”) is issued by the Deputy Regional Humanitarian Coordinator (DRHC).

3. The DRHC 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

4. The HPF Turkey Operational Manual should be considered in conjunction with the Operational Handbook for Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs). This manual outlines all the steps and phases to be followed throughout the allocation processes and defines the country-specific regulations that govern the fund. 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.

5. Adherence to the guidance provided in the two documents is mandatory so as to ensure standard and transparent processes. Both documents are complementary to the each other.

6. The purpose of the HPF Turkey Operational Manual is to outline the objectives, eligibility, allocation modalities and accountability mechanisms of the Fund.

7. Under the direction of the DRHC, the HPF Turkey aims to support the timely disbursement of funds to the most critical humanitarian needs as defined by the whole of Syria Strategic Response Plan (SRP).

8. In this regards, this Manual will provide guidance to implementing partners and facilitate the role of OCHA, members of the Review Committees, and the cluster leads.
3. Objectives of the HPF Turkey

9. The HPF provides flexible and timely resources to partners thereby expanding the delivery of humanitarian assistance, increasing humanitarian access, and strengthening partnerships with local, Syrian and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

10. The long-term goal of the Turkey Humanitarian Response Fund is to strengthen the capacity of Syrian NGOs which it does in three ways;
   i. Providing direct funding to Syrian NGO;
   ii. Applying participatory capacity assessment methodologies to identify and address capacity needs of the partners;
   iii. Funding projects of UN agencies and INGO’s with distinct capacity building components targeting Syrian NGOs.

11. The Fund aims for a more inclusive approach by working with a variety of implementing partners (Syrian, International NGOs and UN agencies) in a complex operational environment. The HPF in Turkey has the following overall objectives:
   iv. Support life-saving and life-sustaining activities while filling critical funding gaps;
   v. Promote needs-based assistance in accordance with humanitarian principles;
   vi. Strengthen coordination and leadership by leveraging the cluster system;
   vii. Improve the relevance and coherence of humanitarian response by strategically funding priorities as identified under the Strategic Response Plan (SRP);
   viii. Expand the delivery of assistance in hard-to-reach areas by partnering with national and international NGOs.

12. Interventions supported by the HPF are to be consistent with the core humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence.

4. Governance and Management

13. The activities of the HPF in Turkey will be carried out under the overall leadership of the Deputy Regional Humanitarian Coordinator (DRHC). The DRHC will be supported by an Advisory Board and an OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU) fulfilling the HPF Turkey secretariat functions. The Advisory Board will be chaired by the DRHC 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 Deputy Regional Humanitarian Coordinator (DRHC)

14. The overall management of the Fund on behalf of the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) will rest with the DRHC, supported by an OCHA HFU and advised by the Advisory Board. Key responsibilities of the DRHC are:

i. Approves the 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 (HLG), 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 DRHC and cannot be delegated. Funding decisions can be made at the discretion of the DRHC, without a recommendation from the Advisory Board, for circumstances which require an immediate response. In addition, the DRHC has the authority to overrule recommendations from the review committee(s);

vii. Approves projects and initiates disbursement;

4.2 The Advisory Board (AB)

15. The Advisory Board (AB) will support the DRHC in developing an overall strategy and overseeing the performance of the Fund. It will advise the DRHC 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 SRP 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 DRHC to discuss funding priorities in line with the SRP.

16. Key functions of AB are:

i. *Strategic focus and fund allocation*: The AB should support the DRHC in ensuring that the main objectives of the Fund are met. The AB should review and advise the DRHC 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 DRHC in setting funding targets and support resource mobilization efforts;
ii. **Risk management**: The AB supports the DRHC 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;

17. The membership of the AB for **HPF Turkey** is:

- Deputy Regional Humanitarian Coordinator (Chairperson)
- Donor representatives (contributing donors)
- UN Agency representatives
- NGO representatives
- OCHA Head of Office

The names of the organizations represented in the AB and a rotation plan will be determined by the DRHC in consultation with the HLG.

### 4.3 OCHA Head of Office (HoO)

18. 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 HPF in Turkey are to:

i. Support and advise the DRHC 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 **HPF Turkey** processes and ensure that the Fund scope and objectives as outlined in the Operational Manual and/or allocation papers are aligned with the SRP;

v. Approve project no-cost extensions within the scope of the delegation of authority granted by the DRHC;

vi. Interface with headquarters on policy issues related to the HPF Turkey;

vii. Act as a permanent member of the AB.

### 4.4 OCHA headquarters

19. 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 DRHC;

iv. Provide periodic financial reports on the HPF Turkey to the DRHC, contributing donors and the AB;
v. Provide the DRHC and the AB with funding updates of donor commitments and disbursements transferred to partners, as well as other financial information related to the HPF Turkey;

vi. Provide policy and guidance to ensure the Fund is in line with OCHA’s global guidelines.

4.5 OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit (HFU)

20. The HFU under the overall supervision of the OCHA Head of Office and will ensure adequate and efficient management of the HPF in Turkey.

21. In support of the DRHC and AB, and with the assistance of relevant units at OCHA headquarters, the HFU will undertake the following tasks:

Management of HPF Turkey operations and policy advice to the DRHC:

i. Advise the DRHC and OCHA HoO on fund strategies and any other policy matters related to HPF Turkey;

ii. Facilitate the development of the HPF Turkey scope and objectives and/or allocation strategy paper;

iii. Ensure timely communication to partners on HPF Turkey standard allocation calendar of activities;

iv. Engage with HPF Turkey 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 DRHC 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 DRHC and Advisory Board on the allocation process, project implementation and monitoring;

viii. Support resource mobilization for the HPF Turkey;

ix. Produce reports, analysis and other documents as necessary to support decision-making, coordination, communication and resource mobilization activities;

x. Perform secretariat functions for the Advisory Board;

xi. 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 HPF Turkey procedures;

iii. Provide support to all HPF Turkey 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;

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;
xii. Ensure Financial Tracking Service (FTS) reporting as required.

Implementation of the HPF Turkey Accountability Framework:
i. Support and advise the DRHC 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 DRHC;
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 HPF Turkey operations.

4.6 Cluster Coordinators and Co-coordinators

22. Each cluster in the process of HPF Turkey will be coordinated by representatives from a cluster lead UN agency together with an NGO Cluster Co-coordinator.

23. Cluster coordinators support HPF Turkey at two levels: (i) at a strategic level, cluster leads should ensure that there are linkages between the fund, the SRP and cluster strategies; 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.

24. The Cluster coordinator and co-coordinators will undertake the following activities in relation to the HPF Turkey:
i. Facilitate all HPF Turkey related processes in consultation with cluster partners;
ii. Establish needs-based priorities for HPF Turkey funding in consultation with cluster partners;
iii. Facilitate cross-cluster coordination;
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 HPF Turkey 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 DRHC;

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 HPF Turkey procedures.

5. Eligibility, Capacity Assessment, Parameters and Modalities

5.1 Eligibility

25. Donor contributions to the HPF Turkey will be utilized to fund projects carried out by:
   - National Syrian and international Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs)
   - UN Organizations (UNOs) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM)

UN eligibility:

26. In order to become eligible for funding from the HPF Turkey, UN agencies and IOM must fill out the Registration Form on the Grants Management System (GMS) of the Fund (http://cbpf.unocha.org). UN agencies and IOM 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.

27. Once the registration and due diligence form (as applicable for UN agencies) duly filled out has been submitted; OCHA HFU will proceed with its review and approval.

NGO eligibility:

28. OCHA HFU will carry out capacity assessment of the potential implementing partners followed by a due diligence process. The capacity 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 HPF. The HPF prioritizes supporting Syrian NGOs in delivering humanitarian assistance to the Syria while developing their institutional, operational, and logistic capacity in a sustainable manner.

International NGO eligibility

29. International NGOs registered overseas or in Turkey are eligible to apply for the HPF. Strong emphasis is given to the INGOs establishing partnerships with Syrian NGOs in implementing projects and assisting them in building institutional and operational capacities in delivering humanitarian assistance to the people in need in Syria. INGOs also go through capacity assessment process to become an eligible HPF partner.

5.2 Capacity Assessment

30. In order to be considered as an eligible partner for funding, interested NGOs/INGOs must undergo a Capacity Assessment with OCHA Turkey. This is one of the major pillars of the HPF Risk Management and Accountability Frameworks (Annexes 5&6). Its main aim is to ensure that the HPF possesses the
necessary information about the capacities of the non-governmental partners that seek access to HPF funding in order to make an informed decision on the eligibility. The methodology of the capacity assessment process is available in Annexes section (under capacity assessment category) of this Manual.

31. Outcome of the capacity assessments determines partners risk level and it is a dynamic rating that can change over time through the interactions between the partner and OCHA and further assessments. Performance in the implementation of HPF projects can trigger changes in the risk level: timeliness of reporting, achievement of project objectives and targets, findings of audits, financial spot-checks and field monitoring visits, are all elements that influence the risk rating of partners.

Table 1: Risk Levels based on Capacity Assessment Scoring Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Scoring in Points</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Category A</td>
<td>81 - 100</td>
<td>Organisation is eligible as a Low Risk partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category B</td>
<td>61 - 80</td>
<td>Organisation is eligible as a Medium Risk partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category C</td>
<td>31 - 60</td>
<td>Organisation is eligible as a High Risk partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category D</td>
<td>0 – 30</td>
<td>Organization is not considered eligible. A new submission for capacity assessment can be considered by the HPF six (6) months after this review date.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Minimal Operational Modalities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RISK LEVEL</th>
<th>PROJECT DURATION (Months)</th>
<th>PROJECT VALUE</th>
<th>MAXIMUM AMOUNT PER PROJECT (USD)</th>
<th>Maximum total amount in Existing Contracts</th>
<th>DISBURSMENTS (in % of total)</th>
<th>REPORTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FINANCIAL EXpenditure Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH RISK</td>
<td>Less than 7</td>
<td>≤250</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>60-40</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥250</td>
<td>500,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>50-50</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Between 7-12</td>
<td>≤250</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>40-40-20</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥250</td>
<td>800,000</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>40-30-30</td>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIUM RISK</td>
<td>Less than 7</td>
<td>≤250</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>≥250</td>
<td>750,000</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>80-20</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(i) Capacity Assessment Application:

32. To become eligible for funding under the HPF Turkey, prospective Implementing Partners will initiate the capacity assessment process by filling out the Initial Application Form (Annex 3) and the Initial Application Checklist (Annex 2) and submit their completed application to the Grant Management System (GMS), together with the required documentation outlined in the Checklist (declarations and other documents).

33. The HFU will provide an information session on the capacity assessment process and training on the Grant Management System (GMS) prior to the application deadline.

34. The HFU will then conduct a review of the capacity assessment application and documents submitted. The assessment methodology will be comprised of a desk review of the documentation received from the organization, interviews with key informants and visits to the organization’s main office and sub-offices where interviews will be conducted with staff members, systems checked and additional documents requested.

35. The Capacity Assessment Tool is structured to cover seven areas with several sets of questions. The objective is to systematically review the institutional, technical, management, logistic and financial capacities of partners. Using a scoring and weighting system an overall ‘score’ will be given to partners/organizations.

36. Existing partners who received funds from the HPF Turkey at least for two allocations are able to re-apply for a capacity assessment if they want to upgrade their risk level category.

37. Eligible partners, based on the individual score obtained during the assessment, will be categorized in three risk-level categories (low-category A, medium-category B and high-category C). The score will
also determine the appropriate operational modalities (refer to table 2), control and reporting mechanisms that will be applicable to them as defined under the HPF Turkey Accountability Framework (Annex 5).

38. Partners who disqualify and considered ineligible for the HPF processes would be given another opportunity to fill in and submit Capacity Assessment applications to the HFU after 6 months. They will be provided a detailed feedback addressing areas to improve.

39. Prior to applying for the Capacity Assessment NGOs must address below points:
   i. Be an active partner of the coordination system and regularly attend at least one Sector Working Group and report to the 4Ws at least over last 6 months;
   ii. Be operational inside Syria with presence on the ground (or via implementing Syrian NGOs);
   iii. Be operating according to clearly articulated humanitarian principles;
   iv. Have a valid registration in Turkey and/or another country;
   v. Demonstrate a track record of working in partnership with donors, UN and International organizations; and;
   vi. Demonstrate a clear organizational structure and have the financial capacity to absorb funds.

5.3 Due Diligence Application

40. Due Diligence application is also part of the capacity assessment process. Partners must complete due diligence component to successfully pass the capacity assessment. Organisational information and documents on focal point, registration number, and banking details must be all submitted on GMS.

41. Any missing or inaccurate information on Due Diligence component will cause delays on the overall HPF allocation and contracting process. Please refer to the Due Diligence Application Instructions (Annex 8) for details. Partners will not be able to submit project proposals until Due Diligence Part is completed.

6. Allocation Process

6.1 Allocation criteria

42. The review and approval of project proposals is made in consultation with the clusters in line with the SRP and Allocation Paper objectives on the basis of the following criteria:

   vii. Partner eligibility and capacity: verified through a due diligence and capacity assessment process;
   viii. Access: accessibility and/or physical presence in areas of operation; the location of the project is clearly identified;
   ix. Strategic relevance: clear linkage to SRP and Allocation Paper objectives, compliance with the terms of the standard allocation as described in the allocation paper, and alignment of activities with areas of special focus of the Fund;
x. Needs-based: the needs are explained and documented, and beneficiaries are clearly described;

xi. Appropriateness: the activities are adequate to respond to the identified needs;

xii. 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;

xiii. Risk management: assumptions and risks are comprehensively and clearly spelled out, along with risk management strategies;

xiv. Monitoring: a realistic monitoring and reporting strategy is developed in the proposal.

xv. The HPF allocations will utilise the Inter Agency Steering Committee (IASC) Gender Marker to promote gender mainstreaming. This is a self-applied coding system that checks the extent to which gender equality measures have been integrated into project design. It recognizes that differences between women, men, boys and girls need to be described and logically connected through three key sections of a proposal: a). The need assessment (context/situation analysis), b) the activities and c) the outcomes. When this is done, a project is more likely to meet the different needs of men, women, boys and girls and contribute to greater equality;

xvi. In all clusters, HPF funding will prioritize projects achieving the highest gender marker code signifying that the project has made significant efforts to address gender concerns or the principal purpose of the project is to advance gender equality. 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;

xvii. The gender marker is only one tool used to promote gender equality. The HPF encourages the use of participatory approaches, involving affected communities (male and females) in needs assessment, implementation and monitoring and evaluation, fielding gender balanced assessment and monitoring teams, developing gender indicators and ensuring programming tools (surveys, strategies, objectives) are gender sensitive.
The **Humanitarian Pooled Fund** (HFP) is established to provide timely and flexible funding to deliver cross-border assistance to the affected Syrian population.

The **mission** of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) is to mobilize and coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action in partnership with national and international actors.

**Coordination Saves Lives**
6.2 Allocation parameters

43. The HPF allocation parameters are defined based on the Operational Handbook for CBPFs and are as follows:
   i. Project duration: maximum 12 months;
   ii. Grant amount will be determined and disbursed in tranches on the basis of the capacity assessment outcomes (project duration, partner capacity and risk levels, and in line with OCHA’s global guidelines for CBPFs);
   iii. Implementing partners can request project revisions and/or no-cost extension to re-program and/or extend the duration of the grant.

6.3 Allocation modalities

44. The HPF will have two options in terms of fund allocation modalities. A standard allocation (through a call for proposals) will be issued on a periodic basis at the discretion of the DRHC and linked to the priorities of the SRP. A reserve allocation (approximately 10% of the total fund) may be maintained to respond to unforeseen requirements.

6.4 Standard allocation paper and workflow

45. At the centre of the standard allocation is a standard allocation paper developed based on the agreed priorities of the SRP. The DRHC, supported by the HFU, utilizes existing coordination mechanisms and clusters 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.

46. The allocation paper includes information on:
   - Humanitarian context with a focus on how the allocation fits into the context;
   - Allocation paper and related priorities;
   - Total amount to be allocated;
   - Criteria for project prioritization (reflected in a prioritization matrix or “scorecard”);
   - Timeline.

47. The development of the allocation strategy paper is supported by OCHA through the HFU. The draft will be reviewed by the clusters and presented to the DRHC and AB for recommendations.
48. Steps of the standard allocation process include:

- Attend GMS Info Session
- Register on the GMS
- Submit Capacity Assessment Application via GMS
- Due Diligence Approval
- Submission of projects;
- Strategic / Technical Review;
- Financial Review;
- Final approval by DRHC;
- Disbursement.

49. 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 SRP 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Submission of proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Development and launch of Allocation Paper</td>
<td>* Clusters&lt;br&gt; * OCHA HFU&lt;br&gt; * DRHC&lt;br&gt; * AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Submission of full project proposal</td>
<td>* Implementing partner</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Strategic review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Strategic Review Committees use Scorecards to assess projects in their respective clusters and finalizes shortlist for recommendation to the DRHC.</td>
<td>* Cluster Coordinators&lt;br&gt; * HFU&lt;br&gt; * CCs&lt;br&gt; * RB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>DRHC preliminary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Projects shortlisted are submitted to the DRHC for approval and goes to the technical review.</td>
<td>* DRHC&lt;br&gt; * HFU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Step 4: Technical and financial review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Technical and financial review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Technical AND Budget Review</td>
<td>* Technical Review Committees/Cluster Coordinators * OCHA (HFU and FCS Finance Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Consolidation of financial and technical comments and submission to partner</td>
<td>* HFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Revision of proposal - max 3 times</td>
<td>* IPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 5: Final approval by HC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 5</th>
<th>Final approval by HC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 HFU prepares draft Grant Agreement and decides start date in consultation with partner, and consequent reporting timeline</td>
<td>* HFU 1 Day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 DRHC approves project and signs Grant Agreement; approved projects are shared with the AB for information</td>
<td>* DRHC 2 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Grant Agreement is shared with IP for counter-signature (date marks start of eligibility, and earliest possible date for start of project implementation)</td>
<td>* IPs 2 working days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Grant Agreement is signed by OCHA HQ</td>
<td>* OCHA FCS Finance Unit 2 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Step 6: Disbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 6</th>
<th>Disbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1 Following OCHA EO signature, first tranche of funding is disbursed to the partner</td>
<td>* OCHA FCS Finance Unit 10 working days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.5 Reserve allocation paper and workflow

50. The reserve allocation is intended for rapid and flexible allocation of funds in the event of unforeseen circumstances, emergencies, or contextually relevant needs (NFI, FSL, Health, logistics, etc.). The reserve will be used to provide an immediate response in areas not within the SRP 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 DRHC to trigger a reserve allocation. The necessity and size of the reserve allocation will be decided by the Advisory Board and the DRHC.

51. Steps of the reserve allocation process:

i. Submission of projects and review of strategic relevance;

ii. Technical and financial review;

iii. Final approval by HC;

iv. Disbursement.
Table 2: Reserve allocation workflow (with indicative number of days)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 1</th>
<th>Submission of proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Submission of proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Implementing partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>Review of strategic relevance using simple scorecard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* HFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Review Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Submission for technical review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* HFU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 2</th>
<th>Technical and financial review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Financial and technical review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* Technical Review Committees/Cluster Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* OCHA (HFU and FCS Finance Unit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Consolidation of financial and technical comments and submission to partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* HFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Revision of proposal - max 2 times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* IPs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 3</th>
<th>Final approval by HC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>DRHC approves project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* DRHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>HFU prepares draft Grant Agreement and decides start date in consultation with partner, and consequent reporting timeline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* HFU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>DRHC signs Grant Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* DRHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Grant Agreement is shared with IP for counter-signature (date marks start of eligibility, and earliest possible date for start of project implementation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* IP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Grant Agreement is signed by OCHA Executive Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* OCHA FCS Finance Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* OCHA ASB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step 4</th>
<th>Disbursement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Following OCHA EO signature, first tranche of funding is disbursed to the partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* OCHA FCS Finance Unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 Project Proposal Submission

52. All project proposals should be submitted via Grant Management System (GMS). GMS registration is obligatory for all eligible partners prior to the project proposal submission. GMS is a web-based platform that supports the management of the entire grant life cycle for the HPF.  https://cbpf.unocha.org/
53. Once you complete your registration on the GMS, please login to CBPF GMS Support portal and read instructions on how to submit a project proposal. https://gms.unocha.org/CBPFsupportPortal/index.html

54. Project proposals should be prepared in line with the strategic objectives of the SRP and the Allocation Paper. This needs to be supported by clear log frames with outcomes, outputs, SMART indicators and detailed activities. (Please refer to Annex 10 for a sample Project Proposal Template).

55. Project proposals must be submitted via GMS on the due date outlined on the allocation paper by COB 17.30 (Turkish time). Late project proposals will not be accepted.

56. Organisations should consult with relevant cluster coordinators during the project proposal preparation phase.

7.1 Budget Preparation

57. All project proposals must have a detailed budget outlining all the project related expenditures under relevant budget lines. Please refer to Annex 18 Project Budget Template and Annex 8 Budget Checklist for further details.

58. Budget proposals must reflect the correct and fair budget breakdown of the planned costs and clearly outline units, quantities and percentages. Partners should avoid including only lump sum amounts and provide bill of quantities (BoQs) including list of items and costs per item to total the unit cost for the planned expenditures.

59. Provide a budget narrative (as an essential component of the budget) that clearly explains the object and the rationale of any budget line. For example, shared costs, large/expensive assets, and costs/equipment required to support the regular operation of the implementing partner, are clear cases where the provision of details will be necessary in the budget narrative.

60. Project proposals with missing financial and budgeting information (no bill of quantities or without clear budget lines) will not make it to the strategic review stage and project proposal will be eliminated.

61. For further guidance on budgeting (eligible and ineligible costs, direct or indirect costs) please also refer to the Operational Handbook for CBPF pages 35-39.

7.2 Start date and eligibility of expenditure

62. 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 DRHC can then sign the grant agreement.

63. Upon signature by the DRHC, 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 FCS Finance Unit in New York for the final signature. Eligibility of expenditures will be determined by the date of DRHC`s and implementing partner’s signatures of the grant agreement.

7.3 Procurement Procedures

64. For the procurement of goods and services “Best Value for Money” principle has to be observed. Please refer to Annex 16 for the procurement Guidelines.

8 Revision request

65. 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 DRHC.

66. 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 DRHC.

67. The HFU Turkey team should immediately be informed by the implementing partners in case of any unexpected incident or problem which impact the nature of the project (due to the insecurity or inaccessibility).

9 Budget Revision

68. 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 DRHC.

69. Budget revisions cannot be higher than the total budget originally approved by the DRHC.

70. Revision requests are submitted and processed through the GMS. Please contact HPF team prior to submitting your revision request (ochahpf@un.org ).
10 Monitoring and Reporting (financial and programmatic)

71. Implementing partners to HFP Turkey 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. The role of HFP Turkey management is to collect, organize and provide quality control of the information that has been generated through these mechanisms.

72. The Implementing partners (UN Agencies and NGOs) have to share their HPF funded project and other associated evaluation reports with the OCHA HFU when available.

73. The HFU will design context-appropriate monitoring methodologies and apply them based on the Operational Modalities. The DRHC will be responsible for ensuring that a representative sample of projects funded under a HFU 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.

74. The Implementing Partner shall submit on regular basis an Expenditure Statement depending on the Risk Level and depending on the start date. (pls. Refer to Annex 11)

75. Disbursement requests for the 2nd and subsequent instalments have to be done through GMS. For this the Implementing Partner has send a request by mail once 70 % of the first instalment is spent. HPF Turkey Finance Team will open the system in GMS for the financial disbursement report for the 2nd/3rd instalment/disbursement.

76. Reporting timelines are determined according to each partner’s risk level and indicated in the grant agreement. Both financial and narrative reporting is conducted over GMS.

**HPF Reporting Requirements for NGO Implementing Partners and UN Agencies/IOM in line with HPF MoU**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UN Agencies and IOM</th>
<th>Programmatic Reporting</th>
<th>Financial Reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reporting to be undertaken in accordance with rules and requirements of the Administrative Agent:</td>
<td>- Uncertified financial reports together with submission of progress and final narrative reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- If the duration of the project is between 7-12 months progress report at project mid-term (two months after project mid-term point is reached)</td>
<td>- Annual financial statements and reports as of 31 December by 31 January of the following year. Interim financial statements will be submitted every calendar year until the submission of the final financial statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Final narrative report at project end (three months after project end)</td>
<td>- Certified final financial statements and final</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- how funding has been allocated in relation to key humanitarian events</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Coordination Saves Lives | www.humanitarianresponse.info/operations/stima/hpf"
### 11 Audits

77. UN agencies and IOM are subject to internal oversight audit systems and other mechanisms established by their respective governing bodies. NGOs partners receiving funds from CBPF are subject to external audit by the Fund.

78. For further details on the auditing please see page 33-34 of the *Operational Handbook for Country-Based Pooled Funds (CBPFs)*. Document can be accessed from below link:


### 12 Information

79. Periodic updates and annual report: To ensure continuous and sufficient information sharing stakeholders, OCHA will generate periodic dashboards and one annual report on the achievements, challenges and funding trends of the HPF Turkey, which will be available on STIMA website. These reports will not disclose information that may put implementing partners or affected population at risk.

80. Complaint mechanism: The following email address, ochahpf@un.org, is available to receive feedback from stakeholders who believe they have been treated incorrectly or unfairly during any of the HPF Turkey processes. OCHA will compile, review, address and (if necessary) raise the issues to the DRHC, who will then take a decision on necessary action.

81. Relevant OCHA policies and guidelines on CPBFs can be found at

   http://www.humanitarianresponse.info/operations/stima/hpf

   Contacts: ochahpf@un.org
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