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At the outset of 2016, many of us hoped that the year would bring positive change for civilians across South Sudan who had borne the brunt of more than two years of horrific civil war. Instead, the conflict deepened and spread, reaching areas previously considered stable and uprooting hundreds of thousands of people from their homes. Food insecurity and malnutrition rose to unprecedented levels, and civilians continued to endure horrendous violations, with rape an abhorrent and repeated feature of the conflict.

With needs across the country rapidly rising, humanitarian partners worked day and night to reach people with life-saving assistance and protection, including in some of the most remote locations. Rather than folding under the pressure of multiple simultaneous crises, we came together—coordinating rather than competing, and striving to reach as many people in need as possible, as quickly as possible.

Within this context, the South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF) was an important catalyst for fast, coordinated and effective humanitarian action. Under the SSHF Advisory Board’s stewardship, we allocated US$81.3 million to 211 projects implemented by 67 partners across the country throughout the year, making the SSHF the fourth largest donor to the 2016 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP).

Faced with a sharp decline in donor contributions, we responded by bolstering our collective prioritization, ensuring that funds were directed to the most time-critical and life-saving projects. Recognizing that our partners were faced with onerous operational demands as the crisis grew, we lightened and streamlined SSHF processes, making the Fund more nimble, user-friendly and efficient. We also benefitted from an unanticipated return of funds unspent from previous SSHF allocations, which enabled us to allocate funds well beyond the contributions we received.

Our two standard allocations provided a vital injection of funding to the most urgent activities under the 2016 HRP, although our timeliness was hampered by delays in contributions. Given the decrease in contributions, I was circumspect in my use of the reserve. However, we were able to support the rapid scale-up of the response in Wau in June and, when additional funds became available late in the year, we moved quickly to fund the procurement of life-saving supplies for the Greater Equatoria response.

Inspired by the Grand Bargain adopted at the World Humanitarian Summit, we worked intensively in 2016 to support frontline responders and promote efficiency in the humanitarian operation. Some 12 per cent of SSHF funding in 2016 (up from 11 per cent in 2015 and 8 per cent in 2014) was allocated to 24 national NGOs (up from 22 in 2015 and 16 in 2014), and an estimated 85 per cent of all resources allocated by the SSHF benefitted the NGO community, either through direct funding for frontline activities or supplies and common services provided in-kind by UN agencies. We drastically reduced ‘pass-through’ funding, with a view to eliminating it entirely by 2017.

As we look toward 2017, I would like to thank all the partners who have contributed to the continued success of the SSHF, and particularly our generous donors without whom the SSHF would not exist. However, I would be remiss if I did not close by appealing for our supporters to increase their contributions in 2017. Needs are continuing to rise and the SSHF is well-placed to ensure that the humanitarian response is swift, effective and coordinated.

Eugene Owusu
Humanitarian Coordinator for South Sudan
The South Sudan Humanitarian Fund 2016 at a Glance

**Allocations (US$)**
- 81.3M

**Contributions (US$)**
- 58.2M

**People Reached**
- 1.8M

**Allocations by Response Type**
- $47.1M Frontline services
- $24.5M Core pipelines
- $9.7M Logistics and common services

**People Assisted by Sex & Age**
- 1.8 million people reached
  - Boys: 32%
  - Girls: 23%
  - Men: 25%
  - Women: 20%

**Number of Projects**
- 211

**Number of Partners**
- 67

**SSHF as a % of HRP Funding**
- 7.5%

**Allocations by Location**
- $29.2 million
  - 2nd standard allocation round
  - $38.7 million
  - 1st standard allocation round
  - $13.4 million
  - Reserve allocations

**Allocations by Agency Type**
- INGOs: $30.0 million
  (94 allocations)
- UN: $41.3 million
  (58 allocations)
- NNGOs: $10 million
  (59 allocations)

**Total Allocations**
- $81.3 million

**Contributions to SSHF (US$)**
- 58.2M

**Cluster Allocations (US$)**
- Nutrition: 14.1M
  - 17%
- WASH: 13.4M
  - 16%
- Health: 11.9M
  - 15%
- ES/NFI: 10.1M
  - 12%
- Logistics: 9.1M
  - 11%
- FSL: 8.8M
  - 10%
- Protection: 6.8M
  - 8%
- Education: 4.3M
  - 5%
- ETC: 0.7M
  - 1%

*In addition to donor contributions of $58M, there was $22.2M available from carry over, and $13.3M available from refunds, in the SSHF during 2016. Refunds include $11.5 million of unutilized amounts or ineligible expenditures from NGO projects implemented between 2012 and 2015.
In 2016, the humanitarian crisis deepened and spread, affecting people in areas previously considered stable and exhausting the coping capacity of those already impacted. At year end, 7.5 million people were in need of humanitarian assistance.

The proliferation and expansion of the conflict in South Sudan beyond the Greater Upper Nile to new locations, including the Greater Equatoria region and Western Bahr el Ghazal, left one in four people uprooted, with 1.9 million people internally displaced, and more than 1.4 million refugees in neighbouring countries by year’s end.

Civilians continued to face horrific violations, including widespread sexual violence and recruitment of children by armed actors. In the first half of the year, fighting—including violations against civilians—was reported in Wau town and surrounding areas in Western Bahr El Ghazal, Malakal in Upper Nile, Pibor in Jonglei, Mundri and Yambio in Western Equatoria, and Lobonok and Terekeka in Central Equatoria. Then, in July 2016, clashes erupted in South Sudan’s capital city, Juba, sparking an escalation of conflict in multiple other locations, including in the Greater Equatoria region and Unity.

Hunger and malnutrition reached unprecedented levels, with some 4.8 million people severely food insecure at the height of the lean season, including 40,000 facing Catastrophic (IPC Phase 5) conditions. In several locations, global acute malnutrition rates were nearly, or more than, twice the emergency threshold. Health conditions deteriorated, with cases of malaria, measles and acute respiratory infections surpassing those in 2015, and the cholera outbreak declared in June 2016 continuing as of December.

In the face of rising needs, the operating environment remained challenging and dangerous. Following the outbreak of conflict in Juba in July, there was a spike in humanitarian access challenges, with an average of nearly 88 access incidents reported per month in the second half of the year, compared to around 63 in the first half. Twenty-four aid workers were killed in 2016.

For more information, see the 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview: http://bit.ly/2i5HpEA
Donors contributed $58 million to the SSHF in 2016. This was significantly less overall than in 2015, and less was deposited in the first half of the year compared to 2015, delaying disbursement to some dry season projects.

Thirteen donors, including three participating for the first time, contributed to the SSHF over the course of the year, up from 11 in 2015 and 10 in 2014. The United Kingdom remained the biggest contributor (US$19.5 million), followed by Norway ($8.1 million), Sweden ($7.3 million) and the Netherlands ($6.8 million). Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Luxembourg, Republic of Korea and Switzerland collectively contributed $16 million, with Canada, Luxembourg and Republic of Korea contributing for the first time.

However, despite the increase in donors to the SSHF, donor contributions in 2016 were 41 per cent less than in 2015 and the lowest since the inception of the fund in 2012. This meant that the SSHF dropped from being the highest funded humanitarian country-based pooled fund (CRPF) globally in 2015 to the sixth highest funded in 2016, behind Yemen ($107 million), Iraq ($102 million), Turkey ($66 million), Afghanistan ($62 million) and Ethiopia ($59 million).

As with 2015, there were sizeable contributions to the SSHF from March to May ($23.8 million in 2016 compared to $19.3 million in 2015). However, the SSHF encountered several challenging trends in contributions, including: diminished investment in the fund at the outset of the year ($3.3 million received in January 2016 vs $20.4 million in January 2015); delayed funding in the second half of the year (main contributions in August 2016 versus June 2015); and diminished contributions in the final quarter ($4.6 million received in 2016 versus $23.4 million in 2015). As a result, the SSHF relied upon carryover from 2015 ($22.2 million) and unanticipated refunds received in August 2016 ($11.5 million) to remain a key contributor to the humanitarian response in South Sudan.
The SSHF allocated $81.3 million during 2016 to 211 top priority projects under the Humanitarian Response Plan, agreed on through rigorous collective prioritization.

In 2016, the SSHF continued to be an important provider of timely funding to address the most urgent priorities within the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP):

- 84 per cent of funds ($67.9 million) were allocated through two standard allocation rounds, and 16 per cent ($13.4 million) through the reserve window.
- 58 per cent of the funds ($47.1 million) supported frontline activities, 30 per cent ($24.5 million) the procurement and delivery of common core pipeline supplies, and 12 per cent ($9.7 million) the provision of common services.
- 51 per cent of the funds ($41.3 million) went to UN agencies (including $34.2 million for core pipelines and common services), while 37 per cent went to international NGOs ($30 million) and 12 per cent to national NGOs ($10 million).

**Standard allocations injected critical funds to priority HRP projects**

Two standard allocation rounds were carried out in 2016, each of which entailed extensive prioritization through inter-cluster and cluster-specific discussions. In January 2016, $38.7 million was allocated to 57 top priority HRP projects. However, delays in expected contributions meant that some projects were unable to commence until well into the second quarter, diminishing the ability to capitalize on the dry season for pre-positioning and delivery of supplies. In August 2016, $29.2 million was allocated to 90 collectively-prioritized HRP projects, providing a vital injection of funding for the response to the escalation of conflict and displacement precipitated by the eruption of fighting in South Sudan’s capital, Juba, in July 2016.

**Reserve allocations enabled rapid response to new needs**

The reserve modality was used twice in 2016 – compared to five times in 2015 - to meet time-critical and urgent needs. The first reserve allocation was carried out following the outbreak of fighting in and around Wau town in Western Bahr El Ghazal in June, which displaced tens of thousands of people. The SSHF provided $2.4 million to support urgent scale-up of the response, including deployment of mobile response teams and life-saving supplies. Subsequently, in December, following clashes and rapidly rising needs in the Greater Equatoria region, the SSHF allocated $11 million for procurement and transportation of vital core pipeline supplies to support the expansion of the response.

**Robust prioritization meant SSHF funds targeted people most in need**

In the face of a deepening and spreading crisis and diminishing resources, humanitarian partners intensively prioritized SSHF allocations in 2016.

The geographical distribution of funding shifted from 2015, reflecting the expansion of the conflict. Around 57 per cent...
went to Greater Upper Nile (vs 79 per cent in 2015), while 25 per cent was allocated to the Greater Equatoria region (vs 7.5 per cent in 2015), and 18 per cent to Greater Bahr el Ghazal (vs nearly 14 per cent in 2015). For Western Bahr El Ghazal, Western Equatoria and Eastern Equatoria, funding increased more than ten-fold compared to 2015.

SSHF funding was prioritized for the most urgent and life-saving activities. This included, wherever possible, funding of multi-sectoral interventions such as inter-agency survival kits, integrated treatment of acute malnutrition, and support for survivors of gender-based violence. The highest-funded sectors were: Nutrition (17 per cent), WASH (16 per cent), Health (15 per cent), ES/NFI (12 per cent), FSL (10 per cent) and Protection (8 per cent). In addition, the SSHF supported interventions with multi-sectoral impact, including Education in Emergencies (5 per cent) activities, recognizing the role of schools as zones for peace and protection, and communication with communities in camps through CCCM activities. The SSHF also invested in logistics (11 per cent) to facilitate the transportation of supplies and aid workers, and emergency telecommunications (1 per cent) to ensure connectivity in key field locations.

Funding to front-line actors was prioritized

In 2016, the proportional amount of SSHF funding allocated to front-line actors grew, with international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) and national NGOs (NNGOs) directly receiving 49 per cent ($40 million) of the allocated funds, up from 41 per cent in 2015. In addition, of the $41.3 million allocated to the UN, nearly 83 per cent ($34.2 million) funded the procurement of core pipeline supplies and system-wide enablers for which the end users were predominantly NGOs. Both the number of NNGOs receiving funding (24 in 2016, up from 22 in 2015), and percentage of funding allocated to NNGOs (12 per cent in 2016, up from 11 per cent in 2015) increased.

“Every time I thought of going to the communal latrine I would be stressed. Now, I’m not afraid because the family latrine is accessible at all times. I use it even at night. I am very grateful to the SSHF and World Vision for this blessing.” - Julia, Wau Shilluk

The SSHF provided an important source of funding for the HRP

The SSHF remained the fourth largest source of funding for the South Sudan HRP in 2016, after the United States of America (38.6 per cent), the United Kingdom (13.4 per cent) and the European Commission (11.5 per cent). The amount allocated through the SSHF ($81.3 million) was around 7.5 per cent of all funding secured for the HRP ($1.1 billion). The SSHF also played a significant role in meeting HRP partners’ funding requirements: 58 per cent of partners (67 of 116) with projects in the HRP received SSHF funding. SSHF funding was particularly important for national NGOs, accounting for 81 per cent of all funding secured by national NGOs with projects in the HRP (up from 72 per cent in 2015), 17 per cent of HRP funding secured by international NGOs (up from 10 per cent in 2015), and 5 per cent of HRP funding secured by UN agencies (down from 7 per cent in 2015).

SSHF allocations were coordinated with, and complementary to, other funding streams

In 2016, efforts continued to maximize complementarity between the SSHF and other funding sources, including the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) and bilateral donors. In the first quarter of 2016, the CERF allocated $15
Helping girls continue their education during crisis

Nyayuot Khor Keah, from Pathiel village in Khol payam in Nyal, Unity is one of only a few female students who attend upper primary school, thanks to an SSHF-funded education project implemented by Mercy Corps.

Aged 15, Nyayuot has faced numerous obstacles to continuing her education, including peer pressure, insecurity, having to travel the long distance to Nyal town to attend classes, and the lack of available teachers. Her commitment and determination have helped her to stay on track and now, through the SSHF-funded education project, she is able to enjoy learning from qualified teachers and alongside dedicated classmates.

The education project has established two new temporary learning spaces, renovated two existing classrooms, and distributed learning and teaching materials to pupils, including exercise books, pens, mathematics sets, and school bags. This support, as well as witnessing the efforts of other pupils from poor families like hers, has given Nyayuot the motivation to continue with her education. Determined to sit for her primary eight (P.8) basic examinations in 2017, Nyayuot said: “My classmates and I will sit exams in 2017 with this support and inspiration, we shall make it”.

The number of girls achieving secondary education in South Sudan is half the number of boys. This project and others like it are a lifeline for girls who are otherwise at risk of child marriage, which has increased due to the economic crisis.
2016 saw the fine-tuning of multiple aspects of the SSHF, including as envisaged in the Grand Bargain, enabling it to deliver on globally-agreed pooled fund outcomes and principles.

This included: leveraging the role of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC); enhancing collective prioritization; engaging front-line responders; increasing efficiency in the humanitarian operation; streamlining SSHF processes; ensuring flexibility in a highly volatile context; managing the risks of the SSHF portfolio; and increasing accountability. However, the SSHF also faced important challenges during the year, particularly as a result of delayed and diminished contributions, which impacted the timeliness and flexibility of SSHF funding.

**Leveraging and strengthening the role of the Humanitarian Coordinator**

In the face of increasing humanitarian needs, the SSHF fortified the leadership of the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC). Overseeing allocations amounting to $81.3 million—representing 7.5 per cent of all funding secured for the HRP and its fourth largest funding source—the HC, supported by the Advisory Board, was able to drive prioritization and incentivize efficiency, effectiveness and multi-sectoral collaboration.

The decrease in contributions to the SSHF in 2016 diminished the ability of the HC to call for reserve allocations in response to new crises, with two reserve allocations in 2016 compared to five in 2015. The HC was, however, still able to utilize the reserve to important effect, injecting vital funding at critical junctures. The Wau reserve allocation was launched immediately after the HC visited the area in June 2016, enabling timely scale-up in the response to displacement and destruction. Likewise, the reserve allocation in December facilitated the procurement of supplies to scale-up the response to mass displacement and rapidly rising needs in the Equatorias.

**Enhancing collective prioritization**

Allocation processes were refined in 2016 to make prioritization more robust and increase collective buy-in for agreed priorities. Inter-cluster peer reviews were introduced, enhancing complementarities across clusters, and strengthening consideration of cross-cutting issues, such as gender.
part i: fund performance: effectiveness & accountability

The inter-cluster reviews pushed clusters to question one another’s strategies, explore integrated approaches, and agree on top priorities for submission to the Advisory Board and HC. SSHF prioritization processes edified wider coordination, building on the severity mapping undertaken in the Humanitarian Needs Overview, and the activity-based and geographical prioritization undertaken by clusters through the Humanitarian Response Plan.

Engaging frontline responders

The SSHF promoted the role of frontline responders in humanitarian action, in line with global commitments under the Grand Bargain endorsed at the World Humanitarian Summit in May 2016. Allocation strategies emphasized the importance of direct funding to implementing organizations, precluding ‘pass-through’ funds unless exceptionally justified. Some 12 per cent of SSHF funding in 2016 (up from 11 per cent in 2015 and 8 per cent in 2014) was allocated to 24 national NGOs (up from 22 in 2015 and 16 in 2014), and an estimated 85 per cent of all resources allocated by the SSHF benefitted the NGO community, either directly or through supplies and common services provided in-kind by UN agencies. National NGOs were represented on the SSHF Advisory Board, and support and advice was provided to NGOs during capacity assessments, monitoring, financial spot checks, audits and trainings, to assist them in accessing the fund. Open ‘clinics’ were held to support and enhance partners’ financial management capabilities.

Streamlining SSHF processes

Processes throughout the Fund cycle were lightened and shortened as compared to previous years, based on stakeholder feedback gathered through structured ‘lesson learning’ exercises. The time from release of the allocation strategy paper to the HC’s approval of project proposals was reduced from 42 working days for the first standard allocation to 34 for the second; and from 22 days for the first reserve allocation to 18 for the second. The time taken for contracting and first disbursement for NGO projects improved from 23 days for the first standard allocation to 15 days for both the first reserve and second standard allocation.

Ensuring flexibility in a highly volatile context

The SSHF strived to ensure that flexibility and the re-calibration of projects facing extenuating circumstances was accompanied and offset by good project management. In 2016, 13 per cent (27 of 211) of SSHF-funded projects were revised, down from 14 per cent (26 of 184) in 2015 and 55 per cent (109 of 197) in 2014. The continued decrease in the percentage of projects facing revisions reflected efforts to enhance project cycle management, including early follow-up with partners facing challenges and continued application of the Standard Operating Procedure requiring exceptional justification for late revision requests. Most of the project revisions in 2016 occurred in the latter half of the year, following the crisis in Juba in July, which significantly disrupted procurement and transportation of supplies and staffing around the country. Two-thirds of the revisions involved no-cost extensions, while the remainder involved budget realignment or reprogramming of activities. As in 2015, around half of all revisions were due to insecurity and access challenges. The
remained were caused by escalating inflation, staffing issues and other programmatic impediments. Project revisions were completed in 19 working days on average, including review and endorsement by the cluster and the SSHF TS prior to HC approval.

“Children who come to the SSHF-funded child-friendly space easily reintegrate with host communities.”

- UNIDO Child Protection Officer

Managing the risks in the SSHF portfolio

In 2016, progress was made in risk management at both the strategic and operational levels. The SSHF Operational Manual was finalized, reflecting global guidance for Country-Based Pooled Funds and setting out the parameters of the SSHF accountability framework. As part of the finalization of the manual, the SSHF Risk Management Framework was updated, identifying risks to meeting the objectives of the Fund and corresponding mitigating actions. The SSHF also addressed policy-related recommendations from the UN Inter-Agency Audit of the governance of the SSHF conducted in 2015.

During the year, two outstanding cases of concern involving NGO projects from previous years were brought to closure: a small write-off was effected in the case of one partner that ceased to exist as a result of the conflict; and the final audit report of another partner confirmed financial statements to be in order. In addition, 15 capacity assessments of NGO partners were carried out under the UN’s Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers (HACT), including seven with a materiality risk (based on cumulative budget amount) and eight to follow up on queries from the 2015 audits. Two NNGOs were assessed as representing ‘significant’ risk in terms of ability to execute a programme or project in accordance with the work plan, nine (four NNGOs and five INGOs) as ‘moderate’ risk and four (one NNGOs and three INGOs) as ‘low’ risk. Follow-up assurance activities were conducted in line with the assessed risk, including monitoring visits, financial spot checks and audits. Beyond the HACT assessments, 133 financial spot checks were undertaken in 2016 to assess the accuracy of financial records submitted by NGO partners, confirm that reported expenditures were in accordance with work plans, assess any significant changes to the partners’ internal controls, and review implementation of recommendations from capacity assessments. The SSHF TS also worked with partners to improve financial management and the rigour of financial, administrative and procurement controls.

External audits of 195 NGO projects were completed in 2016 through two audit rounds. There were no audit reports containing qualified or adverse opinions. However, the delayed submission of reports was a recurring finding and is being addressed with partners. Ineligible expenditures or unspent balances amounting to $786,715 were identified in relation to 43 allocations, and refunds amounting to $296,709 were received from partners in relation to 29 allocations. Allocations to UN agencies are not audited through the SSHF TS, but provide annual certified financial statements and reports.

Promoting efficiency in humanitarian action

The SSHF promoted operational and financial efficiencies, including by: supporting core pipelines under the stewardship of UN Cluster Lead Agencies, maximizing procurement value-for-money by buying, transporting and pre-positioning humanitarian supplies in-bulk; funding common services and promoting joint planning to optimize movements of cargo and passengers; vetting cluster strategies and project proposals to ensure competitiveness and consistency; analysing the feasibility of both cluster strategies and individual project proposals, based on an honest assessment of security and access conditions; and promoting a combination of delivery modalities—including static response, mobile teams, and survival kits—best-suited to each response.

Promoting high performance

The SSHF Partner Performance Index (PPI) was utilized effectively in 2016, combining data on each partner’s submission of proposals, project implementation and reporting. PPI results incentivized performance by influencing funding decisions, and informed grant management. There was an increase in the percentage of SSHF funds going to high-performing partners in 2016, with 89 per cent ($72.6 million) allocated to partners with good or very good performance, compared to just over 60 per cent ($55.5 million) in 2015. Some $5.1 million (6 per cent) was allocated to partners with average performance, based on programmatic necessity, and $3.5 million (4 per cent) to partners assessed as underperforming, following exceptional justification due to their unique position to address certain needs. Underperforming partners were required to undertake additional monitoring and reporting, ensuring that risks were managed while providing an opportunity to demonstrate improved performance.

Various measures—including capacity and performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Figures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>74 projects monitored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>133 financial spot checks conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>195 audits conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>128 narrative reports submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307 financial reports submitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessment, interrogation of feasibility of strategies and projects, thorough review of revision requests, and strengthened monitoring and reporting - promoted high utilization rates of funds disbursed. By 31 December, 91 per cent of funds allocated under the first standard allocation ($35.2 million of $38.7 million) had been spent; 46 per cent under the second standard allocation ($13.4 million of $29.2 million); and 63 per cent under the first reserve allocation ($1.5 million of $2.4 million). Utilization under the second reserve window was minimal as the allocation of $11 million was made in December.

Of $40 million allocated to 153 NGO projects, 66 per cent ($26.5 million) had been utilized by December 2016, the balance pertaining mainly to 61 projects funded under the second standard allocation for which implementation will be completed at the beginning of 2017.

Of $41.3 million allocated to 58 UN agency projects, 57 per cent ($23.6 million) had been spent by December 2016, the balance pertaining mainly to 19 projects funded under the second standard allocation and 12 under the second reserve allocation, for which implementation will be completed at the beginning of 2017.

**Increasing accountability**

New and streamlined monitoring and reporting arrangements were introduced in 2016, building on lessons learned, consultations with clusters and partners, and audit recommendations. The team of Monitoring and Reporting Specialists was relocated to work under the direct supervision of the SSHF TS, allowing for more efficient, flexible, and independent monitoring. The relocation enabled a downsizing of the Monitoring and Reporting team from eight specialists to four, as each specialist was able to support multiple clusters. Monitoring plans were updated following each allocation, prioritizing higher-risk projects and partners.

New remote monitoring modalities were introduced during the year, with the outbreak of conflict in Juba and temporary relocation of the SSHF TS team prompting innovation. In 2016, 74 SSHF projects were monitored by the team. This included: 14 projects funded in 2015 that were ongoing in 2016, bringing the monitoring coverage of the 2015 project portfolio to 33 per cent; and 60 projects funded in 2016, representing 28 per cent of the 2016 portfolio. Further monitoring is planned in 2017 for ongoing projects funded in 2016.

Training for partners strengthened both the timeliness and quality of narrative reporting, with 128 narrative reports submitted out of 137 due (93 per cent), and 308 financial reports out of 359 due (86 per cent), by the end of the year.

**Minimizing management and administrative costs**

Management and administrative costs were maintained at the same level as 2015 ($5.4 million), but accounted for a slightly higher percentage (6 per cent) of funds available due to the decrease in the size of the Fund. Programme Support Costs for UNDP South Sudan in its role as Managing Agent for NGO projects accounted for 51 per cent of management and administrative costs; OCHA’s Humanitarian Financing Unit 30 per cent; fees to the Multi-Partner Trust Fund Office as Administrative Agent 12 per cent; and costs for external audits 7 per cent.

“At the centre, I was accepted by other women, I heard their stories which made me feel I was not alone. The women invited me to join them to get firewood to sell to buy food. I found comfort in coming to the center.”

- A widowed woman supported by the IMC centre in Kodok funded by SSHF.
The SSHF fostered quality programming throughout the fund cycle, promoting gender mainstreaming, ensuring the centrality of protection, and strengthening accountability to affected people.

**Gender**

Gender was a primary consideration in both standard allocations and reserve allocations, with 4 per cent ($3.3 million) of SSHF-funded projects focused on advancing gender equality and a further 80 per cent ($65 million) contributing significantly to gender equality. Just 5 per cent ($3.9 million) of funding went to projects designed to contribute in only a limited way to gender equality, while 11 per cent ($9.1 million) went to projects providing support services which were not ranked through the gender marker.

Inter-cluster prioritization processes highlighted gender as a cross-cutting concern, as well as calling for a specific focus on gender. The second reserve allocation for the Greater Equatoria region, for example, prioritized response to gender-based violence, support to women’s reproductive health, and maintaining women’s dignity during displacement and crisis. Through this allocation, the SSHF funded the procurement and transportation of reproductive health kits—including post-exposure prophylaxis for survivors of sexual violence—and dignity kits, a basic package of supplies for women (bag, t-shirt, kanga, underwear, reusable sanitary pads, solar flashlight, slippers and soap). The first reserve allocation provided funding for the establishment of clinical management of rape services following horrific reports of sexual violence in and around Wau.

The SSHF advanced gender representation within cluster strategies and prioritized projects. This included the promotion of equal representation of women and men in community leadership structures within camp settings, as well as in Parent-Teacher Associations (PTAs) and School Management Committees (SMCs). Nutrition partners encouraged men to become more engaged in Counselling for Infant and Young Child Feeding, and formed mother-to-mother support groups. SSHF-funded projects also enabled the recruitment of additional female facilitators and teachers and supported training on gender mainstreaming for health professionals.

The SSHF ensured gender-sensitivity in selected projects. Special consideration was given to the provision of safe, segregated latrines, and SSHF partners adjusted their projects to take into account feedback from community members to become more gender-sensitive. For example, the ES-NFI cluster adjusted the items distributed to include kanga, a key ask from women. Women and girl friendly spaces were established, allowing those most at risk to access information about rights and restore self-esteem and dignity. Partners disaggregated data by sex and age to inform decision-making and project design, monitoring and reporting.

**Protection and accountability to affected people**

As the protection crisis in South Sudan grew, the SSHF acted as a catalyst in driving forward the HRP’s call for the Centrality of Protection in the humanitarian response, promoting specific protection initiatives, as well as mainstreaming protection concerns in cluster strategies and projects.

Substantial progress was made in two-way communication with affected communities. CCCM partners strengthened community feedback and reporting mechanisms, complemented by communications campaigns to increase information and awareness about services available. Nutrition partners established feedback and complaints mechanisms as part of their projects, and ensured that members of affected communities were involved in planning, monitoring and implementation. Health partners were encouraged to institute formal mechanisms for community feedback on the assistance provided. Approaches were embedded through monitoring, including of community reactions, and the documentation of good practices. WASH beneficiaries were consulted during project planning, and committees were established to support project implementation.

Drawing on lessons learned, the SSHF promoted conflict sensitivity to ensure civilians were not placed at heightened risk by humanitarian action. The ES-NFI Cluster worked with protection partners ahead of distributions to ensure that arrangements did not increase exposure to attack or violence. Training initiatives and distributions under the FSL Cluster placed emphasis on reducing the potential risks of GBV and looting faced by women as a result of the location and timing of activities.

The SSHF also helped build protection sensitivity and capacity. Education partners trained teachers and members of PTAs and SMCs on child protection, including the use of referral pathways to ensure children at-risk received the support they required. The Protection Cluster strengthened community-based child protection networks, and the participation of caregivers for unaccompanied and separated children in the implementation of community-based psychosocial support activities.
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CHALLENGES & LESSONS LEARNED

Delayed and diminished funding, proliferation and spread of conflict, and rising inflation all presented challenges to the implementation of SSHF projects in 2016.

From the inception of the Fund in 2012 to 2015, the lowest level of donor contributions was $92 million in 2013. In contrast, just $58 million was contributed to the Fund in 2016. This substantial decline in contributions came against a backdrop of rapidly rising humanitarian needs, and was compounded by delays in the receipt of anticipated contributions. In the final quarter of 2015, after reviewing available and expected funding, the SSHF Advisory Board decided to adopt a ‘two-tranche’ approach to the first standard allocation for 2016. The first tranche consisted of $20.3 million of the highest priority projects, to be funded with contributions available in the SSHF. The second tranche was $18.4 million of high priority projects to be funded once anticipated contributions became available. However, these contributions came far later than expected, meaning that some of the projects in the first standard allocation did not receive funding until well into the second quarter of 2016. This experience reinforced the importance of early deposits to the SSHF (November to February being particularly critical) to ensure that allocations are able to maximize programmatic reach and capitalize on seasonal factors, which are critical in South Sudan.

Escalating conflict and insecurity, particularly in the latter half of the year, disrupted or delayed SSHF projects, forced partners to relocate staff, displaced populations, and made access negotiations more protracted and complex. To offset these challenges, during the strategy and planning phase, the SSHF promoted use of flexible programming modalities – from static presence to mobile operations and survival kits – most suited to the context. At the project level, improved Fund management and early engagement with partners enabled flexibility and adaptation. In some instances, for example, target locations were adjusted—either because operations in the original area became untenable, or because the population intended to benefit from the project had moved—to ensure SSHF funding had maximum impact and assisted the most vulnerable.

The deteriorating economy – including rampant inflation and currency devaluation - had knock on effects on SSHF project budgets, while partners also experienced protracted delays in receiving tax exemptions for imported goods, and faced restrictions on the withdrawal and movement of cash from Juba to field locations. One unanticipated positive consequence of the devaluation of the South Sudanese Pound for SSHF-funded projects, which receive grants in US dollars, was savings under certain cost categories. After receiving approval from the Humanitarian Coordinator, several projects were able to utilize these unspent funds to expand the scale of their projects, reaching a larger number of people in need than originally planned. Separately, although bureaucratic impediments were not unique to SSHF-funded partners, identification of the challenges across multiple SSHF partners bolstered the evidence base for engagement and advocacy with relevant authorities to roll-back and remove procedural blockages.

Finally, the SSHF helped highlight and address general coordination and sequencing challenges in the humanitarian operation. For example, SSHF frontline partners noted shortages in pipeline supplies, prompting engagement with the relevant Cluster Lead Agency and feeding into future SSHF funding considerations.

A life changed by the repair of a borehole

Nyabil Keat is from Wech Kuarí village, located at about 15 kilometres from Akobo town in Jongle, with a population of 3,000 people. She used to have to walk for one hour to fetch 20 litres of unsafe water from the Pibor River, which her family members used for drinking and household activities. However, after the SSHF funded Nile Hope, a national Non-Governmental Organization (NGO), to rehabilitate a nearby borehole, it now takes her less than five minutes to fill a jerry can.

“We are thankful to Nile Hope for rehabilitating the only borehole in the village,” said Nyabil

“Today, we are able to enjoy safe drinking water which we are able to fetch from a source very close to our homes.”

Since the borehole in Wech Kuarí was repaired, women in the village have been able to spend more time with their families, cases of diarrhoea amongst children have declined, and inter-communal tensions related to the availability of water have reduced.
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Through SSHF supported projects, Camp Coordination and Camp Management (CCCM) partners reached more than 201,700 beneficiaries in Protection of Civilian (PoC) sites across the country, including Juba, Malakal and Melut, accounting for nearly 42 per cent of all people reached by the cluster during the year. Over 80 per cent of people assisted through SSHF-funded CCCM projects were women and children.

SSHF projects contributed to the achievement of two cluster objectives: camp coordination and camp management structures were strengthened to coordinate the delivery and monitoring of humanitarian services and improve living conditions for IDPs; and humanitarians, local actors and authorities were equipped with the tools and knowledge to apply camp coordination and camp management concepts and best practices. This included enhancing communication with communities living in camps and camp-like settings, including through feedback mechanisms to capture and address concerns and complaints from IDPs, as well as awareness campaigns that reached some 17,700 people.

SSHF funds were used strategically to meet critical needs not covered by other funding sources, reaching over 40 per cent of all IDPs residing inside camps and camp-like settings. CCCM supported IDP communities, humanitarian agencies and UNMISS staff to build their understanding and practical application of camp management concepts and practices, enabling smooth implementation of camp management activities. Coordination of service provision ensured efficient and effective utilization of resources.

As with 2015, more IDPs were relocated in 2016 than planned due to conflict and displacement. SSHF funding facilitated the relocation of 9,749 IDPs within PoC sites during the year, up from 6,000 planned. This included emergency relocations undertaken in the Malakal PoC site following violence in February 2016 which destroyed three quarters of the infrastructure, including shelters.
Funding provided through the SSHF enabled the continuation or resumption of education activities in hard to reach areas. More than 66,500 children were reached through SSHF-funded projects, representing 20 per cent of all people assisted by the cluster in 2016. SSHF funded projects contributed towards the achievement of two main cluster objectives: increasing access for conflict affected children to quality learning in protective spaces; and providing psychosocial support and life skills training.

More than 45,500 children in conflict-affected areas benefited from emergency education supplies, representing 13 per cent of overall cluster achievements; 97 Temporary Learning Spaces (TLS) or classrooms were constructed, representing 7 per cent of overall cluster achievements; and 890 teachers were trained on emergency education and provision of psychological support, representing 10 cent of overall cluster achievements.

Although challenges were faced in the implementation of education projects, more TLS were able to be constructed than planned (97 vs 68) due to savings on other elements of project budgets, relocation of activities and extension of project periods. The TLS provided an opportunity to promote life-saving messages about health, hygiene, nutrition and risks from mines and other unexploded ordinance, acting as a protective space for multi-sectoral interventions.

Schools also continued to act as zones for peace, providing a safe and trusted entry point for multi-sectoral interventions. Through SSHF-funded projects, more than 7,900 children were able to access psychosocial support services and referral pathways for protection, nutrition and basic healthcare.

SSHF-funded projects helped promote the importance of education for girls, with more than 7,200 community mobilization sessions carried out to promote girls education and raise awareness of the impacts of gender-based violence, including child marriage.

Training was provided for 820 members of Parent-Teacher associations (PTAs) or School Management Committees (SMCs), increasing community engagement in education projects and promoting equal participation by women and men.

SSHF funding also provided incentives for 440 learning facilitators, including 187 women, up from 415 planned. This was possible due to the devaluation of the South Sudanese Pound (SSP), which meant that additional funding was available. SSHF funding also enabled the distribution of learning materials to 200 teachers.
Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Items

ES-NFI projects supported by the SSHF reached nearly 567,600 people, 45 per cent of the total number of people reached by the cluster during the year. Some 54 per cent of people reached were female, while 86 per cent of people assisted by SSHF-funded ES/NFI projects were internally displaced, 9 per cent were members of host communities, 4 per cent were returnees, and 1 per cent were otherwise affected by disasters.

SSHF resources supported all three cluster objectives: providing populations most in need with access to life-saving non-food items; delivering locally appropriate and dignified shelter solutions; and ensuring swift delivery of assistance through efficient, timely and cost effective procurement, transportation, pre-positioning and storage of shelter materials and NFIs.

SSHF funded projects reached nearly 114,000 people with emergency shelter, nearly 360,500 with non-food items and some 80,000 with inter-agency survival kits, representing 38 per cent, 37 per cent, and 87 per cent respectively of the overall cluster achievements. However, ES-NFI partners faced challenges in implementing their projects due to conflict in 2016, with access to project sites in the Greater Equatoria region and Western Bahr el Ghazal compromised during clashes. This resulted in ES-NFI partners being able to reach only 89 per cent of their target for both NFI and shelter distributions.

SSHF funding was vital in supporting the ES-NFI core pipeline to procure and transport shelter and NFI materials. 4,145 kits were procured and 818 metric tonnes of emergency shelter material was transported to field locations for distribution.

SSHF-funding was particularly vital for ES-NFI NGO partners, with most frontline partners and up to 60 per cent of the mobile response capacity of the cluster relying exclusively on SSHF funding.

As a continuation of innovation in NFI kit content, SSHF funding facilitated the procurement of kanga—a piece of material which can be used as clothing, swaddling clothes or to provide privacy—responding to feedback from women on the most critical NFIs. However, bureaucratic impediments, including protracted processes for securing tax exemptions, caused delays of up to six months between procurement and delivery of some pipeline items, causing the Cluster not to reach its procurement timeline target.

Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Items: Output Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people served with NFIs</td>
<td>403,200</td>
<td>360,487</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people served with Shelter</td>
<td>128,151</td>
<td>113,949</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people served with survival kits</td>
<td>80,800</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of shelter kits procured</td>
<td>4,650</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tonnage of NFI/shelter kits transported</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>925</td>
<td>171%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSHFF funding enabled FSL partners to reach more than 390,100 people, exceeding the planned target by 38 per cent and representing nine per cent of all people reached by the cluster during the year. Women accounted for 55 per cent of people assisted through SSHFF-funded FSL projects, reflecting the prevalence of female-headed households in the war torn country.

Given the scale and scope of food assistance in South Sudan, the SSHFF retained its focus on support to emergency livelihoods, where smaller amounts of funding can have significant impact. To this end, SSHFF projects contributed to the cluster objective of protecting livelihoods and promoting livelihoods-based coping capacities of the most vulnerable population at risk of hunger and malnutrition.

In the main farming season, crop seeds and tools were distributed to nearly 89,700 people and nearly 79,300 people respectively, representing 2 per cent of overall cluster achievement, and training was provided to ensure maximum yield. These figures were lower than expected, at 73 per cent and 67 per cent of the respective targets, primarily due to the proliferation of conflict in areas that were previously considered stable, making cultivation of crops less viable, as well as the looting of FAO’s main warehouse in Juba during the July conflict, which resulted in substantial losses of vital stocks of seeds and tools, interrupted the transportation and distribution of livelihood inputs, and delayed the implementation of projects. As a result, SSHFF partners focused on the distribution of rapid growing vegetable kits, reaching more than 131,600 people (102 per cent of target), and fishing kits, reaching more than 36,100 people (142 per cent of target). Fishing kits are able to be used by people even in settings of high conflict and displacement as they are light and easy to carry.

Conflict also negatively impacted planned interventions in support of livestock health. Throughout the year more than 656,800 animals were vaccinated (just 60 per cent of the target) and 411,600 were treated (56 per cent of the target), with training provided for community animal health workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOOD SECURITY AND LIVELIHOODS: OUTPUT INDICATORS</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of people receiving fishing kits</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>36,139</td>
<td>142%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people provided with vegetable seeds</td>
<td>129,100</td>
<td>131,624</td>
<td>102%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people provided with crop seeds</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>89,669</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of people receiving agricultural tools/kits</td>
<td>118,200</td>
<td>79,289</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of heads of livestock vaccinated</td>
<td>1,101,500</td>
<td>656,826</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Pipeline Quantity of crop seeds distributed (Kg)</td>
<td>260,000</td>
<td>97,752</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSHF-funded projects enabled health partners to reach more than 1.3 million people, 48 per cent of the total number of people reached by Health Cluster partners during the year. Funding supported the three cluster objectives of: improving access to essential emergency health care, emergency obstetric care and neonatal services; improving access to psychosocial support and mental health services, including for survivors of sexual violence; and preventing, detecting and responding to epidemic prone disease outbreaks. The projects helped in addressing malaria, diarrhoea and pneumonia, the major causes of mortality among children under age 5.

Through SSHF-funded projects: more than 743,200 outpatient consultations were provided in conflicted affected and other vulnerable areas, representing 13 per cent of the total cluster achievement for the year; nearly 214,900 children were vaccinated against measles, representing 57 per cent of the cluster achievement; and nearly 9,500 children received three doses of pentavalent vaccine, representing 5 per cent of the cluster achievement. SSHF funding also promoted multi-sectoral response to malnutrition, with 1,310 severely acutely malnourished children with medical complications clinically managed in stabilization centres.

Widespread displacement and the deterioration of health conditions increased the population in need, resulting in SSHF partners assisting more people than planned. The number of outpatient consultations was 134 per cent of the target (just under 555,400), and partners vaccinated nearly four times the targeted number of children (nearly 57,600) against measles as outbreaks affected more than seven counties. In addition, 831 health workers received training (compared to 639 planned), including on the Minimum Initial Service Package (MISP) for reproductive health, clinical management of rape (CMR), and disease surveillance and outbreaks response. SSHF funding supported increased surveillance, triggering early warning alerts that mitigated and interrupted the spread of communicable diseases, including cholera, hepatitis E, measles, tuberculosis, HIV and malaria.

SSHF funding supported procurement and pre-positioning of emergency supplies through the health core pipeline, ensuring availability of essential medicines, including in areas where conflict and displacement intensified in the latter half of the year. More than 188,300 people were assisted through the delivery of emergency health supplies, compared to 150,000 planned.

However, conflict negatively impacted progress in reproductive health for women, with the number of deliveries attended by skilled birth attendants just 68 per cent of the target (5,898 out of 8,679). Limited availability of cold chain facilities—due to damage, destruction and loss of staff in health facilities—hampered administration of pentavalent vaccine, with fewer children vaccinated than envisaged.
Through SSHF-funded projects partners reached more than 486,700 people with nutrition services in 2016, 69 per cent of the total number of people assisted by the cluster during the year. Women and girls accounted for 68 per cent of people assisted, due to the focus of nutrition interventions on children and pregnant and lactating women. In the face of an increasing number of locations affected by malnutrition, versus decreasing resources available, the cluster prioritized locations with Global Acute Malnutrition rates of 20 per cent and above for SSHF funding, rather than the standard emergency threshold of 15 per cent.

SSHF-funded projects primarily supported the cluster objective of delivering quality lifesaving management of acute malnutrition for the most vulnerable and at risk. Through SSHF-funded projects: 49,825 children under age five were treated for severe acute malnutrition (SAM), representing 31 per cent of the overall cluster achievement; 72,421 children under age five were treated for moderate acute malnutrition (MAM), representing 20 per cent of the overall cluster achievement; and 10,369 pregnant and lactating women were treated for acute malnutrition, representing 5 per cent of the overall cluster achievement. In addition, more than 190,400 pregnant and lactating women and caretakers of children under two years of age were supported through Infant and Young Child Feeding in Emergencies (IYCF-E) activities. Although still small in numbers, efforts were made to better engage men in IYCF-E activities to promote a more gender-equal burden-sharing in caregiving.

In counties where SSHF funded-projects were implemented, cure rates were 85 per cent and 78 per cent for programmes addressing SAM and MAM respectively – exceeding national benchmarks and SPHERE standards. Death rates of children were maintained below established thresholds. Performance against indicators for Therapeutic Feeding Programmes (TFP) and Targeted Supplementary Feeding Programmes (TSFP), including cure, death and defaulter rates, exceeded targets.

Through SSHF funding, nutrition core pipeline managers procured and distributed 23,402 cartons of ready-to-use therapeutic food, 92 metric tons of ready-to-use supplementary food for children and 100 metric tons of super cereal (CSB+) for pregnant and lactating women.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NUTRITION: OUTPUT INDICATORS</th>
<th>PLANNED</th>
<th>ACHIEVED</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of SAM boys and girls aged 0-59 months newly admitted for treatment</td>
<td>48,071</td>
<td>49,825</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of MAM boys and girls aged 6-59 months newly admitted for treatment</td>
<td>70,086</td>
<td>72,421</td>
<td>101%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of PLW with acute malnutrition newly admitted for treatment</td>
<td>11,605</td>
<td>10,369</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of functional mother-to-mother support groups</td>
<td>607</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>107%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of pregnant and lactating women and caretakers of children 0-23 months reached with IYCF-E interventions</td>
<td>139,868</td>
<td>190,427</td>
<td>136%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SSHF-funded partners reached more than 134,200 people with protection interventions, accounting for 51 per cent of the overall cluster achievement during the year and exceeding the planned SSHF target by 17 per cent. Women and girls accounted for 73 per cent of people reached through SSHF-funded protection activities.

SSHF funded-projects mainly supported the cluster objective of improving the safety and dignity of vulnerable groups through prevention programming and protection mainstreaming to address potential threats and vulnerabilities.

Activities related to gender-based violence (GBV) targeted vulnerable groups - including female-headed households, pregnant and lactating women, persons with disabilities and adolescent girls. More than 2,200 survivors of GBV accessed at least one of the services available, including GBV case management, case management of rape, psychosocial support and/or psychosocial first aid, and 12,370 dignity kits were procured and distributed to assist women and girls in crisis settings, exceeding the target of 8,500. There was also unexpectedly high usage of women friendly spaces, with nearly 22,000 women and girls accessing the spaces, compared to 7,000 initially targeted.

Child protection partners used a community-based psychosocial approach, leading to the identification of higher than planned numbers of Unaccompanied and Separated Children (UASC) and other extremely vulnerable children. Active family tracing was initiated for 1,090 UASC and missing children out of 1,498 cases registered, representing 21 per cent of the overall cluster achievement, while psychosocial support was provided to 10,367 crisis-affected children. In deep field locations, child protection partners expanded psychosocial support by involving community-based child protection networks in interim care or family placement. Social workers documented cases of grave child rights violations to feed into the Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism (MRM).

Community-based protection was increased, with more than 500 caregivers reached with community-based psychosocial support, and more than 500 people trained in conflict resolution. During the year, there was high demand for mine action services to facilitate the safe movement of IDPs and humanitarian actors. A total of 425 surveys were completed compared to 300 targeted and 5,118 explosive remnants of war and small arms ammunitions were destroyed, compared to 6,000 targeted. Challenges included escalating conflict, which forced humanitarian workers to relocate from Juba and field locations, as well as access delays and denials.
SSHF-funded WASH projects assisted nearly 517,000 people in 2016, equivalent to 20 per cent of all people reached by the cluster. Women and girls accounted for 54 per cent of those assisted, while projects were prioritized in areas hardest-hit by conflict, displacement and disease.

SSHF resources supported all three cluster objectives, supporting affected populations to: have timely access to safe and sufficient water for drinking, domestic use and hygiene; practice safe excreta disposal with dignity in a secure environment; and build knowledge and appropriate behaviours to prevent and mitigate WASH-related diseases and practice good hygiene. SSHF-funded projects: provided more than 319,900 people with access to improved water sources, representing 13 per cent of the total cluster achievement; helped more than 20,700 access improved sanitation facilities, representing 3 per cent of the cluster achievement; and reached more than 301,500 people with messages and information promoting hygienic behaviours, representing 14 per cent of the cluster achievement.

Hygiene promotion was crucial to preventing and mitigating water borne and sanitation related diseases among children, pregnant women and other vulnerable populations in areas where SSHF projects were implemented.

The SSHF supported the WASH core pipeline, with 84 partner requests for supplies honoured in 2016. Procurement and transportation of gender-sensitive WASH emergency supplies - including 3,803 Menstrual Hygiene Management (MHM) kits for women and 9,492 hygiene kits – were facilitated, and WASH partners took gender concerns into consideration in project implementation including, for example, ensuring appropriately marked and segregated latrines in camp settings. However, the escalation in conflict made it challenging to promote safe and dignified menstrual hygiene management, with partners only able to reach 38 per cent of women and girls targeted and just 33 per cent of the planned MHM kits distributed. Conflict makes it difficult to ensure that there are safe and private spaces in which to educate women and girls on MHM, and it is considered irresponsible to deliver MHM supplies without the ability to undertake sensitization.

**Funds Allocated by SSHF (US$)**

$13.4\,\text{m}$

18% of HRP secured funding

**SSHF Projects**

41

**Partners**

**INGOs: ACF-USA, CW, GOAL, INTERSOS, MEDAIR, OXFAM GB, RI, Samaritan’s Purse, Solidarités, WVSS**

**NGOs: AWODA, CMD, IHQ, Nile Hope, PCO, RUWASSA, SPEDP, SSUDA, THESO, UNIDO, UNKEA**

**UN: IOM, UNICEF**

**Cluster Lead & Co-Lead**

Lead: UNICEF

Co-lead: NRC

**People Reached**

- **516,987** people reached
  - Men: 22%
  - Women: 32%
  - Boys: 22%
  - Girls: 24%

**WATER, SANITATION AND HYGIENE - WASH: OUTPUT INDICATORS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency affected people with access to improved water sources</td>
<td>245,800</td>
<td>319,925</td>
<td>130%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency affected people equipped to practice good hygiene behaviors through participatory hygiene promotion</td>
<td>291,306</td>
<td>301,506</td>
<td>104%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency affected women and girls enabled to practice safe, dignified menstrual hygiene management</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>10,054</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency affected people with access to improved sanitation facilities</td>
<td>26,400</td>
<td>20,762</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of partner requests for WASH core pipeline supplies that are honoured</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>164%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rebuilding Malakal Protection of Civilians site

Sisters Nyban and Nyabi were originally from Malakal town, but were forced to flee to the UN Protection of Civilians (PoC) site in Malakal when conflict broke out at the end of 2013.

Their lives were again upended on the night of 17 February 2016, when the Malakal PoC was attacked and fighting erupted. “We remember the night of the attack. It was the shouting that woke us up. When we heard the fighting and shooting start, we were worried for our lives and started to pack our things”, recalls Nyabi.

Fire consumed a large part of the PoC site. “At night, we heard the fire from very far away but then it began to spread. We saw it slowly creep closer towards us over night. We could not sleep” said Nyban and Nyabi. By morning, they were forced to flee the path of the fire as it consumed their homes. “Everything we had was lost. Nearly all of our belongings, our clothes, jewelry, and whatever else that we brought from our lives in Malakal was reduced to ashes.”

Hundreds of shelters were destroyed and thousands of IDPs were forced to flee into other areas of the PoC. Days later, Nyban and Nyabi collected the scraps of their homes in hopes of being able to rebuild.

Nyban and Nyabi were supported to restart their lives with projects funded through the SSHF. The Logistics Cluster coordinated the delivery of more than 47 metric tons of relief items—including for the Health, Nutrition, Protection and ES/NFI clusters—to Malakal, while CCCM managed emergency relocations of IDPs who lost their shelters. The initial response was able to utilize stocks already pre-positioned in Malakal.

“Amid the chaos, forward planning and rapid mobilization by humanitarians were key to saving lives and providing immediate assistance to IDPs like Nyban and Nyabi who had lost their shelters and belongings,” said Julie Van der Viel, Deputy Logistics Cluster Coordinator.

Providing mobility, building a livelihoods

James Wani has a disability caused by polio contracted during his childhood, which impeded his attendance at primary school. To support his family, including his wife and four children, James initially made handicrafts on a small-scale in Torit in Eastern Equatoria. However, James’ life improved when he received support from Handicap International funded by the SSHF.

First, James was provided with a cash grant to start a small business next to his house through a livelihood programme. Then, James was provided with a tricycle to help facilitate his movement. Previously, because of his limited mobility, a community member supported James by collecting water from the stream and buying goods from the market, which is two kilometres away from his home, for his handicrafts. The support provided by Handicap International helped him to become self-reliant and expand his business at a time when Torit was facing increasing difficulties due to rising insecurity in Eastern Equatoria.

“With this tricycle, I am now able to bring water from the river and to go to the market to buy some stock for my business on my own. Since I received this support, my income has increased. This year, I have been able to send two of my children to school and they have food to eat every day,” James says. “God will help all humanitarian people for bringing change to our life.”

James Wani is one of many people with special needs who have been assisted through SSHF-funded protection projects.
The SSHF was indispensable to the work of the Emergency Telecommunications Cluster (ETC), as its sole source of funding in 2016, and enabled the Cluster to support some 120 humanitarian organizations during the year. Resources supported the agreed Cluster objectives to: coordinate and support the humanitarian community in the assessment, deployment and development of emergency telecommunications services for reliable access to security and key information; manage inter-agency projects for the provision of advanced emergency telecommunications services to the humanitarian community; and provide the humanitarian community with capacity-building opportunities in emergency telecommunications.

The Cluster implemented upgrades to security-related communications, including through the installation of Digital Mobile Radio (DMR) equipment and associated training for technicians. The Cluster also supported and maintained 22 repeater sites and 15 Communication Centres that provided security telecommunications services. Radio programming services were offered to humanitarian organizations, and 1,540 staff members from across the humanitarian community were trained in radio communications.

Low-cost, long-term and reliable satellite-based data connectivity was established through the Humanitarian Internet Support Project (HISP) to provide emergency telecommunications services to humanitarian personnel in five prioritized locations—Aweil, Bentiu, Bor, Malakal and Mingkaman.

With 720 registered users, the services enhanced information sharing and coordination within the overall response. Equipment was powered through the installation of solar panels. In the middle of the year, the Cluster supported the scale up of response in Wau where an emergency telecommunications kit was pre-positioned. Two further kits were deployed to Koch and Leer.

### EMERGENCY TELECOMMUNICATIONS: OUTPUT INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Planned</th>
<th>Achieved</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of humanitarians trained in radio communications</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>1,540</td>
<td>128%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of emergency telecommunications response kits prepositioned</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of sites with access to internet and radio communications through interagency projects</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 2016, support from the SSHF made an important contribution to the timely, effective and prioritized delivery of logistics services to the humanitarian community. Allocations at critical moments during the year strengthened the coordinated emergency response and enabled logistics, cargo and passenger services for humanitarian organizations.

With SSHF funding, the Cluster executed 934 movement requests, airlifting 1,000 metric tonnes of emergency cargo on behalf of 87 humanitarian organizations through the deployment of two helicopters and one fixed wing aircraft. Prioritization by the inter-cluster working group (ICWG) of cargo and locations for mobile response, and the determination of cargo requirements for static response, ensured that assistance was targeted to communities with the most severe needs.

In addition to funding for air transportation of cargo, the SSHF supported ground transportation of cargo to and from airports where feasible, increasing the efficiency of the humanitarian operation. A fleet of 16 trucks was managed and operated by IOM under the Common Transport Service (CTS) project and positioned in key towns, including Bentiu, Bor, Juba, Malakal, Melut and Rumbek. The CTS trucks shunted 9,870 metric tonnes of supplies between airstrips and warehouses in 2016, for onward delivery to hard-to-reach locations.

Faced with increasing banditry and road attacks by armed groups, the Cluster took on a new role, coordinating joint humanitarian convoys along major supply routes, working closely with stakeholders to facilitate the safe passage of aid. Efforts to expand the use of rivers were constrained by the limited availability of barges and poor port infrastructure. SSHF funding helped ensure continuity of UNHAS operations at the beginning of the year before complementary contributions from other sources were secured, including for the positioning of one fixed wing aircraft to better serve Greater Bahr el Ghazal in view of deteriorating conditions there. Another allocation in the second half of the year supported the scale up of services to locations across the Equatorias.

During the year, 234 humanitarian organizations benefitted from 25,016 passenger flights and the movement of 219 metric tonnes of light cargo. Rapid response missions prioritized by the ICWG were supported, and 100 per cent coverage of required medical evacuations and security relocations was provided.
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The SSHF Advisory Board (AB) represents the views of donors, UN agencies and the NGO community in providing guidance and advice to the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) on strategic and policy matters in pursuit of the Fund’s overarching objectives. AB members represent their respective constituencies, not individual agency opinions.

Membership of the AB is as follows:

a. Humanitarian Coordinator (as Chairperson, non-rotating)
b. 2 representatives of contributing donors (rotating)
c. 2 representatives of participating UN Cluster Lead Agencies (rotating)
d. 1 representative of the international NGO community (rotating)
e. 1 representative of the national NGO community (rotating)
f. OCHA Head of Office (as Observer on behalf of SSHF TS, non-rotating)
g. UNDP Country Director (as Observer on behalf of SSHF TS, non-rotating)
h. 1 representative of a non-contributing donor (as Observer, rotating)

The AB is responsible for:

a. Advising the HC on the strategic direction of the SSHF and its continuous development and refinement as an effective humanitarian funding instrument. This may involve participation in occasional reviews, evaluations and other learning initiatives;
b. Analysing risks that may affect the achievement of the Fund’s objectives and advise the HC on risk management strategies;
c. Supporting the HC in the mobilization of resources to maximize overall reach and impact of the Fund;
d. Advising the HC on the quality, transparency and equitability of SSHF processes throughout the programme cycle. Participate during the development of allocation strategies, at cluster defences, and at any other stage as may be required by the HC. Advise on monitoring and reporting arrangements;
e. Supporting the promotion of the Fund, including but not limited to the review of key information products such as Annual Reports, to ensure an accurate reflection of achievements.
### Funding by Organization

#### International NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Allocations (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF - USA (Action Contre la Faim - USA)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,204,648.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT/DCA (ACT Alliance / DanChurchAid)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$650,000.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT/FCA (ACT Alliance / Finn Church Aid)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT/LWF (ACT Alliance / Lutheran World Federation)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$633,995.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTED (Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$999,998.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE International</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,684,589.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCM (Comitato Collaborazione Medica)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$658,694.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA (Christian Mission Aid)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$565,999.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COSV (Comitato di Coordinamento delle Organizzazione per il Servizio Volontario)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$224,582.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUAMM (Collegio Universitario Aspirante e Medici Missionari)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$546,978.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS (Concern Worldwide)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$905,274.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDG (Danish De-mining Group)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC (Danish Refugee Council)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$2,707,000.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL (GOAL)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,220,931.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI (Handicap International)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$156,862.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIS (IBIS)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$289,983.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICM UK (International Medical Corps UK)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,297,411.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERSOS</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,651,859.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC (International Rescue Committee)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,565,285.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAID</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,746.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAM International (Joint Aid Management International)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$390,164.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDAIR</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,320,303.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP (Nonviolent Peaceforce)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$497,738.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC (Norwegian Refugee Council)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$545,994.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OXFAM GB</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,330,000.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAH (Polish Humanitarian Action)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$755,444.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLAN (Plan International)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$424,661.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RI (Relief International)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$838,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP (Samaritan’s Purse)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$698,719.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC (Save the Children)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$502,209.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE (Solidarité International)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$800,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEARFUND</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$400,799.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSF-Switzerland (Vétérinaires Sans Frontières-Switzerland)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$680,000.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC (War Child Canada)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$84,999.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Relief</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$471,187.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WV South Sudan (World Vision South Sudan)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$1,394,266.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
<td><strong>$30,037,493.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### National NGOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Allocations (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADCORD (Advocates Coalition for Rights and Development)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$354,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFOD (Action For Development)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$156,862.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWODA (Aweil Window of Opportunities and Development Agency)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$144,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADA (Community Agribusiness Development)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$80,000.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCDC (Confident Children out of Conflict)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$289,983.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINA (Community in Need Aid)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$260,018.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CISDA (Community Initiative for Sustainable Development Agency)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$230,620.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMD (Christian Mission for Development)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$418,000.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FYF (Fashoda Youth Forum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$119,999.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCO (Hold the Child Organisation)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$799,888.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLSN (Health Link South Sudan)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$568,753.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHO (Impact Health Organization)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$100,000.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCED (Lacha Community and Economic Development)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$229,375.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile Hope</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,220,931.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCO (Peace Corps Organization)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$162,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RuCAPD (Rural Community Action for Peace and Development)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,005.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUPWASA (Rural Water and Sanitation Support)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$500,000.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAFL (Standard Action Liaison Focus)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$120,001.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMSC (Sudan Medical Care)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$200,385.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPEDP (Support for Peace and Education Development Programme)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$345,001.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUDA (South Sudan Development Agency)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$320,584.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THESO (The Health Support Organization)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$125,008.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNIDO (Universal Intervention and Development Organization)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>$1,762,806.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNKEA (Universal Network for Knowledge and Empowerment Agency)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$1,217,714.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>59</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,927,222.32</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### UN Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>No. of Projects</th>
<th>Allocations (US$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAO (Food &amp; Agriculture Organization of the UN)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$4,100,000.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM (International Organization for Migration)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$12,213,200.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA (United Nations Population Fund)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$2,611,885.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR (UN High Commissioner for Refugees)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$199,841.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF (United Nations Children’s Fund)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$11,387,525.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP (World Food Programme)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>$8,326,934.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO (World Health Organization)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$2,462,201.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,301,590.15</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ACRONYMS

A
ACF-USA Action Contre la Faim-USA
ACT/FC Action Alliance/ Finn Church Aid
ACT/LWF Act Alliance/Lutheran World Federation
ACTED Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
ADCODR Advocates Coalition for Rights and Development
AFOD Action for Development
AWODA Aweil Window of Opportunities and Development Agency

B
BSFP Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programme

C
CADA Community Agribusiness Development Agency
CAHW Community Animal Health Workers
CARE CARE International
CBCPNs Community-Based Child Protection Networks
CBFs Country Based Pooled Funds
CCCM Camp Coordination and Camp Management
CCM Comitato Collaborazione Medica (Medical Collaboration Committee)
CCOC Confident Children Out of Conflict
CERF Central Emergency Response Fund
CINA Community in need Aid
CMA Christian Mission Aid
CMD Christian Mission for Development
CMR Clinical Management of Rape survivors.
COSV Comitato di Coordinamento delle Organizzazione per il Servizio Volontario
CUAMM Collegio Universitario Aspirante e Medici Missionari
CW Concern Worldwide

D
DDG Danish De-mining Group
DFID Department for International Development – GOV. UK
DMR Digital Mobile Radio
DRC Danish Refugee Council

E
ECHO European Commission’s Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection department
ES-NFI Emergency Shelter and Non Food Items
ETC Emergency Telecommunication Cluster

F
FAO Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations
FSL Food Security and Livelihoods
FYF Fashoda Youth Forum

G
GBV Gender-based violence

H
HACT Harmonised Approach to Cash Transfers
HC Humanitarian Coordinator
HCO Hold the child Organisation
HCT Humanitarian Country Team
HI Handicap International
HISP Humanitarian Internet Support Project
HLSS Health Link South Sudan
HNO Humanitarian Needs Overview
HRP Humanitarian Response Plan

I
IBIS IBIS
ICWG Inter-Cluster Working Group
IDP Internally Displaced Person
IEHK Interagency Emergency Health Kit
IHO Impact Health Organisation
IMC-UK International Medical Corps- United Kingdom
INGO International Non-Governmental Organization
IOM International Organization for Migration
IPC Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
IRC International Rescue Committee
IYCF-E Infant and Young Child Feeding in Emergencies

J
JAM Joint Aid Management International

L
LCED Lacha Community and Economic Development

M
MAM Moderate Acute Malnutrition
MHM Menstrual Hygiene Management
MISP Minimum Initial Services Package
MRM Monitoring and Reporting Mechanism
MT Metric Tonnes

N
NF&ES Non-Food Items and Emergency Shelter
NGO Non-Governmental Organization
NNGO National Non-Governmental Organization
NP Non Violent Peaceforce
NRC Norwegian Refugee Council

O
OCHA Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
### P
- **PAH**: Polish Humanitarian Action
- **PCO**: Peace Corps Organization
- **PFA**: Psychosocial First Aid
- **PHC**: Primary Health Care
- **PLW**: Pregnant and Lactating Women
- **PoC**: Protection of Civilians
- **PSS**: Psychosocial Support
- **PTAs**: Parents Teachers Associations

### R
- **RA**: Reserve Allocation
- **RI**: Relief International
- **RUCAPD**: Rural Community Action for Peace and Development
- **RUWASSA**: Rural Water and Sanitation Support Agency

### S
- **SA**: Standard Allocation
- **SALF**: Standard Action Liaison Focus
- **SAM**: Severe Acute Malnutrition
- **SC**: Save the Children
- **SMART**: Specific Measurable Achievable Realistic and Time bound
- **SMC**: Sudan Medical Care
- **SMCs**: School Management Committees
- **SPEDP**: Support for Peace and Education Development Programme
- **SSHF**: South Sudan Humanitarian Fund
- **SSHF TS**: South Sudan Humanitarian Fund Technical Secretariat
- **SSUDA**: South Sudan Development Agency

### T
- **TB-HIV**: Tuberculosis and Human Immunodeficiency Virus
- **TFP**: Therapeutic feeding Programme
- **THESO**: The Health Support Organization
- **TLS**: Temporary Learning Structures
- **TSFP**: Targeted Supplementary Feeding Programme

### U
- **UASC**: Unaccompanied and Separated Children
- **UK**: United Kingdom
- **UN**: United Nations
- **UNDP**: United Nations Development Programme
- **UNFPA**: United Nations Population Fund
- **UNHAS**: United Nations Humanitarian Air Services
- **UNHCR**: United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Refugees
- **UNICEF**: United Nations Children’s Fund
- **UNIDO**: Universal Intervention and Development Organization
- **UNKEA**: Universal Network for Knowledge and Empowerment Agency
- **UNMISS**: United Nations Mission in South Sudan
- **US**: United States
- **US$**: United States dollar
- **USAID/OFDA**: United States Agency for International Development/Office for U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance

### V
- **VSF-S**: Vétérinaires Sans Frontières – Suisse

### W
- **WASH**: Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
- **WCC**: War Child Canada
- **WFP**: World Food Programme
- **WFS**: Women Friendly Space
- **WHO**: World Health Organization
- **WVSS**: World Vision South Sudan
1. The unique number of people reached was estimated by: a) identifying the number of people reached by each cluster in each country; b) assuming the highest number of people reached by any one cluster in any given county to be the total number of beneficiaries reached by all clusters combined in that country; and c) adding the total number of beneficiaries reached across all counties. In addition, beneficiaries supported by projects which procure emergency supplies for core pipelines are excluded, since those same supplies are used to assist beneficiaries through front line projects.

This approach to estimation minimizes the risk of duplication, both between pipeline and front line beneficiaries, as well as between beneficiaries assisted by more than one cluster. It is the same method used to estimate the unique number of people reached under the Humanitarian Response Plan.

2. More than one SSHF project can support the same project under the HRP.

3. Total funds available ($93.6 million) included contributions deposited by donors during 2016 ($58 million), as well as carry-over funds from 2015 ($22.2 million) and refunds of unspent amounts from projects undertaken in previous years ($13.3 million).

4. One project revision might be attributable to multiple causes.

5. A large piece of cloth used as clothing, for carrying personal items, protecting infants and so on.

6. CCCM results are compiled from three final narrative reports (out of three due), and two progress narrative reports (out of two due).

7. Education results are compiled from 10 final narrative reports (out of 10 due), and one progress narrative report (out of two due).

8. ES-NFI results are compiled from 10 final narrative reports (out of 10 due), and five progress narrative reports (out of six due).

9. FSL results are compiled from 10 final narrative reports (out of 12 due), and three progress narrative reports (out of five due).

10. Health results are compiled from 13 final narrative reports (out of 16 due), and two progress narrative reports (out of three due).

11. Nutrition results are compiled from 16 final narrative reports (out of 18 due), and two progress narrative reports (out of two due).

12. Protection results are compiled from 10 final narrative reports (out of 11 due), and two progress narrative reports (out of four due).

13. WASH results are compiled from 19 final narrative reports (out of 21 due), and 3 progress narrative reports (out of 4 due).

14. Emergency Telecommunications results are compiled from one final narrative report (out of one due).

15. Logistics results are compiled from five final narrative reports (out of 5 due).
SSHF CONTACTS

General enquiries and business correspondence can be sent to: OCHASSHF@un.org

The email address OCHASSHF-Feedback@un.org is available to:

- receive feedback and complaints from partners who believe they have been treated incorrectly or unfairly during any of the SSHF processes;
- receive feedback from users of services or recipients of assistance in connection with SSHF-funded projects;
- and receive allegations of misuse of funds, collusion and misuse of authority.

Contact details for SSHF staff can be found at: https://www.unocha.org/country/south-sudan/humanitarian-fund-contacts

USEFUL LINKS

- South Sudan Humanitarian Fund: https://www.unocha.org/country/south-sudan/humanitarian-fund-overview
- OCHA South Sudan: http://www.unocha.org/south-sudan
- OCHA Country-Based Pooled Funds Grant Management System (GMS): https://gms.unocha.org
- Multi-Partner Trust Fund, South Sudan Humanitarian Fund factsheet: http://mptf.undp.org/factsheet/fund/HSS10
- UNDP South Sudan: http://www.ss.undp.org
- Financial Tracking Service: https://fts.unocha.org
- UN Central Emergency Response Fund: http://www.unocha.org/cerf