

# Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF)



## Strategy Paper

### 2017 First Reserve Allocation *Call-for-Proposal*

*Ensuring urgent life-saving response to  
immediate humanitarian needs in  
Rakhine (northern and central), Kachin and northern Shan States*

*Yangon, Myanmar  
21 February 2017*

## Table of Contents

A. Financing Overview .....	3
B. Summary of Funding Allocation Envelopes .....	3
C. Prioritization Criteria.....	4
D. Humanitarian Coordination Engagement.....	4
E. Eligible Partners and Partnership Arrangements.....	4
F. Cash Programming.....	5
G. Allocation Strategy by Geographical Area .....	5
<i>Allocation Strategy for northern Rakhine</i> .....	5
1. Humanitarian context in Rakhine State (northern) .....	5
2. Priorities for reserve allocation .....	6
3. Targeted organizations.....	6
4. Sectors / Clusters and indicative funding envelope .....	6
<i>Allocation Strategy for central Rakhine</i> .....	7
1. Humanitarian context in Rakhine State (central and zone one) .....	7
2. Priorities for reserve allocation .....	7
3. Targeted organizations.....	7
4. Sector / Cluster and indicative funding envelope .....	8
<i>Allocation Strategy for Kachin and northern Shan</i> .....	8
1. Humanitarian context in Kachin and northern Shan States .....	8
2. Priorities for reserve allocation .....	8
3. Targeted organizations.....	9
4. Sector / Cluster and indicative funding envelopes .....	9
H. Operational Modalities and Accountability Framework.....	10
I. Timeline and Procedure .....	10
J. MHF Feedback and Complaints Mechanism .....	11
K. Contact Information.....	11
<i>Cluster / sector coordinators</i> .....	11
<i>OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit</i> .....	11
Annex I: Tips for Cash Programming Projects .....	12
Annex II: Operational Modalities and Control Mechanisms for NGO Partners .....	12
Annex III: Basic Definitions and Guidance for Budget Preparation Process .....	13
Annex IV: IASC Gender Marker – Frequently Asked Questions.....	17

# Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF)



## 2017 First Reserve Allocation: Call-for-Proposals Strategy Paper

**DEADLINE for submissions of project proposals through GMS:  
Monday 06 March 2017 at 23h59 (Yangon time)**

The Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF) is an OCHA-managed country-based pooled fund led by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC) to provide emergency response to urgent needs of people affected by natural disasters or conflict. Since 2007, the MHF has mobilized US\$24 million for 76 projects, providing assistance to more than 860,000 vulnerable people.

This allocation strategy paper is the result of consultations with stakeholders from January 2017 onwards; including national and international NGOs, UN agencies, donors, the inter-Cluster Coordination Group (ICCG) and the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT). Consultations at sub-national level have been also conducted, with the involvement of partners, clusters and sectors in northern Rakhine, central Rakhine, Kachin and Shan within the existing coordination mechanism, i.e. general coordination meetings, ICCG and Area HCT. The MHF Advisory Board (AB) provided initial feedback on the strategy paper on 01 February 2017 and final comments by 20 February 2017, before the final endorsement by the HC.

### A. Financing Overview

A total of US\$2.5 million will be made available from the MHF under this First Reserve Allocation. This strategy paper outlines sectors, activities, geographical areas for funding under this allocation. Submissions that do not respond to the priorities outlined in this paper will be automatically rejected. Only one grant will be awarded by funding envelope.

### B. Summary of Funding Allocation Envelopes

Envelope	Activities	Location	US\$
Nutrition / WASH / Health	Emergency nutrition activities, including WASH-related support and health activities focusing on mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) linked to nutrition beneficiaries.	Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung Townships (Rakhine)	1,000,000
Education	Primary and post-primary temporary learning spaces and schools	Sittwe, Pauktaw, Minbya (Rakhine)	500,000
Education	Education in Emergency activities, related to primary education services	Kachin, northern Shan	150,000
Protection	Provision of Psychological First Aid (PFA) and Psychosocial Support (PSS) to women, children and adolescents, GBV Case management services	Kachin, northern Shan	150,000
Shelter / NFI	Emergency shelter / NFIs for displaced people	Kachin, northern Shan	400,000
WASH	WASH intervention	Kachin, northern Shan	300,000
		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>2,500,000</b>

## C. Prioritization Criteria

The MHF Advisory Board agreed of five general prioritization criteria for project selection and funding allocation, as follows:

- reinforce existing capacity in affected areas with operational partners already in place, considering current mandates / activities;
- focus on new needs (northern Rakhine, Kachin and Shan) or critical funding gaps (central Rakhine);
- advocate for direct funding to implementing agencies;
- integrate, when possible, sectoral responses; and
- encourage multi-sector proposals.

## D. Humanitarian Coordination Engagement

Planning and response activities should be mobilized in consultation with the existing coordination mechanisms (general coordination meetings, ICCGs or Area HCTs) and relevant cluster / sector coordinators at national and sub-national levels, to ensure interventions are not duplicated and humanitarian needs are met in a coordinated manner. Proposal development and implementation activities will be undertaken in close coordination with the affected communities, including camp management committees and host communities.

## E. Eligible Partners and Partnership Arrangements

Eligible Partners	In line with the Global Guidelines for Country Based Pooled Funds (CBPF), the MHF Operational Manual and eligibility guidance documents <sup>1</sup> that govern its management, the MHF will only fund active NGOs which have completed the due diligence process through the online Grant Management System (GMS), have undergone the capacity assessment process and become eligible to receive the Fund . Active participation in the humanitarian coordination system at sub-national level, including the sectoral coordination, will be also considered during the evaluation of the project proposal for funding. Only NGOs that are eligible partners can apply for direct funding under this allocation, as well as UN Agencies.
Consortium	<u>A consortium approach</u> with several partners working in cooperation is encouraged: several partners can either apply together with one partner taking the lead. The objective would be for partners to either deliver the same package of assistance in different geographical areas or to complement each other's work (i.e. different organisation deliver different relief assistance in the same community).
Sub-implementing Partners	<u>Partnership</u> between humanitarian actors is strongly encouraged. Clear and identifiable coaching, mentoring, and capacity building activities should be integrated as much as possible. However whilst these activities can form a sub-set of the overall outcome of the project, they cannot represent the main output of the project.  Organizations that have not yet completed MHF eligibility process can be sub-implementing partners to an eligible organisation. However the signatory organisation will bear full responsibility for the work and actions of its sub-implementing partners.

Support to NGOs through this allocation will be prioritised, based on their access and experience in the prioritised geographical areas. However, the decision to fund either an NGO or UN agency through this allocation will be determined by the demonstrated comparative advantage of each organisation to deliver the articulated response.

Any questions or concerns with regards to eligibility and/or partnership arrangements can be directed at OCHA HFU: [MHF-Myanmar@un.org](mailto:MHF-Myanmar@un.org), +95 12305682 ext. 204.

<sup>1</sup> Available for download in English at: [www.unocha.org/myanmar/humanitarian-financing/myanmar-humanitarian-fund-mhf](http://www.unocha.org/myanmar/humanitarian-financing/myanmar-humanitarian-fund-mhf)

## F. Cash Programming

The MHF encourages the use of alternatives to in-kind programming as a response modality for partners with demonstrated technical capacity and strong knowledge and experience of cash transfer programmes. For the use of cash and voucher assistance, as part of the cross-cluster approach<sup>2</sup>, organisations must prepare a protection risk analysis to ensure that cash can be used for its intended purpose and to mitigate any negative consequences. Partners must also provide information on the functionality of the markets and financial service providers, and demonstrate that cash will be equally accessible to men and women, according to vulnerability criteria established for each cluster and, as relevant, cross-cluster (see Annex I for further tips on cash programming).

## G. Allocation Strategy by Geographical Area

### *Allocation Strategy for northern Rakhine*

#### 1. Humanitarian context in Rakhine State (northern)

Rakhine State is marked by historical and ethno-political tensions, and is also one of the poorest states in Myanmar. The development of Rakhine State has long lagged behind much of the rest of the country, leading to a situation in which local Rakhine, as well as Muslims (who self-identify as Rohingyas) and other ethnic minority communities all have their socio-economic needs unaddressed. The Muslim ethnic minority suffer from institutional discrimination, disenfranchisement and deprivation, including lack of equal access to citizenship. Local administrative orders and discriminatory practices upon this population, particularly in the northern part of the State, where overwhelming majority of the population belongs to this community, have severely impacted for years the communities' ability to exercise basic rights. These include in particular the restrictions on freedom of movement, which has the knock-on effect of also restricting access to livelihoods and essential services.

On 9 October 2016, this already challenging environment introduced a new dimension when three Border Guard Police (BGP) posts located in Maungdaw and Rathidaung townships were attacked by unknown perpetrators. Subsequent clashes and serious escalation of violence occurred, including the one on 12 November 2016 when a senior army officer was killed and many civilians lost their lives. The Myanmar security forces started a counter-insurgency operation in the northern part of Rakhine state and locked down the area. This has greatly aggravated the security situation and has resulted in the imposition of further movement restrictions for civilians as well as curtailing of humanitarian access by the authorities. Numerous reports have emerged citing the burning of villages, the rape of women and girls, the extra-judicial killings of civilians, lootings, systematic harassment, the burning and destruction of food stocks and belongings. Additionally, some 1,900 structures constructed without official permits - largely individual houses belonging to Muslims - have been ordered to be demolished. 1,097 of these buildings have been pulled down.

As of 06 February 2017, it is estimated that more than 69,000 persons fled to the neighbouring Bangladesh seeking refuge and some 24,000 persons have been internally displaced, with an additional 20,000 persons estimated to have been affected by the current crisis (hosting communities and those who are not displaced but affected by the housing demolition). The situation was further compounded by the suspension of pre-existing programmes (nutrition and health including mental health and care practices, food security and livelihoods, WASH, protection including support to persons with specific needs, etc.) which were benefiting 150,000 people.

The military operations have resulted in the imposition of further movement restrictions for civilians as well as curtailing of humanitarian access by the authorities. Since the onset of the new humanitarian context in the northern part of Rakhine State, partners with existing operational capacity in the area, supported by the HCT and donors' community, have tried to assess the situation. Even if access remains still unpredictable to affected areas and communities, some progress has been made over the past few weeks and access permission to affected areas was granted to national staff of some agencies.

<sup>2</sup> These activities will be supported by the Cash Working Group.

## 2. Priorities for reserve allocation

Critical needs have been identified on the basis of extensive secondary analysis as well as preliminary results of the initial rapid needs assessment, sector assessments and relief distribution. Data analysis has facilitated to compile enough information to inform response planning and the current reserve allocation strategy application, in coordination with the ongoing CERF Rapid Response Application submitted by the Humanitarian Coordinator to the CERF Secretariat. The intervention will meet life-saving criteria with the primary objective to further prevent the loss of life and to protect the most vulnerable people from further trauma and harm.

In this regard, five main sectors have been prioritized: protection, food security, gender-based violence, health and nutrition, with components of WASH and health focusing on mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS), targeting crisis-affected persons since 09 October 2016, due to the military-led counter-insurgency operation conducted in the northern part of Rakhine State, particularly in Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung Townships.

As per agreement with the HCT and with the advice of the MHF Advisory Boards, this complementary humanitarian funding action will focus in the above mentioned sectors, with the following distribution:

- a) direct funding to UN agencies through CERF Rapid Response Grant (protection, food security, gender-based violence and health)<sup>3</sup>; and
- b) direct funding to NGO partners through a MHF Reserve Allocation covering emergency nutrition activities, including WASH and Health (MHPSS) support. The MHF Advisory Board agreed on 01 February 2017 on an indicative envelope of \$1 million to respond through a multi-sector intervention to critical nutrition needs, including WASH and health activities (mental health and psychosocial support, in the most affected areas of the northern part of Rakhine State, particularly in Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung Townships. This allocation is not intended to cover any other existing underfunded emergency needs.

## 3. Targeted organizations

Only NGO partners are invited to apply to this specific funding envelope<sup>4</sup>. However, the Review Committee only will consider those partners with humanitarian access to the affected population and existing or immediately possible, demonstrated presence, reach and or capacity to immediately act, particularly where access is constrained. Partners will respond through their own existing logistical and response capacities, partners and networks. Depending on the context, humanitarian response would comprise of a mix of either direct provision of humanitarian supplies, contributing to overheads<sup>5</sup> and or direct cash transfers. For this specific humanitarian situation, only a multi-sector project proposal will be considered. The applicant can lead a consortium of organizations but only one grant will be awarded under this funding envelope.

## 4. Sectors / Clusters and indicative funding envelope

After in-depth analysis and consultations with key humanitarian stakeholders, including ICCG members and the MHF Advisory Board, the Humanitarian Coordinator proposes the funding envelope below. Note this amount is indicative only. It is intended to help partners understand potential allocation sizes to sectors and locations. Actual allocation will be based on the strength of the proposals received, taking into consideration the partner risk level limitations indicated in the MHF Operational Modalities (Annex II).

Sector	Activities	Location	Indicative funding envelope (US\$)
Nutrition / WASH / Health	Multi-sector intervention including emergency nutrition activities, WASH-related support and a component on mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) linked to nutrition beneficiaries.	Maungdaw, Buthidaung and Rathedaung Townships (Rakhine)	1,000,000

<sup>3</sup> The ongoing request for CERF Rapid Response grant amounts \$4.4 million and targets 49,000 crisis-affected persons.

<sup>4</sup> As UN agencies are applying for CERF Rapid Response Grant, this MHF reserve allocation for northern Rakhine will target NGOs partners exclusively.

<sup>5</sup> In the event that direct material support is available from other sources, recipient partners may also use the reserve funds to cover transport and delivery overheads.

## Allocation Strategy for central Rakhine

### 1. Humanitarian context in Rakhine State (central and zone one)

In Rakhine State, inter-communal violence in 2012 led to the displacement of approximately 145,000 persons. About 25,000 of these displaced persons were assisted to return or relocate by the end of 2015, with individual housing support being provided by the Rakhine State Government with support from the international community. As of February 2017, some 120,000 displaced persons remain in 36 camps or camp-like settings across Rakhine, of which about 79 per cent are women and children. The majority of displaced persons in Rakhine live in collective shelters. These shelters and other facilities in the displaced persons camps were originally constructed in 2012-13 as a temporary measure, designed to last for only two years. There is a continued need for food, nutrition support, education and protection services in the camps, and it is vital to ensure improved access to primary health care, as well as unobstructed access to secondary health care<sup>6</sup>.

### 2. Priorities for reserve allocation

Life-saving activities are needed to support the displaced persons still remaining in IDPs camps. Needs are also huge for those persons being permanently settled and host communities. As per initial assessments, major funding gaps are found in education, shelter and WASH sectors. However, after discussed with the ICCG members at Rakhine level, a consensus was reached among partners, who prioritized activities within education sector for this MHF reserve allocation.

In Rakhine State, protracted crises have hindered children in displacement camps, host communities, and surrounding villages from accessing quality basic education, increasing their vulnerabilities and protection risks. Due to this situation, as of February 2017, approximately 30,000 girls and boys with no or little access to formal education institutions continue to rely on education services provided in temporary learning spaces (TLS) supported by sector partners in displacement camps and villages in Sittwe, Pauktaw, Minbya.

To ensure the continuation of education services for children affected by complex emergencies, the education sector is in urgent need of funding to keep TLS functional and prepare for the new academic year starting in June 2017. Many of TLS and their WASH facilities built in 2013 / 2014 require rehabilitation or repair to ensure the safety of learners and teachers. Procurement and distribution of essential teaching learning kits and supplies, and ensuring volunteer teacher retention and provision of trainings on pedagogy and essential life-skills including psychosocial support and hygiene education to reduce vulnerabilities and protect children are also critical to ensure child-friendliness and learning conduciveness of TLS.

The education sector is expecting a large gap of funding in 2017, which immediately affects the operation of approximately 100 primary and non-formal post-primary TLS in Sittwe, Pauktaw, and Minbya townships, and hinders preparation for the new academic year. Without funding, the operation of those TLS, which are as of now the main provider of emergency education services for crisis-affected children, will be suspended, driving volunteer teachers and children out of school. This would also lead to the disintegration of already established school communities and increased vulnerabilities of girls and boys affected by emergencies.

Emergency education services in locations with no or little access to formal education institution is extremely critical, especially in the protracted crisis situations. Education helps children and communities gain a sense of stability, structure and routine, which can help them to cope with loss, fear, stress and violence during a time of crisis. Child-friendly education provided in safe and inclusive learning spaces can keep children secure and protected from context-specific risks. Education also contributes to empowering girls and children from disadvantaged groups, giving them greater awareness of their rights and enabling them to make and influence decisions that affect their lives.

### 3. Targeted organizations

International and national partners (UN and NGOs) are invited to apply. However, the Review Committee only will consider those partners with humanitarian access to the affected population and existing or immediately possible, demonstrated presence, reach and or capacity to immediately act, particularly

<sup>6</sup> Please refer to the 2017 HRP for further information on sector priority needs:  
[http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2017\\_myanmar\\_hrp\\_final.002.pdf](http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/2017_myanmar_hrp_final.002.pdf)

where access is constrained. Partners will respond through their own existing logistical and response capacities, partners and networks. Depending on the context, humanitarian response would comprise of a mix of either direct provision of humanitarian supplies, contributing to overheads<sup>7</sup> and or direct cash transfers. The applicant can lead a consortium of organizations but only one grant will be awarded by funding envelope.

#### 4. Sector / Cluster and indicative funding envelope

After in-depth analysis and consultations with key humanitarian stakeholders, including ICCG members and the MHF Advisory Board, the Humanitarian Coordinator proposes the funding envelope below. Note this amount is indicative only. It is intended to help partners understand potential allocation sizes to sectors and locations. Actual allocation will be based on the strength of the proposals received, taking into consideration the partner risk level limitations indicated in the MHF Operational Modalities (Annex II).

Sector	Activities	Location	Indicative funding envelope (US\$)
Education	Primary and post-primary temporary learning spaces and schools	Sittwe, Pauktaw, Minbya (Rakhine)	500,000

## Allocation Strategy for Kachin and northern Shan

### 1. Humanitarian context in Kachin and northern Shan States

The humanitarian situation in Kachin and northern Shan has deteriorated significantly over recent months and close to 11,000 persons currently remain newly and (re)displaced<sup>8</sup> across both states as a result of intensified conflict between the Myanmar Military and ethnic armed groups. In Kachin, up to 7,000 persons are estimated to be displaced following intensified fighting between the Myanmar Military and the Kachin Independence Army since late December 2016. In northern Shan, a further 4,000 persons are estimated to be displaced by continued fighting between the Myanmar Military and an alliance of ethnic armed groups. The displacement situations across both states remain very fluid, and numbers are difficult to confirm given access challenges. Since January 2017, approximately 1,500 displaced persons have crossed active conflict lines into government controlled areas seeking safer refuge, all of which have arrived unassisted compounding existing safety and protection concerns of civilians. Humanitarian access, particularly to people staying in areas beyond government control, remains severely curtailed in both states. Since May 2016, the United Nations has not been able to conduct assessments or deliver relief supplies to nearly 50,000 displaced persons in areas beyond government control, including those recently displaced. National humanitarian organizations continue to provide assistance to these areas but are also facing restrictions. In Shan State, some of the areas recently affected by fighting, such as Mone Koe, remain inaccessible for international and most national organizations.

### 2. Priorities for reserve allocation

Life-saving activities are needed to support the displaced persons recently affected by the increase of fighting in Kachin and Shan States, mostly those moving within non-Government controlled areas (NGCA) and from there to Government controlled areas (GCA).

Immediate lifesaving humanitarian assistance for newly displaced persons who remain inside government controlled areas is being provided by local partners through existing programming, however should their situation become protracted their humanitarian needs will span the complete spectrum of humanitarian needs. Displaced persons who have arrived into government controlled areas are being provided with assistance and shelter from the Kachin State Government (KSG) and humanitarian partners. While the KSG has yet to outline its plan for settlement of these people, immediate needs are likely to be shelter/NFI, WASH, protection and education in emergencies. Food assistance has already been targeted by a previous reserve allocation. Health activities are covered by funding coming from bilateral donors.

<sup>7</sup> In the event that direct material support is available from other sources, recipient partners may also use the reserve funds to cover transport and delivery overheads.

<sup>8</sup> For most of these persons this is their second or third time to be displaced

For people who remain displaced in non-government areas, the primary immediate needs relate to protection of civilians in armed conflict, particularly for the most vulnerable which include elderly persons, women and children. These protection concerns are compounded by the almost complete lack of humanitarian access by international and UN staff and increasingly restrictive access by national partners. Should the newly displaced persons movement continue beyond March 2017, humanitarian needs will increase to include shelter/NFI, WASH and education. Food assistance has already been targeted by a previous reserve allocation. Health activities are covered by funding coming from bilateral donors.

Needs are also huge for those persons by forced displacements in northern Shan (estimation of 4,000), but for the moment partners are responding, when possible, with existing resources.

This reserve allocation is limited in time, scale and scope to the new caseload, currently at 11,000 persons currently remain newly and (re)displaced across Kachin and northern Shan as a result of intensified conflict between the Myanmar Military and ethnic armed groups. Any project proposal beyond that will be not considered for funding. This allocation is not intended to cover any other existing underfunded emergency needs.

### 3. Targeted organizations

International and local partners (UN and NGOs) are invited to apply. However, the Review Committee only will consider those partners with humanitarian access to the affected population and existing or immediately possible, demonstrated presence, reach and or capacity to immediately act, particularly where access is constrained. Partners will respond through their own existing logistical and response capacities, partners and networks. Depending on the context, humanitarian responses would comprise of a mix of either direct provision of humanitarian supplies, contributing to overheads<sup>9</sup> and or direct cash transfers. Multi-sector project proposals will be prioritized. The applicant can lead a consortium of organizations but only one grant will be awarded by funding envelope.

### 4. Sector / Cluster and indicative funding envelopes

After in-depth analysis and consultations with key humanitarian stakeholders, including ICCG members and the MHF Advisory Board, the Humanitarian Coordinator proposes the funding envelopes below. Note these amounts are indicative only. They are intended to help partners understand potential allocation sizes to sectors/regions. Actual allocations will be based on the strength of the proposals received, taking into consideration the partner risk level limitations indicated in the MHF Operational Modalities (Annex II).

Sector	Activities	Location	Indicative funding envelope (US\$)
Education	Education in Emergency activities, related to primary education services	Kachin Northern Shan	150,000
Protection	Provision of Psychological First Aid (PFA) and Psychosocial Support (PSS) to women, children and adolescents, GBV Case management services	Kachin Northern Shan	150,000
Shelter / NFI	Emergency shelter / NFIs for displaced people	Kachin Northern Shan	400,000
WASH	WASH intervention	Kachin Northern Shan	300,000
		<b>Total</b>	<b>1,000,000</b>

<sup>9</sup> In the event that direct material support is available from other sources, recipient partners may also use the reserve funds to cover transport and delivery overheads.

## H. Operational Modalities and Accountability Framework

Allocation size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>US\$2,500,000, distributed as per indicative funding allocation envelopes</li> </ul>
Scope	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This reserve allocation is limited in time, scale and scope to the prioritized activities and sectors indicated in the allocation strategies per each geographical area. <b>Any project proposal beyond that will be not considered for funding.</b></li> </ul>
Eligible partners	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Humanitarian partner (UN or NGO) with demonstrated and existing operational capacity, reach and presence in the targeted geographical areas and operational sectors. The applicant can lead a consortium of organizations but <b>only one grant</b> will be awarded by each funding envelope. Multi-sector project proposals will be prioritized.</li> </ul>
Allocation ceiling per project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per indicative funding envelope</li> </ul>
Duration of projects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximum duration up to 6 months.</li> </ul>
Gender mainstreaming	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promoting gender equality mandatory requirement (Gender Marker 2A/2B)</li> </ul>
Pre-requisites for applicant organizations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Completion of the due diligence process on GMS</li> <li>Capacity assessment conducted by OCHA HFU</li> <li>Active participation in humanitarian coordination system at sub-national level</li> </ul>
Narrative and financial reporting <sup>10</sup>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As identified by the MHF Operational Modalities (Annex II)</li> </ul>
Project monitoring	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Implementing partner(s) are the primary responsible of regular project monitoring.</li> <li>Field site monitoring by MHF, including financial spot checks.</li> <li>Remote monitoring will be used as last resort in case where there are no other options to conduct physical project visits<sup>11</sup></li> </ul>

## I. Timeline and Procedure

Submission of project proposals for this MHF reserve allocation will be open from 21 February 2017 up to 06 March 2017 online via GMS. Applications must be submitted in English due to auditing requirements. This reserve allocation will be implemented as per the Operational Manual and the global Guidelines for Country-based Pooled Funds (CBPFs) that can be found (together with additional information on CBPFs) at:

<http://www.unocha.org/myanmar/humanitarian-financing/myanmar-humanitarian-fund-mhf>.

From 21 February to 06 March 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The MHF reserve allocation is open for project proposals online via GMS at <a href="https://cbpf.unocha.org/">https://cbpf.unocha.org/</a></li> </ul>
From 07 to 31 March 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A Review Committee will conduct a Strategic Review of proposals based on a scorecard for project prioritization and technical criteria.</li> <li>Short-listed proposals by the Review Committee will be submitted to the Advisory Board for comments and preliminary HC's approval.</li> <li>The Review Committee will conduct technical and budget review of the endorsed projects by the HC.</li> <li>Applicant organizations will revise proposals as per comments provided by the Review Committee</li> <li>Revised projects will be submitted to OCHA HQ for budget clearance and grant finalisation.</li> </ul>

<sup>10</sup> Please annex II.

<sup>11</sup> Please see MHF Operation Manual (page 19) for "remote monitoring" details.

## J. MHF Feedback and Complaints Mechanism

MHF implementing partners with insufficiently addressed concerns or complaints regarding MHF processes or decisions can at any point in time send an email to [MHFComplaints@un.org](mailto:MHFComplaints@un.org) and/or contact the OCHA Deputy Head of Office in Myanmar, who oversees the overall MHF management, in support to the OCHA Head of Office. Complaints will be compiled, reviewed and raised to the HC, who will then take a decision on necessary action(s). The HC will share with the Advisory Board any such concerns or complaints and actions taken thereof.



Chris Hyslop, OCHA Deputy Head of Office in Myanmar  
[hyslopc@un.org](mailto:hyslopc@un.org)  
[MHFComplaints@un.org](mailto:MHFComplaints@un.org)

In order to facilitate the communication of any concern or complaint by project beneficiaries or other stakeholders related to the MHF funded project implementation, implementing partners are requested to disseminate and publish the OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit's contacts (+95 123 05 682 ext. 204, [MHF-Myanmar@un.org](mailto:MHF-Myanmar@un.org)) in a visible place in the locations designated to implement MHF funded interventions, taking into consideration conflict-sensitivity analysis and other protection concerns, if any. OCHA HFU will compile, reviewed and raised to the OCHA Head of Office and the concerned implementing partner, who will agree on necessary action(s), as needed. The OCHA HFU will share with the Advisory Board any such concern or complains and actions taken thereof.



OCHA HFU  
 +95 123 05 682 ext. 204  
[MHF-Myanmar@un.org](mailto:MHF-Myanmar@un.org)

## K. Contact Information

### Cluster / sector coordinators

Cluster / Sector / Working Group	Name	Contact
Education	Laxmi Paudyal Stephane Senia	<a href="mailto:laxmi.paudyal@savethechildren.org">laxmi.paudyal@savethechildren.org</a> <a href="mailto:stephane.senia@savethechildren.org">stephane.senia@savethechildren.org</a>
Nutrition Cluster	Anne Laevens	<a href="mailto:alaevens@unicef.org">alaevens@unicef.org</a>
Protection Sector	Geraldine Salducci Petrucci	<a href="mailto:salducci@unhcr.org">salducci@unhcr.org</a>
<i>Child Protection Working Group</i>	Emmanuelle Compingt Lindsay Shearer	<a href="mailto:ecompingt@unicef.org">ecompingt@unicef.org</a> <a href="mailto:lshearer@unicef.org">lshearer@unicef.org</a>
<i>GBV Working Group</i>	Alexandra Robinson Lucy Stevens	<a href="mailto:arobinson@unfpa.org">arobinson@unfpa.org</a> <a href="mailto:lstevens@unfpa.org">lstevens@unfpa.org</a>
Shelter / NFIs / CCCM Cluster	Edward Benson	<a href="mailto:benson@unhcr.org">benson@unhcr.org</a>
WASH Cluster	Sunny Guidotti	<a href="mailto:sguidotti@unicef.org">sguidotti@unicef.org</a>
<i>Cash Working Group</i>	Marc Gschwend	<a href="mailto:marc.gschwend@wfp.org">marc.gschwend@wfp.org</a>

### OCHA Humanitarian Financing Unit

Narciso Rosa-Berlanga, Head of HFU / MHF Manager [rosa-berlanga@un.org](mailto:rosa-berlanga@un.org)  
 Naw Gay Htoo, Humanitarian Financing Officer [htoon@un.org](mailto:htoon@un.org)  
 Pike Pike Aye, Grants Management Officer [aye1@un.org](mailto:aye1@un.org)

+95 12305682 ext. 204  
[MHF-Myanmar@un.org](mailto:MHF-Myanmar@un.org)

## Annex I: Tips for Cash Programming Projects

Projects which can demonstrate the following evidence based analysis of the feasibility of their cash based programme will be positively scored:

- Functionality of the market, dynamism of the market.
- Availability and quality of goods (related to the scale of the intervention and sectorial needs).
- Mapping of the market and location of the beneficiaries.
- Physical, political and social access to the market for beneficiaries.
- Acceptance of cash in the community.
- Mapping of financial service providers and physical, social and political access to beneficiaries
- Global risk analysis (institutional, programmatic, contextual).

## Annex II: Operational Modalities and Control Mechanisms for NGO Partners

Risk level	Project duration (months)	Project value (thousand USD)	Maximum amount per project* (thousand USD)	Disbursements (in % of total)	Financial reporting			Narrative reporting		Monitoring		Audit
					For disbursements	31 January	Final	Progress	Final	Field visit**	Financial spot check	
High	Less than 7	≤ 250		60-40	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	1	Yes	Yes
		> 250	500		Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	1		
	Between 7-12	≤ 250		40-30-30	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	1		
		> 250	750		Yes	Yes	Yes	2	Yes	2		
Medium	Less than 7	≤ 250		100	-	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	-		
		> 250	750	80-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	1		
	Between 7-12	≤ 250		60-40	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	0-1**		
		> 250	1,500		Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	1		
Low	Less than 7	≤ 400		100	-	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-		
		> 400			Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	-		
	Between 7-12	≤ 400		100	-	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	-		
		> 400		80-20	Yes	Yes	Yes	1 (mid)	Yes	1		

\* Total US\$ of Grant Agreements held by individual NGOs with the MHF not to exceed US\$2.5 million at any one time. Project closure should be completed before further funds are disbursed.

\*\* As safety/security and access allow

## Annex III: Basic Definitions and Guidance for Budget Preparation Process

The objective of this section is to provide partners with a common framework to facilitate the appropriate preparation of project budgets. In particular, this guidance focuses on defining eligible and ineligible costs, direct and indirect costs (e.g. Programme Support Costs – PSC), shared costs, budget categories and the adequate break-down of budget lines. This guidance applies to UN agencies, IOM and NGOs.

### 1.1. Rationale and Basic Principles of the Project Budget

The role of implementing partners in the budgeting process is to:

- Provide a correct and fair budget breakdown of the planned costs that are necessary to implement the activities and achieve the objectives of the project.
- Use and comply with the budget template (Annex: Project Budget and Financial Reporting Tool) and guidance provided by OCHA for the classification and itemization of planned costs.
- 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.

### 1.2. Eligible and Ineligible costs

#### Eligible costs

The following attributes define the nature of eligible costs:

- Must be necessary and reasonable for the delivery of the objectives of the project.
- Must comply with the principles of sound financial management, in particular the principles of economy, efficiency, effectiveness, transparency and accountability.
- Must be identifiable in the accounting records and backed by original supporting evidence as incurred in accordance with the approved project proposal and period.

These may include:

- Costs of staff (including salaries, social security contributions, medical insurance, and hazard pay for high-risk locations) involved in the management and implementation of the project. Salaries and costs may not exceed the costs normally borne by the implementing partner in other projects.
- Costs for consultancies involved in the implementation of the project.
- Support staff costs at country level directly related to the project may be included.
- Travel and subsistence costs directly linked to the project implementation for project staff, consultants, and other personnel that may also be eligible, provided the costs do not exceed those normally borne by the implementing partner.
- A contribution to the implementing partner's Country Office costs, as shared costs charged on the basis of well explained calculation and a reasonable allocation system. Shared costs must be itemized.
- The financial support to beneficiaries, including cash and voucher based distribution.
- Purchase costs for goods and services delivered to the beneficiaries of the project, including quality control, transport, storage and distribution costs.
- Costs related to non-expendable items (assets) such as equipment, information and technology (IT) equipment for registration and suchlike field activities, medical equipment, water pumps and generators, etc.
- Expenditure incurred by the implementing partner related to the award of contracts required for the implementation of the project, such as expenses for the tendering process.
- Costs incurred by sub-implementing partners, directly attributable to the implementation of the project.
- Other costs deriving directly from the requirements of the grant agreement such as monitoring, reporting, evaluation, dissemination of information, translation, insurance etc., including financial service costs (in particular bank fees for transfers).

#### Ineligible costs

The following costs are ineligible:

- Costs not included in the approved budget (taking into consideration duly approved budget revisions).
- Costs incurred outside the approved implementation period of the project (taking into consideration duly approved no-cost extensions).
- Debts and provisions for possible future losses or debts.

- Interest owed by the implementing partner to any third party.
- Items already financed from other sources.
- Purchases of land or buildings.
- Currency exchange losses.
- Cessions and rebates by the implementing partner, contractors or staff of the implementing partner of part of declared costs for the project.
- Government staff salaries.
- Hospitality expenses, provision of food/refreshments for project staff (not including water and hospitality for trainings, events and meeting directly related to project implementation).
- Incentives, mark-ups, gifts to staff.
- Fringe benefits such as cars provided by the organization to staff, individual full housing allowance and the like.
- Fines and penalties.
- Duties, charges, taxes (including VAT) recoverable by the implementing partner.
- Global evaluation of programmes.
- Audit fees/system audit fees – these costs are paid directly by the fund.<sup>12</sup>

#### Other Types of costs

On a case-by-case basis and depending on the objectives of the fund, the fund manager retains the flexibility to consider the following costs as eligible:

- Government staff training as a component of a project activity that contributes to the achievement of the overall project objectives.
- Visibility material of the implementing partner directly related to projects funded by the MHF.
- International travel costs when directly linked to the delivery of the project objectives. When international travel costs are requested to support additional activities outside those of the project, such costs can only be considered if they are well justified and in the proportion attributable to the project.
- Vehicles.
- Depreciation costs for non-expendable/durable equipment used for the project for which the cost is not funded in the current budget or prior the MHF funding.
- Equipment for the regular operations of the implementing partner.
- Recurrent costs for the implementing partner's current operations.

### **1.3. Direct and Indirect Costs**

There are two categories of eligible expenditures: direct costs and indirect costs.

#### Direct Costs

Direct costs have to be clearly linked to the project activities described in the project proposal and the logical framework. They are defined as actual costs directly related to the implementation of the project to cover the costs of goods and services delivered to beneficiaries, and the costs related to the support activities (even partial, such as a security guard or a logistician partially working for the project), required for the delivery of services and the achievement of the project objectives.

Direct costs include:

- Staff and related personnel costs, including consultants and other personnel.
- Supplies, commodities, materials.
- Equipment.
- Contractual services.
- Travel costs, including transportation, fuel, and daily subsistence allowances for staff, consultants and other personnel linked to the project.
- Transfers and grants to counterparts.
- General operating and other direct costs including security expenses, office stationary, and utilities such as telecommunications, internet, office rental and other direct costs, including expenses for monitoring, evaluation and reporting, related to the implementation of the project.

---

<sup>12</sup> Those costs are charged as a direct cost for the management of the fund.

### Indirect Costs

Indirect costs are referred to as Programme Support Costs (PSC). PSC are all costs that are incurred by the implementing partner regardless of the scope and level of its activities and which cannot be traced unequivocally to specific activities, projects or programmes. These costs typically include corporate costs (i.e. headquarters and statutory bodies, legal services, general procurement and recruitment etc.) not related to service provision to a particular project. PSC is charged as a maximum 7 per cent of the approved direct expenditures incurred by the implementing partner.

Programme Support Costs of sub-implementing partners associated to the implementation of a specific project should be covered by the overall maximum 7 per cent of the actual project expenditures.

Indirect costs do not have to be itemized in the project budget.

### **1.4. Shared Costs**

Sharing costs between different donors and projects under a country programme of an implementing partner is an acceptable practice for the MHF. The implementing partner may share certain Country. Office costs to different uses and projects, for example staff, office rent, utilities and rented vehicles.

The following guidance shall be observed when including shared costs in the project budget:

- All shared costs must be directly linked to the project implementation.
- All shared costs shall be itemized in the budget, following standard accounting practice and based on a well-justified, reasonable and fair allocation system, to be clearly explained in the budget narrative of the project and to be assessed and approved by the HFU in the OCHA Country Office.
- The implementing partner should at any time be able to demonstrate how the costs were derived and explain in the project proposal/logical framework how the calculation has been made (e.g. pro-rata, averages).
- For staff-related costs, if a position is cost-shared, the percentage of the monthly cost corresponding to the time that the person will dedicate to the project shall be budgeted<sup>13</sup>. It is not acceptable to have portions of a unit for staff costs, only percentages are acceptable.
- Non-staff shared costs should be shared on the basis of an equitable cost allocation system<sup>14</sup>. Accordingly, the percentages in the budget are to be assessed and approved by the HFU in the OCHA Country Office.
- Shared-cost, including staff-related costs, should preferably be charged for the entire duration of the project. When this is not the case the rationale of the apportionment must be explained into the budget narrative.

### **1.5. Guidance on the Itemization of Budget Lines**

Each budget line requires the cost breakdown, as follows:

- Itemize each national and international staff, consultants and other personnel by function and provide unit quantity and unit cost by monthly or daily rates for each staff position<sup>15</sup>.
- Any budget line whose total value is above US\$4,000 (as cumulative value of units contained in the budget line) requires a clear explanation of the calculation in the budget narrative. When budget lines reflect the costs of multiple items (> US\$4,000) a budget breakdown should be included in excel listing item, unit, quantity, value \*or cost (per unit and total cost. The document will be uploaded later in the Grant Management System (GMS).

<sup>13</sup> Cost-shared staff positions whose existence is intended to last the entire duration of the project should be charged for the entire period and charged in percentage against the project (half of the cost of a guard, in a 12 months project, should be budgeted at 50% of the monthly salary for 12 months). Durations shorter than the project are acceptable only if the position is not intended to last for the entire duration of the project. When recording expenditures the partner will retain the possibility to do it, within the budgeted amount, according to the modalities that better suits its preferences (charging 100% of the guard for 6 months).

<sup>14</sup> This should be calculated as a percentage against the overall amount of the shared cost and charged in percentage to the project. It is preferable to charge shared costs for the entire duration of the project. When recording expenditures the partner will retain the possibility to do it, within the budgeted amount, according to the modalities that better suits its requirements (e.g.: to cover half of the rent of an office in a 12 months project, the partner should budget the rent for 50% of the monthly cost for 12 months period. Then the partner retains the possibility to pay the full rent of the office for 6 months with the allocated budget).

<sup>15</sup> Staff positions must be charged per unit. When staff costs are only partially charged to the given budget this must be reflected in the percentage (50% of a staff, and not half of a staff at 100%).

- Provide unit or quantity (e.g., 10 kits, 1,000 metric tons) and unit cost for commodities, supplies and materials to be purchased. The budget narrative should be used to account properly for specifying the applicable unit of reference (length, volume, weight, area, etc.).
- Provide technical specifications for items whose unit cost is greater than US\$4,000.
- Provide technical specifications for those items whose unit costs can greatly vary based on those same specifications (e.g., for generators, a reference to the possible range of power would be sufficient to properly evaluate the accuracy of the estimated cost).
- Provide details in the budget narrative for contract so that the object of the contract results clearly identified.
- Itemize general operating costs (e.g. office rent, telecommunications, internet, utilities) for project implementation providing quantity and unit cost. A lump sum for operating costs is not acceptable.
- Travel costs can be estimated as long as the calculation modality is accurately described in the budget narrative (e.g., providing estimates on the number of trips and average duration in days, daily subsistence allowance (DSA) rates, etc.).
- National travel: estimate number of trips and cost per trip.
- International travel: estimate number of trips and cost per trip.
- Provide the list<sup>16</sup> of items included in kits whose individual value is equal to or less than US\$4,000.
- Provide list of items and estimated cost per item for kits whose individual value is greater than US\$4,000 or where the cumulative value of component units is greater than US\$4,000.
- Provide the list of items for globally standardized kits like Post-exposure Prophylaxis (PEP) kits, Interagency Emergency Health Kit (IEHK2011), etc. This does not include standard kits agreed upon in each country.
- In the case of construction works above US\$4,000, only the labour costs and known essential materials shall be budgeted and itemized, providing unit/quantity and unit cost. The budget narrative should explain how construction costs have been estimated on the basis of a standard prototype of building (latrine, health post, shelter), type of materials (wood, prefabricated, brick/cement/concrete) and formula or rationale used to estimate construction cost (e.g. per square foot or meter, previous experiences, etc.).

---

<sup>16</sup> The list should be provided as an annex to the budget.

# IASC GENDER MARKER - FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

## Why do we need a Gender Marker in CAPs, CERFs and pooled funds?

There is universal acceptance that humanitarian assistance must meet the distinct needs of women, girls, boys and men to generate positive and sustainable outcomes. However, evaluations of humanitarian effectiveness show that gender equality results are weak. Reports of the UN Secretary-General call for tracking of gender-related allocations. Security Council resolutions require it. The reality is that advancing gender equality requires focused action. The Gender Marker was launched by the Sub-working Groups on Gender and on the Consolidated Appeal Process (CAP) to improve humanitarian programming and make humanitarian response more efficient. It builds on the roll-out of a Gender Marker by several UN agencies.

The IASC Gender Marker (GM) is required in all Consolidated Appeals Processes (CAPs) and other humanitarian appeals and funding mechanisms. Cluster Leads should support their partners in the use of the GM so that all projects in an appeal routinely ensure that ALL segments of the affected population have equal access to protection and assistance and that targeted support to advance gender equality is based on a gender analysis. This makes humanitarian activities more effective.

By uploading gender codes onto the global Online Project System (OPS) and Financial Tracking System (FTS), donors are better placed to identify and fund high quality, gender-informed projects.

## What is the Gender Marker?

The IASC Gender Marker is a tool that codes, on a 0-2 scale, whether or not a humanitarian project is designed well enough to ensure that women/girls and men/boys will benefit equally from it or that it will advance gender equality in another way. If the project has the potential to contribute to gender equality, the marker predicts whether the results are likely to be limited or significant.

GENDER MARKER	DESCRIPTION
<b>GENDER CODE 0</b> <i>No visible potential to contribute to gender equality</i>	<b><u>Gender is not reflected</u></b> anywhere in the project sheet or only appears in the outcomes. There is risk that the project will unintentionally fail to meet the needs of some population groups and possibly even do some harm. These projects are considered gender-blind.
<b>GENDER CODE 1</b> <i>Potential to contribute in some limited way to gender equality</i>	<i>There are gender dimensions in <b>only one or two components of the project sheet: i.e. in needs assessment, activities and outcomes</b>.*</i> The project does <i>not</i> have all three: i.e. 1) gender analysis in the needs assessment, which leads to 2) gender-responsive activities and 3) related gender outcomes <i>*Where the gender dimension appears in outcomes only, the project is still considered gender-blind.</i>
<b>GENDER CODE 2A – GENDER MAINSTREAMING</b> <i>Potential to contribute significantly to gender equality (Equivalent to Code 2 for UNDP and UNICEF projects)</i>	<b>GENDER CODE 2B – TARGETED ACTION</b> <i>Project's principal purpose is to advance gender equality (Equivalent to Code 3 for UNDP and UNICEF projects)</i>
A <b><u>gender analysis</u></b> is included in the project's needs assessment and is <b><u>reflected in one or more of the project's activities and one or more of the project outcomes.</u></b>  <b><i>Gender mainstreaming</i></b> in project design is about making the concerns and experiences of women, girls, boys and men an integral dimension of the core elements of the project: 1) gender analysis in the needs assessment which leads to 2) gender-responsive activities and 3) related gender outcomes. Gender mainstreaming in project design promotes the flow of gender equality into implementation, monitoring and evaluation.  <i>Most humanitarian projects should aim to code 2a.</i>	<b><u>The gender analysis in the needs assessment justifies this project in which all activities and all outcomes advance gender equality.</u></b>  All targeted actions are based on gender analysis. Targeted actions are projects that assists women, girls, boys or men who have special needs or suffer discrimination. Most targeted actions are single-sex interventions responding to the disadvantage, discrimination or special needs of one sex or a sub-group of one sex. Other targeted actions can specifically aim to advance gender equality, such as projects that are designed exclusively to provide a gender assessment/baseline for the sector response or a project where all activities contribute to women having equal participation as men in particular sector activities.  <i>A gender analysis will identify how many 2b projects are warranted. It is anticipated that 2b projects would make up approximately 10-15% of projects but, in some contexts, this could be more or less.</i>

## Who will use the Gender Marker?

The key users of the Gender Marker are the clusters and their project teams. Clusters should make gender equality a priority in their Cluster Response Plans, which will guide project partners in designing projects that meet the distinct needs of women, girls, boys and men equally. Clusters should orient and support project partners in the implementation of the Gender Marker.

Project teams will be encouraged to strive for a good code. Cluster vetting teams will have the final say on the gender code for each project. The gender code will be inserted in the project sheet on the online project system (OPS). The gender codes will then appear in the Financial Tracking System (FTS) and donors that are interested in investing in gender-responsive projects can use the OPS/FTS to identify which projects are designed well enough to advance gender equality.

## Who is responsible for implementing the Gender Marker?

Cluster Leads and Heads of Agencies are responsible for ensuring that all cluster partners engage proactively in the Gender Marker. While not delegating responsibility, it might be useful for Cluster Leads to appoint a Focal Point to support cluster partners in implementing the Gender Marker. Whenever possible, the participation of gender specialists – including interagency GenCap Advisors - is encouraged. In addition, experience from implementation of the Gender Marker in 2009 and 2010 shows clearly that the active support of the Humanitarian Coordinator and the Head of OCHA is vital in engaging humanitarian actors to engage in the process and, accordingly, on the results.

## Where will the Gender Marker be used in 2012?

The IASC Gender Marker was piloted in four countries in 2009 (2010 appeals' processes) and then implemented in 12 CAP, ERF and Pooled Fund country appeals in 2010 (2011 appeal). Lessons learnt from the 2009 and 2010 rollouts will inform the implementation of the Gender Marker in 2012 when the IASC Gender Marker (GM) is required in all Consolidated Appeals Processes (CAPs) and other humanitarian appeals and funding mechanisms.

**Country Level:** The Gender Marker is used by clusters/sectors at the country level. Humanitarian Country Teams are encouraged to create a fertile environment for advancing gender equality in the Common Humanitarian Action Plans (CHAPs); to integrate gender equality into their needs assessments, strategic priorities, sector-specific response plans and monitoring frameworks.

**Global Level:** At the global level, the Gender Marker is being integrated into; training programmes for Humanitarian Coordinators, Cluster Leads, CAP and CERF training of trainers; the CAP and CERF guidance notes; and a special field for the gender code on the OPS.

**Donors:** Donors are encouraged to track use of the marker in the FTS and integrate the implementation of their own gender equality policies into monitoring.

## Are there tools available to assist Clusters in implementing the Gender Marker?

The Gender Marker Toolkit provides cluster-specific Tip Sheets that clusters can use to help their partners integrate gender issues into their projects. Using these Tip Sheets will assist project teams to identify and respond better to the distinct needs of male and female beneficiaries. In so doing, their projects will have the best chance of integrating gender issues well and achieving a good code. The majority of all humanitarian projects should mainstream gender (code 2a). There should also be a selected number of targeted actions (code 2b) that address discrimination and/or special needs.

Tip Sheets for the CCCM, Child Protection, Coordination, Education, Food Security, Health, GBV, Mine Action, Nutrition, Shelter & NFIs and WASH sectors and a Vetting Form to assist project vetting teams to code projects are available at <http://gencap.onereponse.info>. All of the Tip Sheets are currently available in English only but will be available in French and Arabic before the launch of the 2012 CAP season.

For more information on the **Gender Marker** go to [www.onereponse.info](http://www.onereponse.info)

For the e-learning course on “**Increasing Effectiveness of Humanitarian Action for Women, Girls, Boys and Men**”, see [www.iasc-elearning.org](http://www.iasc-elearning.org)





*The Myanmar Humanitarian Fund (MHF) is  
an OCHA-managed country-based pooled fund  
led by the Humanitarian Coordinator to provide emergency response to  
urgent needs of people affected by natural disasters or conflict.*

*The MHF is supported by the generous contributions from the Governments of  
Australia, Denmark, Luxemburg, Sweden, Switzerland and the United Kingdom.*