

BACKGROUND

1. **The South Sudan Humanitarian Fund (SSHF) Advisory Board has agreed to allocate around US\$18 million to support the 2017 First Standard Allocation (SA1),** based on projected commitments in the first quarter of 2017. As US\$11 million was allocated by the SSHF to UN agencies in December 2016 to procure core pipeline supplies and expedite dry season pre-positioning in light of the rapidly deteriorating situation in the Greater Equatoria region, the first allocation in 2017 will predominantly support front line activities in areas with the most severe humanitarian needs, and may also support enablers if a strong justification is provided.¹
2. **With the humanitarian crisis in South Sudan deepening and spreading, the 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) estimates that some 7.5 million people, over 60% of the population, are in need of humanitarian assistance.** Areas of the country previously seen as relatively stable, including in parts of Western Bahr El Ghazal and the Equatorias, have been engulfed by conflict, violence and displacement. More than 3.4 million people have been displaced – 1.9 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) and 1.5 million refugees who have fled to neighbouring countries. Health conditions have deteriorated, and food insecurity and malnutrition have skyrocketed. In February 2017, localised famine was declared in Leer and Mayendit, with Koch deemed at high risk of famine. An estimated 4.9 million people are currently severely food insecure and this figure is expected to rise to 5.5 million people at the height of the lean season in July.
3. **The 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) – which requires \$1.6 billion - aims to provide assistance and protection to 5.8 million people with the most life-threatening needs.** Operational Response Plans developed by the respective clusters focus on three Strategic Objectives, namely to: save lives and alleviate suffering of those most in need; protect the rights and uphold the dignity of those most vulnerable; and support communities most at risk to sustain their coping capacities. The HRP strategy emphasises efficient, effective and transparent resource utilisation; the centrality of protection in action and advocacy; flexibility, adaptation and coordination; delivering by securing safe access; rigorous prioritisation; and putting communities at the heart of humanitarian action.

2017 FIRST STANDARD ALLOCATION – STRATEGY AND PROCESS

Allocation Strategy

4. **The overarching aim of the SSHF first standard allocation is to provide a vital and timely injection of resources into the most critical frontline activities in the 2017 HRP.**
5. **The allocation will be strictly targeted to ensure optimal use of the limited funds available.** Specifically, the allocation will prioritise locations where humanitarian needs are most severe, including the two famine-affected counties. To this end, a list of 25 priority counties has been developed based on a composite analysis of displacement, IPC data, global acute malnutrition rates (GAM), and disease outbreaks. The analysis builds on the 2017 Humanitarian Needs Overview, and incorporates recent updates from the IPC analysis for January to April 2017. In addition, six counties - Yei, Lainya, Kajo-Keji, Morobo, Mundri West and Mundri East - have been included in Greater Equatoria where needs are rapidly rising due to conflict and displacement.
6. **In light of the declaration of localized famine in Leer and Mayendit on 20 February, as well as the high risk of famine in Koch, top priority will be given to FSL, Nutrition, Health and WASH frontline projects to be implemented in these three counties.**² Activities and approaches that promote impact across clusters, cross-cluster collaboration and synergies, and the centrality of protection, will be given precedence.

¹ In previous years both core pipelines and front line response were supported through a single standard allocation at the beginning of the year.

² Support to the refugee response and food aid are generally excluded from allocations due to the overall magnitude of their requirements compared to the relatively small resources available to the SSHF. However, if funding to either the refugee response or food aid is agreed as an inter-cluster priority it may be exceptionally considered.

7. **As noted above, the first standard allocation will prioritize frontline activities.** No funding for core pipelines will be given. However, consideration may be given to funding ‘enablers’, where justified on an exceptional basis as being essential to the successful implementation of front line activities e.g. safety and security services, inter-agency assessments, logistics etc.
8. **To be considered for funding, activities and projects must:**
- a. **Be consistent with CERF life-saving criteria³ and aligned with the cluster priority activities outlined in the HRP if 0-25% of HRP funding is received;**
 - b. **Be implementable immediately:** cluster strategies and individual project proposals should include a compelling articulation of approaches that will ensure feasibility of implementation, taking into consideration any access constraints, insecurity or other challenges. Modalities should be prioritised that enable rapid and adaptable responses to humanitarian needs, in light of the volatile situation on the ground. Innovation is encouraged; and
 - c. **Exemplify quality programming (i.e. mainstreaming of gender, protection, AAP, and conflict sensitivity) to the extent feasible in the circumstances.**

Process

9. **The process will build on innovations introduced in allocation rounds in the latter part of 2016 and related feedback from stakeholders.** In light of the urgent humanitarian needs, and limited availability of funding, all efforts will be made to streamline and expedite the allocation process. A detailed allocation timeline has been attached to this Allocation Strategy Paper, summarised as follows:
- Clusters will provide key information in relation to needs, priority activities and locations, proposed envelopes, and other factors such as feasibility, inter-cluster synergies etc.
 - This information will be compiled and peer-reviewed by a team composed of Cluster Coordinators / Co-coordinators and OCHA / SSHF Technical Secretariat (TS). The peer review will allow clusters to question one another’s strategies, explore integrated approaches and arrive at common conclusions regarding the top priorities for funding, including locations, activities and recommended cluster envelopes.
 - The collective, inter-cluster proposition will be defended before the SSHF Advisory Board (AB) and refined as appropriate to obtain AB endorsement.
 - **Proposals** from partners will then be called for and **reviewed** in order to prioritise and select for funding those which most closely **align** to the **parameters endorsed** by the AB.
 - **Selected proposals will undergo the usual technical review process by the SSHF TS and clusters.**

OPTIMAL USE OF RESOURCES: COMPLEMENTARITY AND DIRECT IMPLEMENTATION

10. **Funds allocated shall be complementary to, and not duplicative of, resources available from other sources.** Clusters should estimate their requirements and proposed envelopes on an understanding of other resources available to their partners in prioritised locations. When reviewing proposals from partners, other funding will be taken into account to ensure that the funds allocated are complementary to, and do not duplicate, funding through other mechanisms, or **from previous SSHF allocations.**
11. **Funds will be allocated only to proposals of HRP partners with demonstrated **capacity** to implement immediately priority activities in prioritised locations, in line with cluster strategies.** Funds will be allocated directly to implementers. ***Pass-through of funds from one agency to another is precluded.***

25 Feb 2017

Attached:- Cluster template; CERF lifesaving criteria; allocation timeline; protection main streaming guidance

³ https://docs.unocha.org/sites/dms/CERF/FINAL_Life-Saving_Criteria_26_Jan_2010_E.pdf

SOUTH SUDAN HUMANITARIAN FUND (SSHF)
2017 FIRST STANDARD ALLOCATION ROUND STRATEGY PAPER

Severity-Based Ranking		
County	Severity Score	Rank
Leer, Unity	0.96	1
Mayendit, Unity	0.96	1
Panyijiar, Unity	0.89	3
Rubkona, Unity	0.79	4
Guit, Unity	0.77	5
Aweil South, Northern Bahr el Ghazal	0.76	6
Koch, Unity	0.74	7
Gogrial West, Warrap	0.68	8
Fangak, Jonglei	0.67	9
Mayom, Unity	0.67	9
Aweil North, Northern Bahr el Ghazal	0.67	11
Longochuk, Upper Nile	0.66	12
Ulang, Upper Nile	0.66	12
Uror, Jonglei	0.66	12
Twic East, Jonglei	0.66	12
Abiemnhom, Unity	0.66	12
Aweil West, Northern Bahr el Ghazal	0.66	17
Pibor, Jonglei	0.66	17
Malakal, Upper Nile	0.63	19
Wau, Western Bahr el Ghazal	0.63	20
Gogrial East, Warrap	0.62	21
Magwi, Eastern Equatoria	0.61	22
Lafon, Eastern Equatoria	0.60	23
Juba, Central Equatoria	0.59	24
Aweil East, Northern Bahr el Ghazal	0.59	25

County
Lainya, Central Equatoria
Kajo-Keji, Central Equatoria
Morobo, Central Equatoria
Yei, Central Equatoria
Mundri East, Western Equatoria
Mundri West, Western Equatoria