Since its inception, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) has worked in close partnership with organizations around the world to protect and assist refugees. These partnerships enable UNHCR to implement its programs through other entities and to ensure service to refugees.

UNHCR works with hundreds of non-governmental (NGO) partners to implement a wide range of projects related to aid distribution, protection, education, and basic services. More than 75% of these NGOs are local organizations, and this allows the UN to amplify its services to ensure that the basic needs of refugees and populations of concern are met. In 2014, UNHCR partnered with 908 NGOs, including 543 national/local NGOs and 175 international NGOs.

In order to maintain the quality and productivity of UNHCR-NGO partnerships, UNHCR has been systematically soliciting annual partner feedback at the field level. To test the viability of this feedback system, HIAS prepared a survey in preparation for the UNHCR-NGO consultations in Geneva from June 17-19, 2015 and July 1-3, 2015. Respondents provided their names, positions, organizations, countries, and email addresses in addition to answers to multiple-choice and short response questions about their working relationship with UNHCR. The questions were based upon UNHCR’s draft of the survey.

HIAS and UNHCR conducted a survey for 2015, and other NGOs—including ICVA and InterAction—were instrumental in promoting the survey to the field. The survey received 213 responses. Included in this report are both the overall results and the region-specific results for each question. Finally, this report includes an analysis of what respondents listed as good partnership practices and those with room for improvement.

The survey data is broken down into 5 main regions - “Africa,” which excludes North Africa but includes West Africa, Central Africa and the Great Lakes region, East and Horn of Africa, and
Southern Africa; “Asia,” which excludes the Middle East and the Caucasus; “Middle East-North Africa” (MENA), which refers to an extensive region from Morocco to Iran; “Europe,” which includes Turkey and the Caucasus, “Latin America / Caribbean” (LAC), and “Other,” which contains respondents that represent headquarters of different organizations or was unsure where to characterize themselves, their responses were not numerous enough to skew the results significantly, and all of their comments and answers were included but in the "other" category.

Broadly speaking, partnerships between UNHCR and other organizations appear to be trending in a positive direction. While implementation is very uneven, the responses in the survey indicate that the new guidelines which make up the Framework for Implementing with Partners are being implemented properly by a majority of offices. 67.48% of respondents reported that, at the time of the survey, they had received the new guidance note from UNHCR and 53.80% of respondents reported that their procurement policies had changed as a result of the new policies. It also appears that implementation of UNHCR standards and guidelines have improved as many NGOs report more consistent and substantive communication with UNHCR.

The survey results suggest that UNHCR has made considerable progress working through field and network reference groups with NGO partners around the world. Mechanisms for joint management of agreements, multilateral monitoring of projects, and regular and more transparent review of partnerships are allowing UNHCR to make progress toward its intention of improving accountability in partnerships among its partners and its own field offices, but implementation is uneven. In 2015, only 58% of respondents report that their first payment installments were made within 10 days of signing project partnership agreements (PPAs) and only 52% of respondents who participated in the project partner selection process but who were not selected reported that they were informed in writing, in a timely manner, of the reason for non-selection.

While many of the respondents’ comments about their partnership with UNHCR were generally positive, challenges do remain. One such challenge was well stated by one respondent who noted that, “UNHCR should very carefully examine its current approach to partnerships. And herewith we mean to put the practice where the mouth is, the relationship in the field is too often characterised by a top down approach where every UNHCR field staff appears to be of the conviction they are in fact supervising the operation of partners, often unduly interfering with operational matters, while not having to account for decisions and promises. Also, there is a huge disconnect between the various departments in UNHCR where the one hand doesn’t know what the other is doing.”

Based upon this particular feedback and similar comments, it seems that confusion over management and transmission of information from UNCHR to project partners are still prominent challenges. This concern likely indicates that many NGO partners of UNHCR feel that there is a lack of communication or accountability within UNHCR for failing to provide information to partners.
As UNHCR continues to create new partnerships and build upon existing relationships with NGOs in service to refugees, we hope that the results of this survey will help improve the communication, productivity, efficiency, and overall impact of UNHCR-NGO networks.
Question 1. This survey is only for countries that implement projects with UNHCR funding. Has your country implemented a project with UNHCR and received funding?
213/213 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, since 2013 or earlier.</th>
<th>Yes, since 2014.</th>
<th>Yes, but 2015 is our first year implementing projects with UNHCR.</th>
<th>No, to my knowledge our organization is not implementing any projects with UNHCR.</th>
<th>Other (please specify).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td><strong>72.92%</strong></td>
<td>14.58%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>65.79%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td><strong>29.41%</strong></td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td><strong>11.54%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td><strong>16.67%</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 2. What kind of organization do you work for?

213/213 responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An operational office of an international NGO (an NGO with operations in more than one country)</th>
<th>An operational office of a national NGO (an NGO with operations in only one country)</th>
<th>The headquarters of an international NGO</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>71.05%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3. What is your office’s area of operation?
171/213 responses; 42 skipped

Initial geographic breakdown:

Geographic breakdown of “Other” category (7.02%):

Under “Other,” respondents specified the following geographic regions:

- “Afrique Autrale (Southern Africa)”
- “Central Asia”
- “East Africa – Ethiopia”
- “Emergency Transit Center, Asylum seekers in Romania and people with different protection forms”
- “India”
- “Horn and East Africa”
- “Philippines only”
- “Croatia”
- “South Asia”
- “Headquarters of an organization”
**Question 4. What is your organization’s country of operation?**

123/213 responses; 90 skipped

59 countries represented; *If more than one respondent operates in a country, then “(#)” next to a country is the number of respondents who operate within that country (note: some organizations operate in multiple countries, so the numbers next to country names equate to more than the number of responses to the question).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>LAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>Afghanistan (8)</td>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>Colombia (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso (6)</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>Dominican Republic (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Azerbaijan</td>
<td>India (4)</td>
<td>Iraq (8)</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina</td>
<td>Kyrgyzstan (2)</td>
<td>Jordan (2)</td>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad (4)</td>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>Malaysia (2)</td>
<td>Lebanon (6)</td>
<td>Panama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>Georgia (3)</td>
<td>Myanmar (3)</td>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia (2)</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>Venezuela</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Moldova</td>
<td>Pakistan (10)</td>
<td>Yemen (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya (6)</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Philippines (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>Serbia (3)</td>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar (2)</td>
<td>Switzerland (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi (2)</td>
<td>Turkey (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>Ukraine (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4, continued:
Represented countries by region (based upon the 123 respondents):

- 36% Africa (not including North Africa)
- 22% Europe (including Turkey and the Caucasus)
- 17% Asia (not including the Caucasus)
- 14% Middle East or North Africa (not including Turkey)
- 12% Latin America or the Caribbean
Question 5. Was your organization invited to UNHCR’s Country Operations Planning (COP) stakeholder meeting for 2015?

171/213 responses; 42 skipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Description</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, our organization was invited and attended.</td>
<td>72.92%</td>
<td>44.74%</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, our organization was invited but did not attend.</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, our organization was not invited to the COP stakeholder meeting.</td>
<td>10.42%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>15.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My organization requested to attend the COP but was not invited to attend.</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not know or not applicable.</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Percentage calculations based on the total number of responses (171) after excluding skipped responses (42).*
### Question 6. Did your organization participate in a selection process for a project partnership with UNHCR in 2015?

*171 responses; 42 skipped*

#### Pie Chart:
- **Yes, we participated and were selected for all projects for which we applied.**
- **Yes, we participated and were selected for some but not all projects.**
- **Yes, we participated and were not selected for any of the projects.**
- **No, we did not participate in the selection process for 2015.**
- **Other.**

#### Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes, participated and were selected for all projects</th>
<th>Yes, participated and were selected for some but not all projects</th>
<th>Yes, participated and were not selected for any of the projects</th>
<th>No, we did not participate in the selection process for 2015</th>
<th>Other.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>52.08%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
<td>21.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td><strong>35.29%</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td><strong>34.62%</strong></td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td><strong>7.69%</strong></td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7. UNHCR policy requires UNHCR to inform the partner in a timely manner about the general reasons for the decision. The partner may seek additional information from UNHCR. If you participated and were not selected for one or more of the projects, were you informed in a timely manner of the general reasons for the decision?

171/213 responses; 42 skipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, we were informed timely in writing of the reason for our non-selection.</th>
<th>We were informed in writing of the reason for our non-selection, but the decision was not timely.</th>
<th>The letter of non-selection was timely but did not even generally explain why we were not selected.</th>
<th>The letter of non-selection was not timely and did not even generally explain why we were not selected.</th>
<th>Not applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>7.89%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 7, continued:
Comments from respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “Etant selectionné, cette partie ne nous concerne pas”
- “We were selected for one sector and not others and no explanation given for non selection”

Asia
- “We did not know what is timely or not”
- “We were unaware that there was a selection process.”
- “Just for one project the letter of non-selection was timely but did not even generally explain why we were not selected and for the remaining three projects we not informed by letter and verbally that we were not selected”
- “We were not selected for a particular sector that we were implementing for 10 years and were not communicated timely (a month’s time) and the letter was not clear at all.”
- “Did not informed, did not give any letter of the reasons for non-selection”
- “The general reasons were not acceptable to us and then we further requested for additional information which was not provided to us in satisfactory manner.”

Middle East or North Africa
- “We submitted several area expression of interests for multi - sectors interventions. We got a letter explaining in which area and for which sectors we were pre - selected, but not the reason for non - selection of the other components. We had to request a meeting with UNHCR in capital to get a full picture.”
- “Whilst a letter that outlined the selection criteria was sent it did not provide any details regarding why a project was rejected.”
- “The letter mentioned the projects we were selected for with no recurrence to the non-selected projects”

Europe
- “However, in 2013 we responded to the request to write a proposal for one country operation for which we never received any feedback. This is not uncommon. We tried to follow up on it and asked our contact person to give us some insights, but we did not get a response.”
Question 8. If you participated and were not selected, did you ask UNHCR for more information about the reason for non-selection?

171/213 responses; 42 skipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes, we asked and received a detailed and satisfactory explanation from UNHCR.</th>
<th>We asked UNHCR for more information but UNHCR did not even respond.</th>
<th>We asked UNHCR for more information and they responded, but the response was not helpful.</th>
<th>Not applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>5.26%</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>13.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>2.94%</td>
<td><strong>14.71%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td><strong>15.38%</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments from respondents, organized by region:

Africa

- “The delayed decision from UNHCR affected our programme implementation in terms take-over/handover process”
- “Selection process based on on-site context bearing in mind each organization's strengths in a particular field.”
• “We applied for Education. Though the committee determined that we were the most competent to implement these activities, the Representative overrode the decision and chose another organisation. We failed to understand how this was fair.”

Asia
• “The explanation they gave was bureaucratic and had no relation with their policy of result based management. We had good results in the field, even PoC said that, but the reasons given was a policy reached in Geneva that UNHCR should streamline NGOs.”

Middle East / North Africa
• “Though the EoI process was launched with the aim of enhancing transparency, the result was exactly the opposite. The expression of interest was based on sectoral strategies that we all agencies contributed to develop. Yet the feedback for the non-acceptance of our protection proposal was that our EoI was not in line with the protection strategy. We asked for more explanations and we got to know that a ‘new’ strategy was used to review and select the proposals. We are of the view that this strategy and criteria for selection should have clearly stated at the beginning of the process. Additionally we were told that our ‘bad’ reporting contributed to the non-retention of our agency. However we had never received any feedback/comments - negative or positive - on our previous grants.”
• “The selection process was not transparent and consultation was limited. There was a general feeling that decisions had been made prior to the selection process and the selection process was more of a formality.”
Question 9. Is your organization an international NGO?

171/213 responses; 42 skipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>41.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>23.68%</td>
<td>76.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>73.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 10. Did your partnering UNHCR office share the new Guidance Note on UNHCR’s Contribution towards Project Headquarters Support Costs? The Note is available at: https://icvanetwork.org/resources/ip-management-guidance-note-no-3-unhcrs-contribution-towards-project-headquarters-support.

68/213 responses; 145 skipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes, UNHCR shared the new guidance on Project HQ Support Costs before we concluded our most recent project agreement with UNHCR.</th>
<th>No, UNHCR did not share the new guidance before we concluded our most recent agreement with UNHCR, but we received the new guidance from elsewhere.</th>
<th>We never received the new guidance from UNHCR.</th>
<th>I do not know if we have received the new guidance from UNHCR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 11. Has the 7% rate for Project Headquarters Support Costs been applied to your current Project Partnership Agreements?
68/213 responses; 145 skipped

Yes, the policy on Project Headquarters Support Costs was accurately applied to our current Project Partnership Agreements.

No, the policy on Project Headquarters Support Costs was not accurately applied to our current Project Partnership Agreements.

I do not know or not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes, accurately applied</th>
<th>No, not accurately applied</th>
<th>I do not know or not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>82.14%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 12. If not, has a different rate been applied (please specify rate)?
8 responses; 205 skipped

Comments from respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “5%”

Middle East / North Africa
- “We understood that we cannot apply for any Headquarters Support, so we did not apply for any.”
- “The rate is 7% but some lines are excluded partially or totally from the calculation such as for procurement exceeding 100,000 USD, in line with the guidelines; and cash transfer. The latter interpretation is not always agreed upon with the office as there are some payments that may or may not be considered as cash transfer. the result is that the actual PHSC is always less than the 7% of the overall budget, approx 4%”

Question 13. If not applied or if applied at a rate different than the policy, what was the explanation for it?
11 responses; 202 skipped

Comments from respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “Inadequate funding”
- “It was applied as per policy”
- “No any explanation”
- “The Programmes Associate Officer was clueless on the contribution percentage.”

Europe
- We were not informed.
Question 14. Please offer any other comments/suggestions on the overhead rate as applied by UNHCR.

17 responses; 196 skipped

Comments from respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “It is fair to grant the overhead rate to the organization implementing the project”
- “Le HCR nous a informé de la note lors de la discussion du budget en cours mais nous ne l’avons pas reçu.”
- “The overhead should be increased or sufficient administration and support cost provided. In many cases UNHCR use the justification of the overhead costs provided to not adequately fund administration and support cost.”
- “Each HCR office has a different understanding of what the overhead rate costs are included and not included in this costing”
- “It is fine as applied currently”
- “We would suggest that instead of having this rate as excluding procurement of threshold more than $100,000, it should be made a flat rate of 7% of full budget. It would then be easier to administer.”
- “It is reasonable.”

Asia
- “Our HQ office takes Indirect Cost Recovery- which is overhead. The other support costs are direct project expenses and are required to meet our own internal controls as well as comply with UNHCR rules/regulations.”
- “UNHCR employees seems to have difficulties in understanding what should and should not be included in the calculation of HQ Over Head support costs (even though it is very clear in the guidance note)”

Middle East / North Africa
- “So far we are pleased with the good cooperation with the regional office we are working with”
- “There was some confusion about overhead vis a vis sub partners whereby the clause related to procurement was conflated with partnership. This caused some confusion as to whether ICR could be taken on the sub agreements. It was ultimately agreed that as sub partners are not procured but rather vetted and chosen that this restriction does not apply and ICR was applied accordingly.”
- “All the budget should be subject to PHSC or overhead as applied generally by all other donors we partner with”

Europe
- “As our HQ office has been already working with UNHCR, the local office was recommended to sign the contract with UNHCR through Head quarters, which received
the overheads but it’s not involved in the implementation of the project at all. To transfer the overhead to the local office is administratively complicated.”

- “It is very small for small projects and organizations which are not funded by any governmental agency of their respective countries. That would not matter so much if one could get different lines inside the agreement for supporting HQ costs, however, this is not possible. For an NGO supporting predominantly through technical missions conducted from HQ and being embedded in the UNHCR office in the field and consequently not maintaining own offices, it is tricky to make it work on the 7%.”
- “A "one size fits all" is not always the best way to operate. A more appropriate action is proposals with justification of needs, and discussion between partners.”

**Question 15. Did your partnering UNHCR office share the new Guidance Note on Procurement by Partners with UNHCR Funds (issued October 2014)?** The Note is available at: https://icvanetwork.org/resources/unhcr-guidance-note-no-4-procurement. The policy requires partners to apply within six months of signing the project partnership agreement.

163/213 responses; 50 skipped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes, we received the new guidance from UNHCR.</th>
<th>No, we have not received the new guidance from UNHCR.</th>
<th>I do not know if we have received the new guidance from UNHCR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>59.57%</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>68.57%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>17.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td><strong>81.82%</strong></td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>65.38%</td>
<td>26.92%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td><strong>54.55%</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td><strong>81.82%</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td><strong>18.18%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 16. Does your organization have Pre-qualification for Procurement (PQP) status?

163/213 responses; 50 skipped

- Yes.
- No, but the organization has applied for PQP status and is awaiting an answer.
- No, because the organization applied for PQP status and was denied.
- No, the organization has not yet applied for PQP status, but is planning on applying before the end of the year.
- No, the organization has not yet applied for PQP status and is not planning on applying.
- I do not know or not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>No, but the organization has applied for PQP status and is awaiting an answer.</th>
<th>No, because the organization applied for PQP status and was denied.</th>
<th>No, the organization has not yet applied for PQP status, but is planning on applying before the end of the year.</th>
<th>No, the organization has not yet applied for PQP status and is not planning on applying.</th>
<th>I do not know or not applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>29.79%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>31.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>2.86%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>8.57%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>30.30%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>3.03%</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>19.23%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td>11.54%</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and explanations by respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “Will apply for PQP once the hub office is established. Application for registration has been processed. Awaiting report and certificate.”
- “This is the first time to hear PQP from UNHCR”
• “We used to have PQP until it was withdrawn by UNHCR and the new process is ongoing”
• “We are clueless about the application.”

Asia
• “No we did not apply but we are implementing procurement guidelines of UNHCR provided to us”
• “We not completed yet all the process for PQP”
• “We do not have much procurement and follow the UNHCR guidelines.”
• “We are planning to apply for pre-qualification, however it may take a year more.”

Question 17. Has your organization’s approach to procurement changed as a result of the new policy?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>I do not know.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
<td>55.32%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>53.13%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>64.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 18. Please explain your answer to the previous question.
90 responses; 123 skipped

Africa
- “Oui, il ya eu beaucoup de reforme adoptée cette année suite à l'analyse du projet 2014 sur les procédures d'achat et operationnelle du HCR. Ces reformes sont en cours d'exécution.”
- “Our procurement policy is all-encompassing since we work with various international donors.”
- “It has improved”
- “The organization is still using the 2013 procurement guidelines”
- “Our procurement policy is quite similar to UNHCR”
- “Notre approche est déjà conforme à la politique du HCR.”
- “My organization has updated its procurement policy and has set up a procurement committee.”
- “Nos procédures prenaient déjà en compte les nouvelles directives d'approvisionnement du HCR.”
- “Nous appliquons notre propre procedure pour les achats”
- “Not implemented the procurement policy”
- “The hiatus created by the lack of a PQP means that we have to ask UNHCR on case by case basis for certain procurements”
- “PAR LA MISE EN PLACE D UN COMITE D ACHAT ET LA CONSTITUTION D UNE LISTE DE FOURNISSEURS”
- “Our organization has developed a new Standard operating procedure taking into consideration the new UNHCR procurement guidelines to ensure consistency.”
- “HCR pre-approval for procurement is too cumbersome and defeats the purpose it was intended for”
- “We were not approached with the new policy as for the former implemented projects we were inline with policy”
- “We have maintained previous procurement guidelines. The guidelines are based on previously-audited processes.”
- “Our organization uses its own procurement policy that it had already put in place”
- “The UNHCR policy is more secure compared to our organization policy in terms reduction in risks associated with procurement of goods and services.”
- “Our approach is in conformity with the rules”
- “What i know is we use the manual procedure of HCR”
- “We have temporarily changed our procurement procedures to adapt to our current situation while awaiting the decision on PQP status.”
- “Bien que nous ne soyons pas pré qualifié, tous les achats s'inscrits dans la procédure du HCR a matière de passation de marche;”
- “Our current procurement policies are in tandem with the new guidelines”
- “IT HAS CHANGED ACCORDING TO THE NEW POLICYOF UNHCR”
• “La nouvelle politique HCR n'est pas encore connue par le Bureau Pays; l'ONG étant internationale a également sa politique qui repond aux standards interantionaux”
• “Procurement is not applicable to our partnership agreement.”
• “The new procurement policy has not been introduced to our organisation.”
• “The Procurement committee for purchase of items was set up to prequalify vendors.”
• “We respect the rules as outlined in the policy”

Asia
• “As most of our org. procurement policies are almost inline with UNHCR policies”
• “New procedures were applied according to guidelines”
• “Although new guidance note on procurement issued on October 2014 has not shared with us, but we are following UNHCR previous procurement guideline,”
• “Ongoing. Changes have started and are continuing”
• “Our practice is consistent with the policy.”
• “Yes, approach to procurement changed according to the new policy.”
• “Our organisation is familiar with the procedure”
• “We are still considering necessary changes to procurement as a result of extensive feedback from UNHCR and because some provisions in the new UNHCR policy are onerous for smaller operations”
• “Now we are not compel to take three quotation for Material from different shops before selection for project implementation and the work of paper becomes decrease”
• “UNHCR capacitated us in the whole procurement process”
• “Our organization's procurement policy is similar to the one by UNHCR.”
• “My organization has its own procurement policy, After partnership with UNHCR and getting their procurement policy we have added some more clause in our procurement policy that support us to update”
• “As the volume of our procurement is not high and we were already following the systems, the new guidelines have not changed much for us.”
• “The new UNHCR procurement policy is related to the previous policy, we are already working on this policy”
• “As a budding organization we did not have the policy of 'Sealed bidding' for amounts above a certain cost, but for this project, we have now introduced this system in our procurement procedures.”
• “Based on the new guidelines, we take the guidelines seriously so as to avoid any discrepancies and further avoid any negative comments by the external auditors.”

Middle East / North Africa
• “We got information about new procedures and rules for payments and will implement them.”
• “Our organisation's approach to procurement as a result of the new policy, enabled us to review our own procurement system and to evolve certain changes to improve our implementation.”
• “Our policy was revised in terms of levels of procurement authorities and some practices”
• “We’re paying salaries in local currency.”
• “This was only brought to our attention during an amendment to our current agreement that was signed ~ March - April 2015”
• “Because we implementing the project with UNHCR, so we have to follow their policy.”
• “UNHCR’s procurement policies are unnecessarily cumbersome. Previously when we had prequalified status we were able to apply our organizations rules and regulations to minimize the burden under very difficult operating contexts. Now we have been told that to qualify for the pre-qualified status we will have to update our procurement manual and even that seems to not exempt us from following the more stringent UNHCR rules with regards to procurement which makes programming more difficult and slower.”
• “In our project we do not procure items without the authorization from UNHCR”
• “The procurement will be done within the agreement and we continuously ask UNHCR field office for advice and guidance before procurement.”
• “Internal standards and procedure of the organisation and are already at the same level required for pre-qualification and applied since several years as the organisation is partner of the major donors/organisations”
• “We did not apply yet due to changes in our procurement policy.”
• “Because we do not have a lot of purchase”
• “As a UNHCR partner, in any procurement process even if its less that 500$ we provide three offers with each purchasing goods or services”
• “Our internal procurement policies and procedures were closely aligned to that of the UNHCR policy. As such, very little adaptation was required.”
• “We didn't get the new guideline”

Europe
• “Our tender procedure started with higher amount (10 000 USD) and UNHCR started with 5 000 which complicates the work of shelter program where the material required for each shelter is different from house to house and expensive”
• “Well not because of the new policy, I have not seen it before today, but we had been given other feedback on procedures and started to change them”
• “There was no need for changes”
• “No significant changes”
• “Our procurement guidelines and thresholds embodied in our Operations Handbook are stricter than the ones applied by UNHCR, therefore no adjustments to the current policy have been made; we continued to apply its own policy.”
• “We have started to make procurement plans, establish committees for procurement and following the rules written in the guidelines. UNHCR [in this city] also implemented a training on procurement.”
• “We adapted our procurement rules to be in line with the Note.”
“The organization's approach to procurement has not changed as a result of the new policy because the policy for procurement of our organization is in compliance with the new policy for procurement.”

“Our approach to procurement guideline states that 'we follow the funding bodies' policies whenever we sign the project based agreements’”

“Besides UNHCR funding our organization receives funding from other sources and has to follow due to national and EU strict regulation public contract regulation”

“Our organization did not have a need to undertake procurement under the current project funded by UNHCR.”

“It was not requested yet”

“We never been communicated by UNHCR on the new procurement policy.”

Latin America and the Caribbean

“Se han incorporado gradualmente mecanismos de adquisicion a la politica interna de la organizacion”

“Con el fin de ajustarnos a la buena gestión del proyecto, las partes han acordado cooperar plenamente, se han realizado ajustes e implementado acciones tendientes a mantener una asociación de calidad, basada en un compromiso humanitario común y orientado hacia la protección de los refugiados y otras personas de interes. Se han establecido procedimientos, criterios y controles financieros. Sistema de seguimiento, registro y reporte de las transacciones. Informes con estadísticas de distribución, estado de cuentas con el informe periódico. Un sistema de seguimiento para la transferencia de efectivo o vales para garantizar el cumplimiento de los procedimientos y principios acordados.”

“No contamos con una nueva política.”

“We do not know because we do not know the process”

“No cuento con elementos de análisis para afirmar o no si hubo cambios”

Other areas

“Based on our organization’s and UNHCR MoU, our procurement procedures can be applied”

“We have made some amendments on our procurement policy such as procurement threshold, vendor management and etc.”

“Yes, it will be changed also our NGO policy. We will be more involved in bureaucratic work and not have enough time to serve the interests of refugees groups.”

“It has been made mandatory to obtain 3 quotations for procurement with cost about 5000 [X currency]”

“In order to meet the update international standards Or to equalized the standard with International standards.”

“Project verification is always conducted as per UNHCR new guideline.”
**Question 19. Applies to NGOs with current partnership agreements: When was your agreement with UNHCR signed?**

*159/213 responses; 54 skipped*

- The agreement was signed prior to January 1, 2015 (or, if the project is a new project, prior to the start of the project).
- The agreement was signed in January 2015 (or, if the project is a new project, during the first month of the project).
- The agreement was signed before April 1, 2015 (or, if the project is a new project, during the first 3 months of the new project).
- No agreement has yet been signed, but our project started more than three months ago.
- I do not know or not applicable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Prior to Jan 1, 2015</th>
<th>January 2015</th>
<th>Prior to April 1, 2015</th>
<th>Before April 2015</th>
<th>I do not know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>21.74%</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>41.30%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>31.43%</td>
<td>5.71%</td>
<td>11.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td><strong>48.39%</strong></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td><strong>36.00%</strong></td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td><strong>36.36%</strong></td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td><strong>9.09%</strong></td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td><strong>18.18%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 20. If the agreement was not signed prior to January 1 or prior to the start of the project, why not? [Select all that apply.]
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- My organization submitted our project proposal at least one month prior to 1st January or one month prior to the start of the project, but UNHCR did not respond in a timely manner.
- My organization did not submit our project proposal one month prior to 1st January or one month prior to the start of the project.
- My organization submitted our project proposal one month prior to 1st January, but UNHCR and my organization both required more time to work together to make changes.
- UNHCR unnecessarily delayed or delayed without explanation the submission or consideration of proposals.
- The Agreement was tripartite and government had to countersign, which caused the delay.
- My organization requires the agreement to be signed at our HQ and the agreement was delayed waiting for HQ approval.
- Other, explain:

38.05%
28.32%
30.97%
7.08%
7.08%
0.88%
10.62%
My organization submitted our project proposal at least one month prior to 1st January or one month prior to the start of the project, but UNHCR did not respond in a timely manner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Africa</th>
<th>Asia</th>
<th>MENA</th>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>LAC</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>3.23%</td>
<td>45.16%</td>
<td>16.13%</td>
<td>25.81%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td>4.17%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>8.33%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
<td>42.31%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>11.76%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments and explanations by respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “L’accord a été signé vers le late April; nous ignorons les raisons de ce retard.”
- “Mon organisation avait des besoins de concertation préalables au dépôt de la demande, mais il n’y a pas eu une réaction à temps là-dessus de la part du HCR. Pour cela, la version finale et officielle de la demande a été envoyé fin décembre.”
- “Our organization had submitted the proposal at the proposed time but due to the amendment that took place in the area had its consequences and updates took some time but for the benefit of the new beneficiaries”
- “The agreement was sent to our office in December and our office signed early January and funds were disbursed after signing the agreement”
- “It’s a combination of things. The request for submission of the proposal for activities was sent by UNHCR on Nov. 24 with a deadline of Dec. 1. Thereafter there is need for discussion with UNHCR and then communication of the proposal and approval from our HQ, then send to UNHCR (Dec. 30). Then there is the time for for the hard copy to be sent from UNHCR which will then need to be scanned and sent to our HQ to receive
delegation of authority for signature. In other words, with the process beginning so late (Nov. 24), it is unimaginable that a signed agreement could be in place by January 1.”

- “Earmarked funding from donor government had to be incorporated into UNHCR’s budget before agreement could be signed.”

Asia

- “We have signed agreement on 6th April 2015.”
- “The project funds were allocated at the sub-office level and we were not included in the annual plan- but given a small amount of funds (less than US$50K) to compliment ongoing program activities.”
- “Our Project approved in September 2014, but start in February 2015, due to closing of year 2014 and our project is for six month period.”
- “When UNHCR local staff call us we signed the agreement”
- “Most often the proposal is submitted on time, but the time specified in call for expression of interest is never taken into account by UNHCR and further if we are selected, we are informed but then the agreement takes month/s to be finalized by UNHCR.”

Middle East / North Africa

- “We signed the agreement in mid June 2015”
- “Our organization signed the agreement from the first of this year.”
- “While we did not submit one month prior to start it is important to note that the call documents and relevant budget indications were not recevied until December; the proposal process is incredibly cumbersome and requires formal indication in writing of funding levels, etc. for HQ reviews and sign off. In addition there were countless revisions and even when the agreement was signed there were mistakes in the PCA. Note that we were able to get a funded LOMI however even that took some time and put unnecessary strain on programs and caused the organization to release a large number of staff due to gap in contract.”
- “My organization submitted the proposal late march as per the request.”
- “My organisation submitted the programs (2 in total; 1 each regional or field office) proposal in December according to timeline requested by the relevant offices. Discussions took place in December and finalised in January, allowing some days for HCR for the internal clearance procedure. PPAs were signed end of January”
- “It was an ongoing project, it took time to finalize the amendments and it was signed after the start of the project”
- “Unnecessary delays were caused by technical problems facing the internal systems of the UNHCR, which did not allow for timely processing and issuing of PPAs.”

Europe

- “We submitted in December but it was not a full month before 1st January”
- “The Agreement was between a lot of partners”
- “Not applicable, as the agreement was signed before 1 January”
• “UNHCR did not publish a Call for expression of interest for 2015 projects since they had done it a year before, and they were pleased with our work. Our organization submitted the project proposal at least one month prior to 1st January and agreed with UNHCR on the details prior to 1st January. The Agreements were signed in the first ten days of January, since our office was closed for the holidays, and it was done upon agreement with the competent persons in UNHCR office.”
• “Our agreement was signed in May 2015 - four months after submission. Although a few initial changes were needed, UNHCR staff turnover and internal UNHCR changing priorities on basis of staff preference delayed the signing process considerably.”
• “The UNHCR office in capital signed the agreement on February 2, 2015. We asked clarification on personnel salaries. We asked UNHCR whether we can pay the termination costs of staff due for 2015 (not for previous years) from our budget. Nearly one month later we have an unclear answer. Program unit of UNHCR clarified that we can pay the 2015 share from the budget but the finance unit stated that we cannot. We both agreed to sign the agreement and solve this issue while implementing the agreement in order not to interrupt the services.”
• “We submitted the proposal on time and UNHCR reviewed and approved it. However, in our country, there are holidays in January, so the signing was delayed. This did not affect the preparation and implementation of the project.”
• “The approval for the implementation of the project was taken in December 2014 but the final signature of the agreement was done on the 5th of January.”
• “There is a very big pressure on the work of NGOs and international organisations in our country now. The NGOs are de-facto banned to get foreign funding. The new laws prevent the work, and the new procedure is not in place yet. UNHCR is in negotiation with the government, but there is no acceptable solution yet.”

Latin America or the Caribbean
• “La permanencia de ACNUR en el país aun estaba por confirmarse.”
• “El proceso este año se demoró para la firma por todo lo que conlleva el entender y los cambios en el PPA. Además de la inmensa cantidad de objetivos en el sistema FOCUS que no permitió que el proyecto se lo realice a tiempo.”
• “By occupation both UNHCR and the NGO did not reach an agreement before the deadline.”

Other areas
• “Not applicable”
Question 21. If no agreement was signed prior to the start of the year (or prior to the start of a new project), was a Letter of Intent with UNHCR signed?
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This question does not apply to our project because an agreement was signed prior to the start of the year.

A Letter of Intent was signed before the project began.

A Letter of Intent was signed but after the project began (specify less than one month, more than one month, more than two months).

No, a Letter of Intent was not signed.

Please specify: less than one month, more than one month, more than two months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>This question does not apply</th>
<th>A Letter of Intent was signed before the project began</th>
<th>A Letter of Intent was signed but after the project began</th>
<th>No, a Letter of Intent was not signed</th>
<th>Please specify: less than one month, more than one month, more than two months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>24.24%</td>
<td>15.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>28.00%</td>
<td>16.00%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
<td>52.94%</td>
<td>5.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Question 21, continued:**
Comments and explanations by respondents, organized by region:

**Africa**
- “Une lettre d’intentation a été signé 23 jours après le début du projet.”
- “More than one month”
- “Within a month”
- “More than three months”
- “Less than one month after the project began”

**Asia**
- “No letter of intent was signed but it was shared through email that you have to start work and you are selected for the project.”

**Middle East / North Africa**
- “More than a month later.”
- “Around one month”
- “Less than one month”
- “More than one month”
- “Signed by UNHCR on 29 January, signed by the INGO on 9 February 2015.”

**Europe**
- “Letter was not signed because this was continuation of three years project”

**Latin America or the Caribbean**
- “Se firmo en menos de un mes después del inicio del proyecto”

**Other areas**
- “More than one month”
**Question 22. If a letter of intent was not signed before the project began, why not? Explain.**
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Comments and explanations by respondents, organized by region:

**Africa**
- “We signed before the project began. However, there were some initial field visits we made based on discussions with UNHCR”
- “No reasons were provided by UNHCR”
- “Manque de réactivité du HCR.”
- “Because of UNHCR delays”
- “LES ACCORDS ONT ETE SIGNES LE 16 JANVIER 2015”
- “Delays from UNHCR, unknown”
- “HCR's inability to prepare one”
- “On ne savait pas qu'on pouvait signer une lettre d'intention avant le début d'un projet.
- When we discussed it with UNHCR, it appeared that the agreement was still going to be signed within the month of January. We mutually agreed that the delay was not significant enough to merit a letter.”
- “The draft agreement had already been developed and was going through the process of approvals and signing thus a letter of intent was unnecessary and also for our organisation this was an ongoing project.”
- “It was never discussed and was probably not needed.”
- “UNHCR never explained reasons.”
- “UNHCR was still working on our budget”

**Asia**
- “We have directly signed agreement [in early] April, 2015.”
- “We do not know about the reason why it was not signed as told before they have informed us electronically to start work.”
- “An email was sent to indicate that our projects were selected for the operation year 2015.”
- “My Organization was applied for the proposed project june 2014 mid the UNHCR sub office MFT team was email to my organization visit and visit was done and we were selected for the project but agreement was done in 16th March 2015.”

**Middle East / North Africa**
- “We have been working with UNHCR to customise the available funds to our intended planned activities, however, limited resources for 2015 and burden of a high expenditure carried forward from 2014 forced us to reduce and change our activities to reach to an acceptable budget funding amount.”
- “Not all the UNHCR area offices agreed to sign a letter of intent.”
• “Due to changes in the general specs of the project which is related to support to IDPs and refugees and the participation of third parties such as the government in some aspects of the decisions that affected our project with UNHCR”
• “Because the funding approval was not clear to UNHCR if their assessments are approved for funding or not”
• “Because discussion were ongoing since December; HCR it intended to limit the LOI as much as it could, to exceptional cases; especially the PPA was with a parter that was already partner in 2014.”
• “it was an ongoing project, we could not interrupt activities for the sake of beneficiaries.”
• “Because the delay was solely 3 weeks and we had been constantly in touch with the UNHCR program department to solve some of the remaining issues.”
• “This was not discussed. However the organisation did receive pre-financing approval to commence implementation prior to PPA signature.”

Europe
• “I did not know that something like this existed, but it normally is not an issue, since the activities do not immediately start 1st January.”
• “Letter was not signed because this was continuation of three years project”
• “It was not considered necessary.”
• “We were not informed about the necessity.”
• “We do not know.”
• “We have never had signed this letter so far.”
• “Because, it is not applicable in our case as UNHCR is still seeking for the ways and flexible solutions.”
• “We never been approached by UNHCR with a suggestion to sign a letter.”

Other areas
• “UNHCR didn't gave us a letter of intent timely.”
• “Email approval was given.”
• “The new project started just after the previous year assignment. No significant time gap.”
Question 23. Section 6.6 of the new Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) requires that the first payment installment be paid by UNHCR to the partners within 10 days of signing.
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The first payment from UNHCR was made within 2 weeks of signing the Agreement.

The first payment from UNHCR was made between 2 weeks and one month of signing the Agreement.

The first payment from UNHCR was made more than one month after signing.

It has been more than one month since we signed the Agreement, but we still have not received the first payment from UNHCR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>The first payment from UNHCR was made within 2 weeks of signing the Agreement.</th>
<th>The first payment from UNHCR was made between 2 weeks and one month of signing the Agreement.</th>
<th>The first payment from UNHCR was made more than one month after signing.</th>
<th>It has been more than one month since we signed the Agreement, but we still have not received the first payment from UNHCR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>24.44%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>4.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>65.63%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>15.63%</td>
<td>3.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td><strong>16.13%</strong></td>
<td>6.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td><strong>75.00%</strong></td>
<td>38.71%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other areas</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td><strong>45.45%</strong></td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td><strong>9.09%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 24. If the first payment was paid later than one month after signing the agreement, did UNHCR explain the reasons for the delay?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Yes.</th>
<th>I do not know or Not applicable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
<td>12.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
<td>92.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “Yes, internal processes take time”
- “We signed the agreement four days ago”
- “They explain and they told us the delay its from the payment transfer”

Middle East / North Africa
- “UNHCR justified that we didn't send the government approval letter for the project implementation and that is why they did not release the installment on time.”
- “Due to the procedure between UNHCR Office”
- “Administrative delay”
Europe

- “The contract cannot be signed because the NGOs are not allowed to administer the grants any more. UNHCXR is having the ongoing negotiations with the government for many months now.”

Other

- “Bank delays were due to technical issues”
- “We have got different explanations from UNHCR country office in this regard.”
- “We were required to open a separate bank account but the amount for funding was so small for our Board of Trustees to approve opening a bank account for X amount plus and also it was difficult to open then a new account in the city as we were new there.”

Question 25. Please offer any comments or suggestions on expediting the installment payments by UNHCR for projects.
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Comments by respondents, organized by region:

Africa

- “Le payement par versement pour les projets du HCR est une bonne orientation pour la traçabilité des opérations d'où un meilleur contrôle du budget.”
- “So far, we have not experienced any delays.”
- “It was good. How ever it was made at the last week of January.”
- “UNHCR has been prompt in the payment of installment of the project.”
- “Because the new influx of refugees from [this country] the PPA was extended but the process to the access to the funds are slow. My suggestion is that UNHCR mas have a provisional funds to react quick and face the emergency.”
- “Si le versement se fait dans les delais, il permet un bon suivi de l'utilisation des ressources allouées.”
- “Perhaps, clear instructions on the process so that the partners fills out documentation accordingly.”
- “Assurer la mise à la disposition des fonds dès le début des activités ou quelques jours avant.”
- “For our organization installment payments is very good”
- “Generally it works ok with slight delays”
- “Expediting the installment payments will help NGOs to implement the activities within the budget because of the inflation in our country, sometimes the gab between the proposed budget which was more than two month and the starting date is wide which put the proposal in a risk”
- “VEILLEZ A RESPECTER LES DELAIS PREVUS”
- “UNHCR should make requests in advance for partners to avoid delays in implementation”
- “Installment should be done 10 days after signed the agreement”
“UNHCR if considered the environment consequences that will help the partners to achieve their activities in timely manner as the situation of the unpaved roads and the heavy rains affects the projected costs especially of the planned transportation and availability of the communities as they will engaged the agricultural business as farming labor. So the funding will be very successful and easy to implement if started from first of January.”

“It would be very good if UNHCR notified partners when they send in the installments as it will enable the partners to be aware and anticipate. Currently no notification is given and the only way to know is after funds are deposited into accounts.”

“Par rapport à 2014, l’UNHCR a fourni beaucoup d’efforts pour le paiement des versements à temps en 2015.”

“It was done on time right after signing of the project”

“Au niveau du HCR a notre niveau nous apprécions la célérité dans l’approvisionnement des partenaires, la petite difficulté est souvent dans le chef des banquiers;”

“There is need to lessen the time for back and forth discussions during the SPMR verification process. It would also help to get the IFPR on time so that the liquidations can be done expeditiously.”

“1. Delayed payments results in poor project implementation. The sooner funding is received, the better for the projects.”

“Completion of the project proposal should be completed by 31 December 2015. This will ensure timely disbursement of funds.”

“Installments are paid punctually as long as a partner has submitted relevant financial report”

Asia

“UNHCR should be very clear ahead of time about all the up to date requirements, in the past our national NGO only had very small projects with UNHCR, therefore having no separate account was ok, but after the audit and along with the new partnership agreement it was requested that the organization gets its own dedicated account for UNHCR funds. In a country, where setting up an additional account takes time, it would be great to be notified about this again when signing the partnership agreement.”

“UNHCR sub office in our region is doing well as far as the release of installments is concern but some times the transactions from bank to bank take time”

“We had no problems in installments payments by UNHCR for projects”

“UNHCR paid installment on time.”

“Just do it. Meaning, just pay when you are supposed to pay.”

“UNHCR must conduct payment on time to IP after completion of 70% expenses as discussed in Annex but it is not followed and most of time payment delaying due to unknown reason which affect the project activities undertaking by UNHCR.”

“The installment plan as per new PPA, should be say for 1 quarter: 3 months+1month but country offices are still not clear about this. So despite the new agreement, the second quarter gets affected as it takes time to send IPFR, verify it and then release payment.”
• “As international NGO UNHCR should send the installment timely according to UNHCR policy but they doing not perform well timely. Even second installment was still delay.”
• “As I assume the project control team has lesser members and they control a wide range of projects. I believe, they are not in a position to finalize their reports on time and that further causes delays in releasing the installments.”

Middle East / North Africa
• “So far payments were always done in a timely manner”
• “It is better to release the installment soon after singing of the contract because the project is already approved by UNHCR”
• “UNHCR should pay the installment on time since most of the project have running cost and any delay will effect of the activities”

Europe
• “Very problematic to have budget in 2 different currencies (USD for HQ) and local currency for local costs”
• “There has been no need to expedite the installment payments so far.”
• “The new system applied proved to be very effective with a detailed installment plan per BL and split per month. The latter Installment Plan can be revised in case on budget revision or increase of budget which offers great flexibility and greater accountability.”
• “We have received the second installment late and could be able to pay the salaries from other sources.”
• “The installments have been in due time and according to the dates priory agreed in the agreement.”
• “We need your urgent help and intervention at the highest level. If this repressive attitude of the government does not change there won’t be any critical voice with independent civic position left in the country.”

Latin America or the Caribbean
• “El mecanismo actual con remesas segun programacion es acorde a un enfoque de resultados y prevencion de riesgos, estamos asumiendo esta dinamica y hasta el momento nos sentimos comodos.”
• “Lo ideal es que se de concomitantemente la firma del acuerdo y el desembolso de los recursos una vez suscrito por las partes el Acuerdo.”
• “Si se mantienen las fechas pactadas se puede sin lugar a dudar cumplir con los compromisos del proyecto”
• “Nuestra realidad es dinámica y el contexto no garantiza garantía para el trabajo.”
• “La situacion de los pagos por parte de ACNUR con el nuevo PPA este año, y ahora que estamos ya en el segundo installment fue demorado ya que este año hay un proceso de verificacion mas profunda de cada installment entregado, este procesodemoro el desembolso.”
Other areas

- “UNHCR should process Installment payments timely or need to advice the partner as to why the delay happening. Delay of installment will affect the project implementation”
- “Provide some guidelines for certain amounts that do not require opening a new account but make use of the current account of the NGO”
Question 26. How would you rate your Partnership with your local UNHCR?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>19.05%</td>
<td>2.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>41.38%</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td><strong>60.87%</strong></td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td><strong>4.35%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>10.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “HRC exerce trop de pressions sur ses partenaires sans considération des termes du sous accord. Les agents de HCR descendent dans les bureaux des partenaires sans information préalable. Ce que fait que notre ONG pense que le HCR ne nous considère comme un partenaire mais comme une agence d'exécution”
- “Il y’a souvent un manque defeed back sur les rapports et sur les attentes des ONG par rapport au HCR”
- “Nous échangeons régulièrement avec le HCR, et nous trouvons dans la majorité des cas un terrain d'entente”
- “When we compare the project length and budget is some how less budget”
- “Sometimes they don't treat partners with respect”
- “We have just moved from the teething stage as this is our second year and the first year was full of lessons as to what UNHCR requires vs our organization's processes”
• “la politique du HCR a matière de partenariat est très transparent et favorise une relation très étroites avec les partenaires de mise en œuvre des activités sur terrain”

Asia
• “There seems to be miscommunication between head office in the capital with regional office. Quality of staff in local office is not optimal as they are constantly in some mission or other, and continuity is lacking. Besides they do not understand the country or try to, they are only intent on bureaucratic management of their own agenda.”
• “Relationships at the sub-office are good; relationships with the Protection officer in the main office are good, but the leadership in the main office is more political than operational and impacts programming.”
• “The reported financial crisis at UNHCR has resulted in project budgets of several months, then extension by one month, then new budget through October, etc. Utter chaos that makes it difficult to keep Staff or effectively work towards durable solutions. Moreover, some programme staff are now expecting monthly reports--in addition to those specified in the PPA. Programme people at UNHCR seem to want more and more control.”
• “Although we have new partners of UNHCR but the local Staff of UNHCR are cooperative and supportive in this regard”
• “It was very good but since mid 2014 there is a tendency on the part of UNHCR office to Micro Manage that is affecting the sense of ownership, morale and output.”
• “They are very approachable”

Middle East /North Africa
• “Depends on the area UNHCR office. In some area the relationship is good, in others is poor.”
• “They are understanding when it comes to delays in reporting, however too many staff with too many different requests with too much level of detail. This requires huge efforts from our staff to respond to. Budget revision is requested after an agreement has been signed. This makes UNHCR a unreliable partner.”
• “There are many field where the partnership is very good. In terms of having a loud voice regarding the state's policy - it's not enough”
• “This varies depending on location as there are many UNHCR contacts in [this country] - I would rate this from Fair to Good depending on the location. This is personality driven.”

Europe
• “Extremely good, we have open kind of communication and our beneficiaries are benefiting from it”
• “Regular consulations take place at FO level and with the Officers in charge at central level in [X city] for the benefit of the project. UNHCR has a Partner has a full and detailed understanding of each of the project components and performed all its
verifications in a timely and professional manner. Some slight improvements need to be done from the side of [X country] to better adhere to the agreed monitoring plans”

• “High level good. Again at field level some teething issues.”
• “We did not receive answers to our questions in time. Our partnership started to be one way partnership. UNHCR mostly impose us that there are UN rules. When we ask clarification about the rules the staff generally do not provide us clear answers. They generally do not want to involve when there is a problem. UNHCR staff has a strong performance anxiety and reflect this to NGOs. We know that this is due to the work load but this is also a symptom of a support mechanism which has reached its limits.”

Latin America and the Caribbean
• “Excelente la comunicacion”
Question 27. How would you rate communication between UNHCR and your organization?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>26.19%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>44.83%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td>3.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>60.87%</td>
<td>26.09%</td>
<td>8.70%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “La communication est ONE WAY (sens unique) Les agents de HCR n'hésitent pas à communiquer pour dire qu'ils viennent pour telle ou telle chose sans tenir compte de nos contraintes. Nous pensons que les agents du HCR doivent faire preuve de professionnalisme et avoir une approche participative”
- “We would benefit from more timely responses.”
- “Parfois (souvent) absence total de réaction même sur des questions urgentes et importantes”
- “Souvent, on manque d'interlocuteur pour apporter des réponses à nos attentes”
- “Communication can sometimes be unclear”
- “Toutes les nouvelles orientations sont toujours portées à la connaissance des partenaires;”

- "Africa failure in the system of providing information to its partners. "I'm not sure if the information I get is going to reach the right people. The channels of communication are not transparent."
- "I think that the communication with the UNHCR is not effective."
- "The communication is not clear enough."
- "There are too many people involved in the communication process, making it difficult to coordinate."
- "We are not informed about all the decisions made by UNHCR."
- "The communication is not timely enough."
- "There is a lack of understanding between UNHCR and our organization regarding common objectives."
• “UNHCR needs to communicate more formally with our NGO, and also with the people who make decisions at Head Office as opposed to Field Staff. When changes or decisions are taken at Field level these are hardly communicated to our Head Office until we ask, this has to improve.”

Asia
• “It was good at first when the staff understood our work. Lately they became more interested in management through larger international NGOs like Save the Children.”
• “Sub office communication is much better than the main office.”

Middle East / North Africa
• “Communication is often ad hoc not allowing sufficient time for responding while often it is not even clear what the information is requested for.”
• “Again - depends on the location. In some locations the staff are cordial and effective. In others I've found them sometimes rude. The main point I would make here is that requests come in very last minute and there are times when additional flexibility would be preferred, however, things always seemed rushed (note that as an INGO we certainly have our constraints and for the most part UNHCR staff have been understanding as I think they are generally aware that we are doing our best to turn things around quickly).”
• “UNHCR has several departments that we are dealing with, some have been very responsive such as the program department. Other units such as the community services have been very unresponsive and turnover in the head of field office post has led to significant deterioration in communication attitude, style and professionalism.”

Europe
• “Extremely good, we have open kind of communication and our beneficiaries are benefiting from it”
• “Regular consultations take place at FO level and with the Officers in charge at central level in [X city] for the benefit of the project. UNHCR has a Partner has a full and detailed understanding of each of the project components and performed all its verifications in a timely and professional manner. Some slight improvements need to be done from the side of [X country] to better adhere to the agreed monitoring plans”
• “High level good. Again at field level some teething issues.”
• “We did not receive answers to our questions in time. Our partnership started to be one way partnership. UNHCR mostly impose us that there are UN rules. When we ask clarification about the rules the staff generally do not provide us clear answers. They generally do not want to involve when there is a problem. UNHCR staff has a strong performance anxiety and reflect this to NGOs. We know that this is due to the work load but this is also a symptom of a support mechanism which has reached its limits.”
Latin America or the Caribbean

- “Muy buenos funcionarios y su colaboración para cualquier proceso ayuda y agiliza los tramites”

Other areas

- “When we send formal letter to UNHCR management hence we are getting no response to our request. Due to short term assignments of UNHCR staffs, they have limited knowledge of the partners goodwill or previous achievements on project implementation. Therefore, they luck providing the required assistance or resources to partners when communicated.”
Question 28. Over the last 12 months, my office’s relationship with UNHCR has:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Improved.</th>
<th>Neither improved nor gotten worse.</th>
<th>Gotten worse.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>54.76%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>24.14%</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td>10.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>43.48%</td>
<td>52.17%</td>
<td>4.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments by respondents, organized by region:

Africa
- “En réalité, en fonction des bases de notre ONG, les situations ont été plus ou moins différentes: acceptable ici, mauvaise de l'autre côté. Tout dépendait des agents avec qui notre organisation était en relation”
- “Depuis notre partenariat avec le HCR, nous vivons un partenariat d’Egalité et d’orientation vers les résultats, ce qui favorise même l’impact de notre travail”

Asia
- “Some miscommunication about project implementation, lack of responses to submission of weekly reports, sudden changes on ideas of how to best implement from UNHCR that were only communicated via phone to some staff of the organization. Some of these issues were clarified in the process.”
• “We are no longer partners, but we are only contacted as civil society organizations and that too when UNHCR agenda needs to be pushed.”
• “Although everyone is nice, it is very difficult to get anything done because too much time is required to address UNHCR’s budget woes, extraordinary short budgetary agreements, ridiculous reporting requirements, and obsessive control.”
• “UNHCR main office is enriched with qualified staff members however due to worse security situation in most field offices local staff is employed. The local staff members, most of the time expect either bribes or they impose their own relatives to be recruited. If we do not accept their demands, they provide fake and negative reports UNHCR regarding out operations at the site.”

Middle East / North Africa
• “We feel less treated as a partner and more as subordinate. UNHCR doesn’t seem to appreciate the huge challenges we face in Iraq and seem more interested in bureaucracy than in supporting refugees.”
• “Again the relationship with the program department has been consistently good. The relationship with the field office has deteriorated due to staff turnover and adoption of a management style that is top down and shows little respect for implementing partners.”

Europe
• “Our relationship with the UNHCR office has always been very good”
• “The relationship has gradually improved but already started at a very satisfactory level. Trust and transparency have led the relationships between [X country] and UNHCR in [Y city] since we resumed our partnership in May 2014 with a continuation over a new project in January 2015”
• “Our partnership has been structured in 2007 when the numbers of refugees are not more than 20 thousand. Now there is more than 2 million refugees in [this country] and our relation with UNHCR has gotten worse due to the limits of UNHCR. Even we can not communicate on urgent matters.”
• “The NGO office relationships with UNHCR have always been very good thus resulting in very good achievements.”
• “The relationship has been excellent during the past years. There were difficulties before. From our point of view the quality of relationship between our organisation and UNHCR strongly depend on acting persons.”

Latin America or the Caribbean
• “Mejorado por el interes mutuo en hacer las cosa de manera conjunta y poder mantener una asociación de calidad en beneficio de los refugiados y personas de interés.”
• “colaboración y comunicacion mas fluida”
Other areas

- “Le partenariat vient d’être conclu. Deux mois de partenariat.”
- “Due to the above reasons, this year office relationship with UNHCR not to the level expected.”
- “We had no problem with communicating programs and audit review with UNHCR.”

Question 30. Please offer any final comments about partnerships with UNHCR, this survey, or suggestions for next year’s survey.
78/213 responses, 135 skipped

Comments by respondents, organized by region:

Africa

- “Oui, le partenariat avec le HCR n'est pas aussi bonne dans la mesure où le HCR se croit supérieur au partenaire et fait montre de suprematie en toute chose comme si l'argent leur appartenait. La notion de partenariat fait vraiment défaut dans l'esprit du personnel HCR. Pour nous, le partenariat exige un respect mutuel, un dialogue permanent et une collaboration mutuelle. Nous devrions être au même niveau. Même les conditions de travail du partenaire ne sont pas conçues.Bref le partenaire est considéré comme un dépositaire et n'a jamais raison en quoi que ce soit vis à vis d'un personnel du HCR. Il faut un lavage d'esprit.”
- “So far the partnership has been excellent and we hope it will continue. Our concern though is the issue of the overhead cost for the headquarters - it is something that should be factored into the budget for various reasons.”
- “We want a clear, transparent, responsive medium to enable smooth operation of activities. I believe that partners should be respected and seen horizontally. An excessive power vested on some of the officers makes an IP fearful and loose their confidence. Unreasonable and one sided decision (with out the consent of IPs) will simply harm the relationship and beneficiaries at large. UNHCR should have a wide eye to identify some of its staff who are highly corruptive. I believe that IPs should only think on how best program activities implemented and hence refugees and host community benefit.”
- “Notre plus grand souhait est que HCR considère les ONGs avec qui il travaille comme étant réellement des partenaires et non comme de simples organisations qui ont besoin de son appui financier. Ce qui amène le HCR à avoir des comportements qui frustrent. Certains agents de HCR qui ont des niveaux de responsabilité assez élevé ne connaissent même pas le contenu des sous accords avec les ONGs (aussi bien du point de vue programmatique que du reporting ). Dans ce contexte, il est normal que ces agents ne puissent pas comprendre et bien apprécier le travail qui est fait. Enfin, il est souhaitable qu’il y ait un bon système de communication à l’interne du HCR entre le niveau central et ses bureaux terrains. Si un tel système existe, selon nous il n’est pas performant et mérite d’être évalué.”
“The partnership between [our organization] and UNHCR has always been good and our organization expects to continue working with UNHCR in the implementation of other projects.”

“The partnership with UNHCR with the different IPs are really good coordinated, the level of communication and commitment from the government help the implementation. The aspects to improve are regarding the coordination with the media and the preposition of minimum NFIs.”

“améliorer la réactivité, améliorer l´écoute des partenaires, tenir des promesses (on a été promis du matériel pour l´exécution de nos activités que nous n´avons jamais recu), verser les fonds à temps”

“UNHCR looks more into national partners' capacity building.”

“Améliorer les liens fonctionnels entre le HCR et les ONG et surtout être pro actifs sur les attentes des partenaires.”

“The current survey is Country wide and in this country with refugee camps of x and y, it would be useful to have area specific surveys”

“The survey in good, but it is targeting the NGOs who have implemented projects with UNHCR, but there are new partners like our case we signed agreement recently and we didn,t receive the first installment and there are some questions we have no answer for ex. section 5”

“UNHCR should build confidence and certainty in its partners so that work delivery should be enhanced otherwise once a pa partner feels insecure then even the morale to work goes low.”

“All selection should be done in November every and first payment 31 December”

“In general we are happy with the relationship between UNHCR and our Organization.”

“HCR wears three hats, no of which they do very well. 1. They have the global mandate for the care and protection of refugees 2. They act as an implementing agency 3. They act as a donor. It is impossible to do all three of these effectively. HCR Needs to figure out what they want to be and stop doing the rest. If they are going to be a donor, then they need to begin to act like a ‘real’ donor. Like USAID, the EU, DFID etc. Otherwise they will continue to do a poor job.”

“UNHCR had been a unique partner and generous donor in our operation area so we consider it as one of the strategic donor to work with and they just need to consider the environmental and the active season of targeted area that is characterized by lack of constructed roads and poor logistics when releasing the funds.”

“Need to make communications on time to avoid unnecessary emergencies”

“We have had a good relationship UNHCR [in this country], they are responsive to the contextual needs and also have a good communication response time. They are also keen to ensure budget discussion processes are done in time. They also are good in discussions with programme staff to ensure project objectives are known by all parties.”

“On sent vraiment que l'UNHCR s'est efforcé d'accélérer le versement des fonds pour qu'on n'ait pas de retard dans la mise en œuvre des activités prévues. Toutefois, notre organisation s'est retrouvée bloquée dans la mise en œuvre des activités car on attendait des directives claires de l'UNHCR après les conclusions de l'audit financier. La
mission de suivi-évaluation de l'UNCHR n'a pu effectivement venir à Madagascar que fin Mai pour donner ses directives. Ce qui a plus ou moins retardé l'avancement de quelques activités. Le règlement de la situation bien avant par téléphone n'a pas pu se faire en raison des problèmes linguistiques. Les responsables à l'UNHCR sont anglophones alors que nous venons d'un pays francophone.”

- “The survey should concentrate on issues like how UNHCR builds the capacity of partners to improve effectiveness of the work and also how UNHCR could improve in providing feedback to partners”
- “Personnellement, le vœu pour la suite du partenariat entre le HCR et les ONG nationales que les ONG nationales d'Afrique soient beaucoup favorisées a devenir international afin d'étendre leurs expériences dans d'autres pays et que les échanges entre les acteurs soient beaucoup favorisées;”
- “So far so good its just teething problems on communications that need to be resolved.”
- “It would be better if the first installment would be released immediately after contract signature in order to speed up implementation of the project activities.”
- “Suggestion for UNHCR 1. Improve Communication with partners 2. Build partners capacities 3. Timely funding disbursements 4. Respect for partners' independence”
- “UNHCR and NGOs should have more timely communication and collaboration. This will assist in implementation.”
- “Partner selection process should be transparent and not be determined by one individual who is based in the local HQ office. UNHCR field offices should be accorded more say in determining partner selection because they work directly with partners”

Asia

- “The collaboration with UNHCR is very important for my organization and we have done some great work with UNHCR over the last year, however especially when working with local NGOs hired for their expertise in terms of community access, UNHCR should be mindful to help the NGO and to streamline the response and interaction with the NGO as the NGO does not have the capacity (yet) to dedicate as much staff and other resources to the UNHCR project for which UNHCR does not pay for (our organization is project-funded). Meaning if UNHCR only agreed to fund a project manager for 35%, then it is important that UNHCR does not demand more time for interaction and activities that are not related to the project work the organization does. Here UNHCR could use some improvements in its interaction with the partners.”
- “Good, well coordinated assignment with UNHCR, appreciated the survey done, suggestion – it’s good to conduct the survey in July/after midyear.”
- “As an implementing partner of UNHCR since 1992 and the pioneer NGO providing humanitarian services for refugees since 1979, we are expecting upgrading our partnership with UNHCR as in past. It is to mention that we are is the only NGO providing health services for refugees in this country as well as working in education and other welfare services over the border.”
- “We hope for further cooperation with UNHCR”
“Quality and sympathetic staff should be present where it matters most, i.e. those who directly with refugees. They should not be sent constantly on missions UNHCR should ask itself whether they really are into result based management or just getting things done bureaucratically.”

“We are happy in partnership with UNHCR and we are serving for communities in our country.”

“It might be useful to ask next year when UNHCR released final installments.”

“Since the UNHCR operates at Head Quarters level in the capital and on operational level in the region, it would be feasible to receive information separately for these two levels. The two levels are distinctly different.”

“We want to strengthen partnership with UNHCR and hope that UNHCR will also delegate some kind of authorities and also involve the partners in selection and decision process. The partnership must based upon equality and UNHCR have to support the IP and increase their capacity if needed not to do most of work upon IP.”

“It was a very wonderful experience with UNHCR”

“This online system is so much better compared to the previous form (written).”

“Partnership with UNHCR is our new initiative but find the UNHCR staff cooperative, supportive and following the proper communication that supports the process of project implementation and strengthening the partnership”

“The survey is quite broad so when you ask questions like relationship with UNHCR, its tough to answer as the NGO may have good relationship with a particular sector in UNHCR and a not so good relationship with another sector.”

“With increasing number of refugees around the world, there is a need to develop better synergy and relations between partners and UNHCR and also to enlist other NGOs working for the poor and marginalised.”

“Good partnership with UNHCR, but its my first time partnership with them may be we will develop excellent relation ship with UNHCR in future.”

“I would request UNHCR top management to put extra control over their field offices and to centralize the management. The implementing partners are not in a position to put their complains since they will lose all their operations in the complained area. There are persons such as X at one office, who is very much well known for being guilty in bribes and imposing his family members to be recruited however yet he is not even transferred/terminated.”

Middle East / North Africa

“We hope we can continue the fruitful cooperation with UNHCR”

“None”

“Good cooperation”

“We actually had a frank discussion with UNHCR on this last week. UNHCR staff acknowledged our concerns but frequently referred to "this is a UNHCR HQ requirement" instead of taking a pragmatic stance on how to better work as partners. The budget ceiling of USD 6.000 per expat staff is still a mayor issue. We’re told this amount even includes expat staff travel currently. This amount stands in no contrast to
UNHCR staff salaries and for example a UNHCR R&R policy of 4-6 weeks whereas INGOs have 12 weeks.”

- “Please ensure that allocations and planning for next year are done well in advance to avoid the rush. This seems to be suggested every year but yearly it is not respected. I cannot express the level of stress this last minute rush has on staff not to mention having to terminate a large number of staff annually and then scramble to rehire them once the agreement is finalized.
  - our partnership with UNHCR is very good and it is suggested for UNHCR to stay with those partners who have the qualification of project implementation and as well as good back ground”

- “Best wishes”
- “UNHCR should very carefully examine its current approach to partnerships. And herewith we mean to put the practice where the mouth is, the relationship in the field is too often characterised by a top down approach where every UNHCR field staff appears to be of the conviction they are in fact supervising the operation of partners, often unduly interfering with operational matters, while not having to account for decisions and promises. Also, there is a huge disconnect between the various departments in UNHCR where the one hand doesn't know what the other is doing.”

Europe

- “Not clear for UNHCR how the cooperation among their implementing partners in the field should looks like and the reality is not suggestions are not responding to the needs of beneficiaries Too much staff kept in HQ (in capital or big cities), to the field send staff who has technical knowledge but are not allowed to make decisions, decisions are done by staff who does not understand the field conditions as sitting cuz not visiting field sites”
- “Hmm, the skip patterns don’t work on this survey, it is easy to miss a relevant question or not respond correctly.”
- “To me the most important are local staff and their understanding on the ground situation. Only together, in open communication, we can make changes. It is good that they are open minded and ready to discuss all problems. The best approach among all UN agencies.”
- “The consultations are highly appreciated and further encouraged to draw good practices for future partnership.”
- “The intent of UNHCR country programme is good, particularly the new acting Rep, however there is still a lot of disparity between capital and field level cooperation, both UNHCR and [this country] promote decentralization of decision making and coordination and it would be good to see this in the future partnership in this country. It is the early days of this partnership (first month officially) and we expect a fruitful and successful partnership going forward, perhaps just a few initial "bumps in the road"."
- “Due to the increasing number of refugees the capacity in this country supporting refugees comes to an end. There is a need to re-establish the refugee support strategies and methodologies including the UNHCR's. Apart from the recent crisis and high
numbers, the RSD mechanism in allows refugees to wait for long years and imposes a feeling of injustice. UNHCR wants to have a strong protective vision over the government, the population and the refugees but the high numbers challenges this vision a lot. Together with UNHCR we are dealing with the issues which is at the top of the iceberg. The mandate of UNHCR regarding protection and support should be re-structured immediately in the region.”

- “We would suggest to continue our cooperation and partnership with UNHCR same as we have had it so far.”
- “Although we have just signed an agreement with UNHCR on a project including us in this survey was good for us and we hope our participation was useful. Thanks”
- “Following the closure of the UNHCR Liaison Office in the country in 1998, UNHCR has been developing relevant activities regarding protection of PoC (in close-operation and partnership with Implementing Partner through advocacy, capacity building, awareness raising, public information, high-level-meetings, networking, reception and direct and free counselling provided to PoC. Implementing Partner is the leading Non-Governmental Organization for Development in this country working exclusively with asylum seekers and refugees, and has been, since 1993, UNHCR’s operational partner, through a Cooperation Agreement, and since 1998 UNHCR’s Implementing Partner, which have allowed the development of relevant activities to enhance the standards of protection and reception of asylum seekers and refugees in the country.”
- “We very much appreciate and enjoy the cooperation with UNHCR.”
- “We need UNHCR in this country, we need other UN agencies in the country. Our country is in much worse situation than the official reports show. The government made the unprecedented crackdown on NGOs since early 2014 and if there is not made the international intervention on the HIGHEST level and the existing trend is not reversed in the nearest few months, the crisis will reach a point where consequences will be difficult if not impossible to be dealt with.”

Latin America or the Caribbean

- “Seguir profundizando en preguntas que indaguen por las dimensiones de la eficacia de la gestion: Gestion estrategica, gestion operatova, gestion relacional y gestion del conocimiento. Exitos en el trabajo. Gracias por compromiso, saludos al equipo de HIAS que anima este ejercicio global!”
- “Nuestra experiencia como asociado de ACNUR supera los 10 años, lo que indica unas excelentes relaciones y trabajo conjunto. Sería importante poder obtener retroalimentación de esta encuesta, primero porque es un canal de comunicación válido y segundo porque se hace seguimiento del que esperamos sea retroalimentado y para superar las dificultades planteadas.”
- “Es importante que incluyan preguntas sobre el trabajo de las personas de ACNUR en campo, su colaboración, seguimiento y auditoría”
- “Para nosotros ha sido una experiencia repleta de aprendizaje y nos permite un mejor abordaje de la problemática de PDI.”
“Seria interesante evaluar cual ha sido la experiencia con el nuevo PPA en todas las secciones, principalmente en el area de monitoreo de los proyectos . Evaluar el impacto del nuevo PPA en proyectos nacionales que abarcan la operacion de muchas ciudades.”

Other areas

- “Dans l'ensemble prévoir dans les communications les trois langues , sinon bien cibler la langue officielle des partenaires”
- “The Partnership is subject to improvement beyond project implementation, we are looking for possible joint resource mobilization”
- “This is a recommendable practice inviting NGO partners to have a saying for the betterment of partnership.”
- “The work with refugees, the social work, the medical care and the psychological assistance cannot be coordinated and directed according to the requests of one worker from UNHCR country office, who stays there and disposes what should do the specialists and the employers involved in the program.”
- “Thank you”
- “None”
- “During the initial discussion for the proposal, there were changing Protection/ Program officers we were talking with; some are very new and We felt we knew more the protection framework and Philippine laws on land and housing, iDPs.”
- “It is good but it would be good to include question for employees motivation that what measures have been taken by both Partner i-e UNHCR and NGOs.”
- “We feels honored to be the partner of UNHCR. Regular interaction between UNHCR and us resulted in organizational development and institutionalization of its compliances.”