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### Respondent Data: 2014-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries represented in NGO results</strong></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Countries represented in UNHCR results</strong></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: I work for...

- 58.3% A UNHCR Country Office
- 12.1% A UNHCR Regional Office
- 12.9% A UNHCR Field Office
- 0.8% UNHCR HQ (Geneva)
- 0.8% UNHCR HQ (outside Geneva; i.e. Amman, Copenhagen)
- 11.4% Other
- 3.8% A UNHCR Sub-Office
- 0.0% A UNHCR Regional Service Center or Hub
- Other
UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: Please provide the job title of the person completing the survey

- **Director**: 3.8%
- **Representative**: 15.2%
- **Head of Field Office/Service at HQ**: 5.3%
- **Deputy Representative**: 2.3%
- **Deputy Head of Office (Field, Sub-Office)**: 0.8%
- **Other**: 72.7%

(included: program officers, protection officers, program associates, field officers, and resettlement assistants)
Types of Partner Organizations Responding to the Survey

INGO
- 76 (2014)
- 192 (2015)
- 157 (2016)

NNGO
- 81 (2014)
- 109 (2015)
- 144 (2016)

Percentage of respondents:
- INGO: 45%, 49%, 52%
- NNGO: 48%, 52%, 48%
Regional Breakdown of Responses to the Survey

- MENA:
  - UNHCR 2016: 21%
  - NGO 2015: 20%
  - NGO 2016: 16%
  - NGO 2014: 11%
  - UNHCR 2016: 6%

- EUROPE:
  - UNHCR 2016: 21%
  - NGO 2016: 19%
  - NGO 2015: 15%
  - NGO 2014: 11%

- AMERICAS:
  - UNHCR 2016: 8%
  - NGO 2016: 12%
  - NGO 2015: 8%
  - NGO 2014: 5%

- ASIA:
  - UNHCR 2016: 16%
  - NGO 2014: 19%
  - NGO 2015: 22%
  - NGO 2016: 24%

- AFRICA:
  - UNHCR 2016: 49%
  - NGO 2015: 28%
  - NGO 2016: 29%
  - NGO 2014: 35%
UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: Regarding the 2014 guidance on the Selection and Retention of Partners and the revised Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), I feel: (Regional differences)

- **MENA**: 0% N/A, 7% Skeptical, 17% No impact on partners or UNHCR, 17% No impact on partners, 27% Caustically Optimistic, 67% Optimistic
- **AMERICAS**: 0% N/A, 17% Skeptical, 18% No impact on partners or UNHCR, 27% No impact on partners, 41% Caustically Optimistic, 36% Optimistic
- **EUROPE**: 0% N/A, 6% Skeptical, 18% No impact on partners or UNHCR, 25% No impact on partners, 35% Caustically Optimistic, 41% Optimistic
- **ASIA**: 5% N/A, 10% Skeptical, 10% No impact on partners or UNHCR, 15% No impact on partners, 35% Caustically Optimistic, 19% Optimistic
- **AFRICA**: 2% N/A, 7% Skeptical, 5% No impact on partners or UNHCR, 16% No impact on partners, 51% Caustically Optimistic, 17% Optimistic
How NGOs and UNHCR Rate Their Partnership

- **NGOs 2014**
  - EXCELLENT: 9%
  - GOOD: 39%
  - FAIR: 15%
  - POOR: 32%
  - NOT APPLICABLE: 0%

- **NGOs 2015**
  - EXCELLENT: 15%
  - GOOD: 44%
  - FAIR: 39%
  - POOR: 3%
  - NOT APPLICABLE: 0%

- **NGOs 2016**
  - EXCELLENT: 32%
  - GOOD: 45%
  - FAIR: 14%
  - POOR: 4%
  - NOT APPLICABLE: 0%

- **UNHCR 2014**
  - EXCELLENT: 39%
  - GOOD: 32%
  - FAIR: 15%
  - POOR: 3%
  - NOT APPLICABLE: 0%

- **UNHCR 2015**
  - EXCELLENT: 44%
  - GOOD: 39%
  - FAIR: 13%
  - POOR: 3%
  - NOT APPLICABLE: 0%

- **UNHCR 2016**
  - EXCELLENT: 71%
  - GOOD: 44%
  - FAIR: 14%
  - POOR: 3%
  - NOT APPLICABLE: 0%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: How would you rate your office's partnership with UNHCR in the field? (INGO v. NNGO)

- **NNGO**
  - Excellent: 54%
  - Good: 39%
  - Fair: 5%
  - Poor: 1%

- **INGO**
  - Excellent: 27%
  - Good: 48%
  - Fair: 17%
  - Poor: 5%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: How would you rate your office's partnership with UNHCR in the field? (Regional differences)

- **MENA**
  - Excellent: 51%
  - Good: 29%
  - Fair: 17%
  - Poor: 3%

- **Americas**
  - Excellent: 34%
  - Good: 47%
  - Fair: 9%
  - Poor: 0%

- **Europe**
  - Excellent: 35%
  - Good: 47%
  - Fair: 9%
  - Poor: 5%

- **Asia**
  - Excellent: 51%
  - Good: 40%
  - Fair: 8%
  - Poor: 2%

- **Africa**
  - Excellent: 28%
  - Good: 55%
  - Fair: 13%
  - Poor: 3%
How NGOs rate their communication with UNHCR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: How would you rate communication between UNHCR and your office? (Regional differences)

- **MENA**
  - Excellent: 43%
  - Good: 46%
  - Fair: 6%
  - Poor: 6%

- **Americas**
  - Excellent: 28%
  - Good: 63%
  - Fair: 6%
  - Poor: 3%

- **Europe**
  - Excellent: 28%
  - Good: 42%
  - Fair: 23%
  - Poor: 5%

- **Asia**
  - Excellent: 42%
  - Good: 42%
  - Fair: 11%
  - Poor: 6%

- **Africa**
  - Excellent: 24%
  - Good: 52%
  - Fair: 18%
  - Poor: 6%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: How would you rate communication between UNHCR and your office? (INGO vs. NNGO)

![Bar Chart]

- **Excellent**: 49% (INGO), 18% (NNGO)
- **Good**: 42% (INGO), 55% (NNGO)
- **Fair**: 17% (INGO), 8% (NNGO)
- **Poor**: 10% (INGO), 2% (NNGO)
Over the last year, NGO relationship with UNHCR has: (UNHCR vs. NGO differences)

![Graph showing NGO relationship with UNHCR over the last year]

- **Improved**
  - UNHCR 2016: 2%
  - NGOs 2016: 60%
  - NGOs 2015: 51%
  - NGOs 2014: 53%

- **Stayed the Same**
  - UNHCR 2016: 35%
  - NGOs 2016: 33%
  - NGOs 2015: 40%
  - NGOs 2014: 40%

- **Gotten Worse**
  - UNHCR 2016: 2%
  - NGOs 2016: 4%
  - NGOs 2015: 8%
  - NGOs 2014: 6%

- **Not Applicable**
  - NGOs 2016: 3%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: UNHCR requires all Partners (new and existing) to register with the Partner Portal by end of 2016. Has your organization registered and worked with the UNHCR partner portal?

- 44.8% My organization registered on the UNHCR partner portal but has not yet submitted any expressions of interest through it
- 40.2% My organization registered on the partner portal and submitted one or more expressions of interest through it
- 8.3% My organization has not yet registered with the UNHCR partner portal
- 6.6% I do not know/not applicable
- 8.3% My organization registered on the UNHCR partner portal but has not yet submitted any expressions of interest through it
- 6.6% I do not know/not applicable
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: Comments/Suggestions on the UNHCR partner portal

- “Alerts issued to relevant users when CEol are released. Minimum time of 2 weeks for submission - except emergency response. Clearer guidelines around partner selection for emergencies. In one instance we were told that we should have applied for a call but as the call was not issued on the Partner Portal we didn't know about it. This happens a lot.”

- “Response time to queries was excellent, but has really dropped off in March. System of getting 'master user' to add all new users without having clear guidelines for this on partners.unhcr.org is counter-intuitive to other portals and has cost us time in submissions; too hard to delete users and/or reassign them between country offices.”

- “Allow for attachment of multiple concept notes”

- « Les informations sur le status de projets soumis peut être intégrer sur le site. » « The information about the status of submitted projects could be integrated onto the site »
• “Would be good if the Portal gives alerts, based on some criteria, for instance when there is a Call for a specific list of countries where your organization is operational. Now it is up to routine/customs of staff to look into the Portal; they are not always present.”

• “The partner portal is user-friendly and informative. We are sure it will be helpful for us to keep up to date about news, summits, trainings, call for proposals and timely react to it.”

• “More systematic use of the portal for Calls for EoI, and also submission of concept notes. For example, in 2015, UNHCR in Ethiopia set up a separate website with the call information and online submission. Also, open access to the knowledge hub section of the portal (ie. materials - templates, guidance documents etc.) to all potential partners, whether they have registered on the portal or not.”
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: If you participated in the selection process for a project partnership and were not selected for one or more of the projects, were you informed of the general reasons for the decision? (INGO v. NNGO differences)

- **INGO**
  - Yes, 41%
  - No, 39%
  - N/A, 21%

- **NNGO**
  - Yes, 25%
  - No, 47%
  - N/A, 28%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: If you participated in the selection process for a project partnership and were not selected for one or more of the projects, were you informed of the general reasons for the decision? (Regional differences)

- **MENA**: N/A, 33% Yes, 25% No, 42%
- **Americas**: No, 0 N/A, 40% Yes, 60%
- **Europe**: No, 12% Yes, 29% N/A, 59%
- **Asia**: N/A, 12% Yes, 32% No, 56%
- **Africa**: N/A, 18% Yes, 32% No, 50%
Whether NGOs not selected by UNHCR sought more information for the reason for non-selection

- **YES, AND THE RESPONSE WAS HELPFUL**
  - 2015: 7%
  - 2016: 17%

- **YES, BUT THE RESPONSE WAS NOT HELPFUL**
  - 2015: 9%
  - 2016: 19%

- **YES, BUT UNHCR DID NOT RESPOND**
  - 2015: 2%
  - 2016: 9%

- **DID NOT SEEK OUT INFORMATION**
  - 2015: 81%
  - 2016: 55%
Does the NGO have Prequalification for Procurement Status?

*UNHCR requires partners undertaking procurement valued at USD$100,000 to have Prequalification for Procurement by November 2016.*
Has organization’s approach to procurement changed as a result of the UNHCR Guidance Note on Procurement by Partners with UNHCR funds?

- **YES**: 2015, 33% | 2016, 38%
- **NO**: 2015, 59% | 2016, 32%
- **I DO NOT KNOW OR NOT APPLICABLE**: 2015, 13% | 2016, 30%
UNHCR consultation with NGO partners in 2015 for 2016 UNHCR operations

INVITED TO PARTICIPATE AND PARTICIPATED
- NGOs, 61%
- UNHCR, 77%

INVITED TO PARTICIPATE BUT DID NOT
- NGOs, 5%
- UNHCR, 2%

NO INVITATION FROM UNHCR
- NGOs, 23%
- UNHCR, 8%

I DON'T KNOW/NOT APPLICABLE
- NGOs, 12%
- UNHCR, 12%
Was participation in UNHCR Country Operations Planning meetings helpful or meaningful?

![Bar chart showing participation percentages]

- **YES**
  - NGOs: 52%
  - UNHCR: 62%

- **NO**
  - NGOs: 5%
  - UNHCR: 3%

- **NO COP MEETING/DID NOT PARTICIPATE**
  - NGOs: 24%
  - UNHCR: 16%

- **NOT APPLICABLE**
  - NGOs: 19%
  - UNHCR: 19%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: Did your office attempt to consult with or meet with UNHCR representatives during your office's own planning process for 2016?

- 43.8% Yes, and we invited UNHCR and UNHCR participated
- 35.8% No, my office held a planning process but did not invite UNHCR
- 3.4% Yes, and we invited UNHCR but UNHCR did not participate
- 7.2% No, my office did not engage in a planning process for 2016
- 9.8% I do not know/not applicable
- 3.4% No, my office did not engage in a planning process for 2016
- 9.8% I do not know/not applicable
UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: If yes, did a representative from your office accept one or more of these invitations and participate in one or more partner NGO’s planning exercise?

- Yes, in 2015 we participated in more than two NGO partners’ planning exercises for 2016 (25.0%)
- Yes, in 2015 we participated in two NGO partners’ planning exercise for 2016 (5.9%)
- Yes, in 2015 we participated in only one NGO’s partner’s planning exercise for 2016 (10.3%)
- No, in 2015 we did not participate in any NGO partner’s planning exercise for 2016, even though we were invited to (10.3%)
- I do not know/not applicable (48.5%)
Was the time between the Call for Expression of Interest for concept notes sufficient?

Yes, current time is satisfactory
- NGOs: 54%
- UNHCR: 66%

Yes, but more time would be helpful
- NGOs: 20%
- UNHCR: 8%

No
- NGOs: 13%
- UNHCR: 7%

I don’t know/not applicable
- NGOs: 13%
- UNHCR: 19%
Q14. UNHCR made a commitment in the "Grand Bargain" to significantly increase the percentage of funds UNHCR provides to national partners for undertaking projects from 12% of UNHCR's Operational budget to 20% by 2020. How would your Office implement such a commitment?

- Primarily by increasing the role and funding to national NGOs by phasing out and/or reducing the funds provided to international NGOs (20.6%)
- Primarily by increasing the amount to national NGOs by reducing UNHCR costs for direct UNHCR implementation of programs and/or UNHCR administrative costs (12.4%)
- Primarily by reducing funding equally for both international NGOs and direct UNHCR implementation of programs and/or UNHCR administrative costs (6.2%)
- Primarily by looking for other potential ways for increasing the role of national NGOs (9.3%)
- Look for Other Ways to Increase Role of National NGOs (15.5%)
- Reduce International NGO costs (17.5%)
- I do not know or I am not sure (18.6%)
- Other (15.5%)

In my operation, I do not believe national NGOs can assume more responsibility and management of larger amounts without additional capacity building by 2020, beyond that which is funded by my current budget.
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: During the last three years, has your office been part of any joint effort to develop local capacity to assist persons of concern? (Check all that apply.)

- 34.0% Yes, an effort between UNHCR and one or more international NGOs to strengthen local capacity.
- 17.8% No
- 17.4% Yes, an effort between one or more international NGOs and one or more national NGOs to strengthen local capacity, not involving UNHCR.
- 11.2% I do not know/not applicable.
- 34.4% Yes, an effort between UNHCR, one or more international NGOs, and one or more national NGOs to strengthen local capacity.
- 11.2% Yes, an effort between one or more international NGOs and one or more national NGOs to strengthen local capacity, not involving UNHCR.
- 0% I do not know/not applicable.
UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: During the last three years, has your office been part of any joint effort to develop local/national NGO capacity to assist persons of concern? (check all that apply)

- No, there was no need: 3.1%
- No, for other reasons (please specify in the comments section): 3.1%
- Yes, an effort between UNHCR and one or more national NGOs to strengthen national NGO capacity (not involving an international NGO): 51.5%
- Yes, an effort between UNHCR, one or more international NGOs, and one or more national NGOs to strengthen local capacity: 41.2%
- I do not know: 8.2%
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: Has your office conducted a formal joint monitoring or project evaluation with UNHCR of one or more of your projects?

- 55.6% Yes, and it was a satisfactory experience
- 14.9% I do not know/not applicable
- 10.0% No, my office did not know joint monitoring was part of the PPA
- 11.6% No, my office engaged in an informal joint monitoring with UNHCR
- 5.8% Yes, but it was not satisfactory experience
- 2.1% No, my office knew that joint monitoring was part of the PPA but did not engage in it
- 10.0% No, my office did not know joint monitoring was part of the PPA
- 2.1% No, my office knew that joint monitoring was part of the PPA but did not engage in it
- 14.9% I do not know/not applicable
Q20. UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: Has your office conducted a formal joint monitoring or project evaluation with NGOs of one or more of your projects, as provided for in the PPA?

- 70.1% Yes, and it was a satisfactory experience
- 11.3% Yes, but it was not satisfactory experience
- 11.3% No, but my office engaged in an informal joint monitoring or project evaluation with any NGO partner
- 4.1% No, my office did no joint monitoring, formal or informal, with any NGO partner
- 3.1% I do not know/not applicable
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: If one or more agreements were not signed prior to January 1 or prior to the start of the project, please check all applicable options as to why.

- **34.4%** I do not know/not applicable
- **19.5%** My office submitted our project proposal at least one month prior to the start of the project, but UNHCR did not respond in time
- **29.5%** My office submitted our project proposal at least one month prior to the start of the project but UNHCR and my office both required more time to work together to make changes
- **12.4%** UNHCR unnecessarily delayed or delayed without explanation the submission or consideration of the proposals
- **7.1%** The agreement was tripartite and government had to countersign, which caused the delay
- **2.5%** My office requires the agreement to be signed at our HQ and the agreement was delayed waiting for HQ approval
- **0.4%** My office was responsible for the delay in signing for a reason other than waiting for HQ approval
- **14.9%** Other
- **14.9%** I do not know/not applicable
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: If you have a project with UNHCR but no agreement was signed prior to the start of the project, was there a Letter of Intent with UNHCR signed?

- 19.1% A Letter of Intent was signed before the project began
- 19.1% A Letter of Intent was signed within one month after the project began
- 7.5% A Letter of Intent was signed within one month after the project began
- 24.1% No, a Letter of Intent was not signed
- 30.3% Not applicable because an agreement was signed before the start of the project
- 19.1% I do not know/other

Not applicable because an agreement was signed before the start of the project

I do not know/other
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: In designing or implementing your project with UNHCR, Persons of Concern were:

- 57.7% Adequately involved in the design and/or implementation of the project
- 19.9% Involved, but insufficiently, in the design and/or implementation of the project
- 13.7% Not involved in the design or implementation of the project
- 8.7% I do not know/not applicable
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: In designing or implementing your project with UNHCR, Persons of Concern were: (Regional differences)

- **MENA**: N/A, 61% Adequately involved, 6% Not sufficiently involved, 17% Not involved, 17%
- **Americas**: N/A, 9% Adequately involved, 44% Not sufficiently involved, 25% Not involved, 22%
- **Europe**: N/A, 18% Adequately involved, 44% Not sufficiently involved, 18% Not involved, 20%
- **Asia**: N/A, 9% Adequately involved, 68% Not sufficiently involved, 12% Not involved, 12%
- **Africa**: N/A, 4% Adequately involved, 62% Not sufficiently involved, 28% Not involved, 6%
Regarding the 2014 guidance on the Selection and Retention of Partners and the revised Project Partnership Agreement (PPA), I feel:

- **40.2% Optimistic** that the 2014 guidance and revised PPA will be successful in contributing to stronger partnerships and transparency between UNHCR and its partners
- **19.6% Undecided**
- **24.7% Cautiously optimistic** the 2014 guidance and revised PPA will contribute to strengthening partnerships and transparency
- **7.2% The 2014 guidance and revised PPA do not impact partnerships but supports UNHCR operations**
- **4.1% I do not believe the 2014 guidance and revised PPA will have any meaningful impact in the partnership between UNHCR and its partners**
- **4.1% I am skeptical about the new framework, or believe it will complicate or weaken partnerships between UNHCR and the field**
- **19.6% Undecided**
UNHCR ON BETTER PARTNERSHIPS:

• To improve partnership with NGOs, UNHCR needs to technically empower its decision makers to manage partnerships, recruit staff with the right background to manage partnerships and provide a level playing field for capacity building opportunities. The current AGD approach is definitely a very good one for POC participation in assessments and program design, but POCs need to be much more involved in program implementation….better dialogue to resolve issues need to be promoted
UNHCR ON BETTER PARTNERSHIPS:

- Budget flexibility; overhead support for national NGOs, IPMS support/technical guidance for the country office to conduct salary surveys for NGO partners aimed for uniform salary scales. Policies that will reduce frequent national staff turnover of NGO partners as it affects program continuity, simplify paperwork requirements for partner selection and retention
NGOs ON BETTER PARTNERSHIPS:

- Establish clear channels of communication, develop better mechanisms for dialogue and consultation on strategic approaches and actions in the country that can inadvertently affect implementing partners, establish feedback and follow up mechanism regarding concerns raised by implementing partners and vice-versa.
NGOs ON BETTER PARTNERSHIPS:

• Meet with communities of refugees to evaluate their present situation and search for solutions that would help improve that situation. Communication between UNHCR and NGO should be partner-to-partner (on equal basis).
Please offer any final comments about improving partnerships with UNHCR, and about how UNHCR and NGOs engage persons of concern in developing and implementing projects.

The roll-out trainings on "Enhanced Framework for Partnerships" conducted at regional level, with participation of both UNHCR and NGO representatives from various country operations were useful and helped in engaging partners in further trainings at country level with a common understanding and joint ownership. These trainings should be conducted periodically, acknowledging the turn-over of staff.

For next year's survey, it would be interesting to have partners' feedback on the new PPA process and documentation. There has been a significant increase in project annexes, with some difficulties to adjust to it (e.g. installment plans). Views and comments from partners on how they see this and their suggestions for improvement would be constructive feedback.

The next year survey should take into account questions on how formulated recommendations have been implemented.
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: Please offer any suggestions for trainings

- Intercultural/Interethnic communication
- Partner Portal, Calls for EoI Timeline
- Systems/Guidelines on Gathering statistics
- Management of client-UNHCR expectations
- Sustainability – What is it? And How to do it?
- Refugee situations in context
- Writing for Proposals, Concept Notes, Fundraising
- Procurement
- Emergency Operations Proposals
- Basics of Partnership Agreements
- Refresher on Best Interest processes
- How to manage relations with government agencies

- Monitoring and Evaluation
- Training for staff in charge of managing camps
- Volunteering programs
- Protection during emergencies
- UNHCR systems, budgeting
- Security
- Codes of Conduct
- Handling difficult (violent) PoCs
- Communication and best-practice sharing between partners
- IDPs
- Voluntary Repatriation
- More consistent trainings (more frequent, regular)
- Breaking reliance on IOM for joint trainings.
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: Please offer any suggestions for next year’s survey.

“Questions regarding reporting requirements. What is stipulated in the contract (in terms of frequency and the deadlines) and what is then requested and adhered to in practice.”

“It consists of the most essential components of partnerships.”

“It could examine the process of planning more in detail with questions to understand how this is done and how it can be improved particularly in relation to the financial side.”

“The survey is simple and it has to be maintained next year too.”
UNHCR Field Offices 2016 Survey: Please offer and suggestions for trainings, or suggestions for next year’s survey.

The partnerships of UNHCR and NGOs offer transparency and openness. There is a friendship relation in this collaboration. Thanks to this collaboration, the persons of concern receive operative and qualitative support and assistance services.

I believe if 'doing business' with UNHCR was more simple and less bureaucratic then there would be an improved perception of the partnership. I am not sure, however, that the perception of improved partnerships necessarily translates into better projects, more meaningful impact, etc.

All operations should be well staffed for planning and processing of partnership as such that control function becomes easy and IPMC can be adopted meaningfully.

Improve communication between partners and training-refreshing.
NGO Implementing Partners 2016 Survey: Please offer any final comments about improving partnerships with UNHCR, and about how UNHCR and NGOs engage persons of concern in developing and implementing projects (continued).

In 2015 there was an initial effort to involve people of concern in planning. However, these people should participate more actively and not just as a source of information (analysis!).

Before developing a partnership there is a need to engage with local community and involve them during the design and implementation of the project.

So far, the partnership has been very good and continues to get better. UNHCR should keep regular visits to the site and continue with the quarterly partnership meetings.
Questions?