

Donor:
Project period:
Project title:

Principal Objective	To reduce suffering and improve well-being of people
Specific Objectives	
<p>Objective 1: To improve psychosocial well-being of conflict-affected men and women, boys and girls</p>	
<p>Objective 2: To improve ability of highly vulnerable conflict-affected population to meet their basic needs</p>	

Objective 3: To improve access to dignified hygiene conditions for conflict-affected population

Objective 4: To enhance ability of conflict-affected older population to meet their basic food needs

Objective 5: To increase access of conflict-affected men and women to NFIs

24 months,
OLD: Protection and humanitarian assistance to highly

affected by the war in Ukraine through emergency tim

Results

Result 1: 11 500 conflict-affected men and women, boys and girls, targeted by the program, improved their psycho-social well-being

Result 2: 5000 highly vulnerable conflict affected men and women improved their ability to cover the basic needs (including but not limited to food needs and access to essential WASH NFIs)

Result 3: Highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women, who are residents of collective centres for IDPs/social institutions improved access to dignified hygiene conditions in WASH facilities in line with applicable standards. Result 4: 1350 highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women, boys and girls have increased access to essential WASH non-food items (NFIs), as defined by Sphere or national standards

Result 5: 5400 highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women have enhanced the ability to meet their basic food needs

Result 6: 1200 highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women have increased access to NFIs

e-critical assistance and ensuring access to basic essenti

Outputs

Output 1: 11 500 conflict-affected men and women, boys and girls, targeted by the program, participated in psychosocial support services

Output 2: 5000 highly vulnerable conflict affected men and women assisted with MPCA

Output 3: 1 110 000 USD in cash transferred to beneficiaries

Output 4: Highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women, who are residents of collective centres for IDPs/social institutions directly utilizing improved sanitation services provided with BHA funding;
Output 5: 1350 highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women, boys and girls received WASH NFIs assistance.

Output 6: 5400 highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women received food security assistance.

Output 7: 1200 highly vulnerable conflict-affected men and women received NFI kits

al services	
Verifiable indicators	Baseline
1. Number of individuals participating in psychosocial support services (BHA) 2. Percentage of people reporting improvement of psychosocial well-being, by sex and age (CUSTOM) 3. Percent of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable, and participatory manner (CUSTOM)	1. 0 2. 0 3. 0
1. Total number of people assisted through multipurpose cash activities 2. Percentage of households who report being able to meet their basic needs of their households (all/most/some/none), according to their priorities 3. Percentage of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner 4. Percent of beneficiary households reporting adequate access to household non- food items 5. Percentage of households by Food Consumption Score (FCS) phase (Poor, Borderline, and Acceptable); 6. Percentage of households who have reduced essential WASH related basic needs expenditures	1. 0 2. to be assessed during baseline study 3. 0 4. to be assessed during baseline 5. to be assessed during baseline 6. to be assessed during baseline

<p>##### #</p>	<p>Sanitation: 1. 0 2. to be assessed during the baseline study 3. to be assessed during the baseline study</p> <p>WASH Non-food items: 1. 0 2 0 3.0</p>
<p>1. Number of beneficiaries receiving food assistance 2. Percent of households with poor, borderline, and acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS) (BHA). 3. Percent of households reporting satisfaction with the contents of the food kits received through direct distribution (CUSTOM) 4. Percent of households reporting satisfaction with the quality of food kits received through direct distribution (CUSTOM) 5. Mean and median Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI) score (BHA) 6. Percent of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable, and participatory manner (CUSTOM)</p>	<p>1. 0 2. to be assessed during baseline study 3. 0 4. 0 5. 0 6. 0</p>

<p>1. Number and percent of households receiving NFIs in identified settlement(s) through use of in-kind NFIs (BHA - S&S NFI)</p> <p>2. Number and percent of individuals reporting satisfaction with the quality of the NFIs received (BHA - S&S NFI)</p> <p>3. Number of NFI kits provided to the collective centres (CUSTOM)</p>	<p>1. 0</p> <p>2. 0</p> <p>3. 50</p>
---	--------------------------------------

Target	Data Collection Method
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 11 500 2. 50% 3. 70% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project documents and records review 2. Ex-ante and ex-post structured surveys with all PSS beneficiaries targeted by the programme initially in Donetsk and Luhansk oblast 3. Endline study/PIM study for beneficiaries targeted by the programme after invasion OR self-reported questionnaire
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 5000 2. 60% 3. 70% 4. 70% 5. 71%/24%/5% 6. 20% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project documents and records review 2. Survey (structured interviews with beneficiaries) 3. Review of financial documents

<p>##### #</p>	<p>Sanitation: Review of documents and records of selected institutions /KII with managers of the institutions.</p> <p>WASH Non-food items: 1. Regular reporting 2. Survey (Structured interviews with beneficiaries)</p>
<p>1. 5400 2. 71% in Acceptable, 26% in Borderline, and 3% in Poor FCG 3. 70% 4. 70% 5.??? 6. 70%</p>	<p>1. Regular reporting 2. Survey (Structured interviews with beneficiaries)</p>

1. 1200 2.720/60%

1. Regular reporting 2. Survey (Structured interviews with beneficiaries)

Means of verification	Frequency	Responsible
<p>1. Project documents and records: attendance lists, case files, lists filled in by the specialists providing PSS</p> <p>2. Survey responses (Baseline and Endline), case files of beneficiaries</p>	<p>1. Throughout the whole project duration: project routine data collection</p> <p>2. 2 times (Baseline and Endline)</p>	<p>1. Project Coordinator</p> <p>2. Project Coordinator (data collection), MEAL Unit (data analysis and reporting)</p>
<p>1. Beneficiaries lists & financial documents</p> <p>2. Survey responses (Baseline, Endline)</p> <p>3. Financial documents</p>	<p>1. Throughout the whole project duration: collection of project and financial data</p> <p>2. 2 times (Baseline, Endline)</p>	<p>1. Project Coordinator</p> <p>2. MEAL Unit</p> <p>3. Financial Coordinator</p>

<p>Sanitation: Project documents and institutions records, needs assessment summary</p> <p>WASH Non-food items: 1. Registration and distribution lists 2. Endline PDM/PIM Study</p>	<p>Throughout the whole project duration: project routine data collection; 1 time (Endline)</p>	<p>Project Coordinator, MEAL unit</p>
<p>1. Beneficiaries lists 2. Endline PDM/PIM Study</p>	<p>Throughout the whole project duration: project routine data collection; 1 time (Endline)</p>	<p>Project Coordinator, MEAL unit</p>

1. Beneficiaries lists 2. Endline PDM/PIM Study 3. Acts of acceptance/certificates of donation	Throughout the whole project duration: project routine data collection; 1 time (Endline)	Project Coordinator, MEAL unit
--	--	--------------------------------

Risks/Assumptions

1. ASSUMPTION - The large-scale military offensive does not escalate in proposed project sites and does not result in interruption or suspension of project activities.

RISK - Escalation of the conflict which results in suspension or disruption of project activities.

2. ASSUMPTION - Political situation enables to conduct

project activities and reach the beneficiaries in selected project locations.

RISK - Political instability in the area of implementation does not enable to implement project activities smoothly.

3. ASSUMPTION - Suppliers and/or local workers are reliable and transparent in the areas of project implementation, including compliance with policies, law and procedures.

RISK - Suppliers and/or local workers are committing fraud.

4. ASSUMPTION - Beneficiaries are not exposed to harm, abuse and/or violence during participation in project activities as unintended negative effect of the action.

RISK - Beneficiaries experience harm, abuse and/or violence during participation in project activities due to the fact of being elderly people with overlapping vulnerabilities (women, health conditions, not independent, mobility problems etc.)

5. ASSUMPTION - Safety of beneficiaries (the COVID-19 spread mitigation measures are prioritized).

RISK - Safety of beneficiaries is not fully prioritized (in particular, COVID-19 spreading mitigation measures).

6. ASSUMPTION - Prices and currency exchange rates will remain stable as foreseen during the period of project implementation.

RISK - High fluctuation of prices in the local markets and currency exchange having impact on supply chain and capacity to deliver expected results.

7. ASSUMPTION - Stability of the market and access of beneficiaries to market to meet their basic needs.

RISK - Lack of availability of needed items at the local market to satisfy the basic needs of beneficiaries.

8. ASSUMPTION - The most vulnerable people are targeted by the project.

RISK - Lack of possibility to check vulnerability of beneficiaries and their verification due to emergency and insecure situation.

9. ASSUMPTION - Contractor responsible for provision of MPCA is able to provide MPCA to beneficiaries.

RISK - Lack of possibility to provide MPCA to beneficiaries in targeted areas

