

# RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS ETHIOPIA RAPID RESPONSE DROUGHT 2015

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Gillian Mellsop

|    | REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY  |
|----|---|
| a. | Please indicate when the After Action Review (AAR) was conducted and who participated.  The Ethiopia Humanitarian Country Team (EHCT) was briefed on the major achievements of this CERF allocation on the meeting of 4 August 2016. WFP confirmed that the allocation was received at a very critical period, and helped facilitate timely response for drought affected beneficiaries.  |
| b. | Please confirm that the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) Report was discussed in the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team and by cluster/sector coordinators as outlined in the guidelines.  YES NO  WFP shared the project (achievements) with the EHCT. The guidelines and components of reporting were shared with WFP prior to the preparation of the report.  |
| C. | Was the final version of the RC/HC Report shared for review with in-country stakeholders as recommended in the guidelines (i.e. the CERF recipient agencies and their implementing partners, cluster/sector coordinators and members and relevant government counterparts)?  YES NO Since it was a WFP stand-alone project, the final report was compiled by WFP with support from OCHA. The HC has reviewed and endorsed the report. |

#### I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

| TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)          |   |             |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Total amount required for the ho                       | umanitarian response: US\$ 606,254,626  |             |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Source                                  | Amount      |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | CERF                                    | 17,003,929  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Breakdown of total response funding received by source | COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND (if applicable) | 1,501,023   |  |  |  |  |  |
| J v v g v v v v g v v v                                | OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)          | 277,083,173 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | TOTAL                                   | 295,588,125 |  |  |  |  |  |

| TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$) |   |                |            |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|----------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Allocation 1 – date of of  | Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 30 October 2015 |                |            |  |  |  |  |  |
| Agency   | Project code  | Cluster/Sector | Amount     |  |  |  |  |  |
| WFP  | 15-RR-WFP-075   | Food Aid       | 17,003,929 |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL 17,003,929   |   |                |            |  |  |  |  |  |

| TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$) |            |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------|--|--|--|--|
| Type of implementation modality  | Amount     |  |  |  |  |
| Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation                                      | 16,915,649 |  |  |  |  |
| Funds forwarded to NGOs and Red Cross / Red Crescent for implementation    | NA         |  |  |  |  |
| Funds forwarded to government partners                                     | 88,280     |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL  | 17,003,929 |  |  |  |  |

#### **HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

Over the last 18 months, Ethiopia has experienced its worst drought in decades due to the combined effect of failed spring (belg) (mid-February-May) rains and the June arrival of the El Niño weather conditions that affected summer / kiremt (June-September) rain patterns across the country. The kiremt rains usually provide much of the country's agriculture harvest and potable water.

The *belg* rains were much worse in 2015, which was not projected by the National Meteorology Agency predictions in January. Water and pasture shortages impacted livestock body condition. Unseasonal livestock migration was reported in pastoral areas. The number of livestock decreased along with the livestock herd size, reducing milk yield in pastoralist and agro-pastoralist communities. This significantly impacted the nutrition conditions of the affected populations. Food insecurity deepened and malnutrition levels rose in affected areas.

The mid-year review of the Government of Ethiopia's (GoE) Humanitarian Requirements Document (HRD) released on 18 August 2015 identified an additional 1.6 million people that required relief food, pushing the number of relief food beneficiaries in mid-2015 to 4.5 million. This represented a 55 per cent increase from the 2.9 million people projected to require food assistance in 2015. However, needs were consistently higher for every round of food aid, which depleted funding and commodities at an accelerated rate. Donors initially did not replenish these resources. The August assessment factored unforeseen emergencies in the first half of the year including the failed *belg* rains and late, erratic and uneven summer/*kiremt* rains. In addition, ad hoc requests for relief food assistance increased, including from previously surplus producing areas in Oromia region.

Escalating needs across the country compelled the GoE to complete a rapid inter-agency assessment at the end of September. On 12 October 2015, the GoE issued an addendum to the Mid-Year Review of the HRD which revised the number of people requiring food assistance upwards from 4.5 to 8.2 million with the regional breakdown as follows: Oromia (2.9 million), Somali (1.5 million), Amhara (1.4 million), Tigray (900,000), Afar (770,000), SNNP (617,000), Dire Dawa (65,000), Hareri (32,000), Gambella (21,000). The El Niño was forecasted to affect rainfall patterns through April 2016; as such, food insecurity has remained a concern in the northern, southern, central, eastern and north eastern parts of Ethiopia. The revised HRD also identified 1 million children and pregnant and lactating women (PLWs) in need of specialized nutritious food, an increase of 300,000 individuals from the 700,000 identified in the mid-year HRD review. Additional readyto-use nutritional (RUTF) and related supplies were needed for the projected 48,000 more children under-5 suffering from severe malnutrition, bringing up the total number to 350,000. From July 2015, malnutrition rose extremely rapidly, with admissions into WFP's Supplementary Feeding Programme having spiked by more than 50 per cent in the third quarter of 2015. The Ministry of Health and UNICEF saw the number of severe acutely malnourished children rise by a staggering 150 per cent in the worst affected areas between June and July 2015. Ongoing screening revealed that Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates in the worst affected areas had already surpassed 20 percent. Even though the GoE made efforts to improve the health and nutrition service nationwide, access to essential services remained low, particularly in pastoralists regions of Somali and Afar, with reports of zero to less than 53 per cent coverage. It was considered that required a further \$5 million to meet the additional needs for the remainder of the year.

The Government called on donors to extend additional support to ensure timely humanitarian response to critically underfunded sectors that were expected to be impacted by on-going *El Niño* weather patterns. The Government and the Ethiopian Humanitarian Country Team (EHCT) also held a series of briefings with donor partners – separately and together – to raise the alarm. Partners agreed that early action was urgently needed to support life-saving interventions and to minimize or even avert the worst effects of *El Niño*, expected to continue well into 2016.

It was considered that of the 8.2 million people in need of humanitarian food assistance, WFP and the GoE would be jointly responsible for covering 6 million people, requiring some US\$ 175 million¹. At the time of submission, the GoE stepped in and provided its own resources to cover the emergency food needs of 4.5 million people, and WFP was responsible to cover the needs of 1.5 million people in Somali region. WFP secured \$17 million for relief food and \$2 million for TSF, leaving a significant shortfall. A timely response was key to alleviating food insecurity related challenges and securing community and household assets to avoid further deterioration and an even greater magnitude of needs.

 $<sup>^{1}\,</sup>$  The NGO- led Joint Emergency Operation Plan (JEOP) was responsible for 2.2 million people.

#### II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

The CERF funds were used to support 1.46 million most-vulnerable drought affected women and men in Afar, Oromia, SNNP, Somali and Tigray regions. The beneficiaries (1.37 million) in Somali Region were prioritized for relief food based on the results from the food security assessments, which indicated significant stress among affected populations and boldly underscored the criticality of providing food assistance on time. A total of 61,812 beneficiaries in Afar, Oromia, SNNP, Somali and Tigray regions were prioritized for the Targeted Supplementary Feeding (TSF) given the very high levels of malnutrition.

The situation in Somali Region was very critical at the time of the CERF request, particularly in the seven woredas of Sitti and parts of Fafan zones. Poor performance of the seasons for consecutive years had weakened the ability of the people to resist shocks. Above all, livestock as major sources of livelihood was seriously affected and many had died due to critical shortage of pasture and water. Remaining herds were also weak with low marketable value due to high body emaciation and poor physical condition. It was evident that the impact would be more severe where communities were already suffering from the cumulative effects of past poor growing seasons. They had been adopting a range of detrimental coping strategies. These included skipping meals, selling off their assets, pulling children out of school, consuming less preferred wild foods and migrating to other areas.

With the objective of rehabilitating moderately malnourished children and pregnant and lactating women, the TSF programme prioritized to address the needs of malnourished children 6-59 months and pregnant and lactating women who were identified during screening conducted at health post/kebele level by the health extension workers and health staff or, as in pastoral areas, through campaigns and extended outreach services. Afar, Oromia, SNNP, Somali and Tigray were prioritized for the TSF given the very high levels of malnutrition.

#### **III. CERF PROCESS**

Priority areas for intervention were identified and agreed at the Ethiopian Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) Workshop conducted on 15 October 2015. The agreed priorities were coherent with the HRD and Somali Region was prioritized for immediate general food assistance. The allocation request was the product of EHCT agreement that identified food aid and TSF as the highest priorities at the time. The EHCT endorsed the following key strategic objectives: a) To reduce mortality and morbidity due to drought b) To protect and restore livelihoods; c) To prepare for and respond to other humanitarian shocks including flooding and displacement. The WFP CERF application was in line with Strategic 'Objective 1' of the EHCT.

#### IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

The CERF funds enabled WFP to urgently procure 28,492 metric tonnes of mixed food commodities. This provided assistance to 1,398,422 beneficiaries of general food distributions for a month/one round and 61,812 beneficiaries in the TSF programme for a period of three months.

With the \$15 million allocated to the Relief Intervention, WFP procured 27,101 metric tonnes of mixed food commodities for one round of food distributions in the Somali Region. The planned tonnage was 25,841 metric tonnes and the actual tonnage procured exceeded the planned target by 1,260 metric tonnes. Commodities were purchased through the Global Commodity Management Facility located in Ethiopia and this reduced the usual lead time of international procurement by half. As a result of the higher actual tonnage procured, WFP was able to reach an additional 30,565 beneficiaries.

| TA              | TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR <sup>1</sup>   |                 |         |                |               |         |                    |                  |            |
|-----------------|---|-----------------|---------|----------------|---------------|---------|--------------------|------------------|------------|
| Total number of | Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 8.2 million in the entire country, 1.5 million people were in Somali region |                 |         |                |               |         |                    |                  |            |
| Cluster/Conter  |   | Female          |         |                | Male          |         |                    | Total            |            |
| Cluster/Sector  | <b>Girls</b> (< 18)   | Women<br>(≥ 18) | Total   | Boys<br>(< 18) | Men<br>(≥ 18) | Total   | Children<br>(< 18) | Adults<br>(≥ 18) | Total      |
| Food Aid        | 377,939   | 357,549         | 735,488 | 386,329        | 338,418       | 724,747 | 764,268            | 695,967          | 1, 460,235 |

For the TSF, \$2 million was used to procure 1,391 metric tonnes of corn soya blend plus plus (CSB++) for 37,087 children (6-59 months) and 24,725 pregnant lactating women (PLWs) for a period of three months. The actual tonnage procured was lower than the planned tonnage as a result of a change in the food basket from CSB+ and vegetable oil to CSB++, which is more expensive. The change in food basket was based on the revised Nutrition Guidance the Country Office received from the Regional Nutrition Advisor. Commodities were distributed in Afar, Oromiya, SNNP, Somali and Tigray and regions.

#### BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

The CERF project budget response plan was based on the 2015 HRD endorsed for the second half of 2015. The HRD gives number of people requiring assistance summarised by drought affected woredas together with the type of commodities and volume of food. The final list of beneficiaries was prepared through the regular targeting arrangement managed by the community elected Food Assistance Targeting committees in every village, which is endorsed by the community. The approved beneficiary figure was grouped by food distribution points to reduce the burden on affected people traveling long distances in collecting their monthly ration.

Following the above procedures in targeting, the CERF project fund was used to assist the 1.37 million affected people in Somali region for general food distributions and 61,812 beneficiaries under the TSF programme.

| TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING <sup>2</sup> |   |         |           |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|---------|-----------|--|--|--|--|
|   | Children         Adults         Total           (< 18)         (≥ 18) |         |           |  |  |  |  |
| Female  | 377,939   | 357,549 | 735,488   |  |  |  |  |
| Male  | 386,329   | 338,418 | 724,747   |  |  |  |  |
| Total individuals (Female and male)   | 764,268   | 695,967 | 1,460,235 |  |  |  |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Best estimate of the total number of individuals (girls, women, boys, and men) directly supported through CERF funding. This should, as best possible, exclude significant overlaps and double counting between the sectors.

#### **CERF RESULTS**

The CERF fund bridged a critical funding gap without which vulnerable food-insecure drought affected households in the Somali region would have starved and resorted to detrimental/negative coping strategies. It helped to deliver urgently required food assistance to vulnerable food-insecure beneficiaries during the critical month/round of the year when the impact of *El Niño* had intensified. Through the funds received from CERF, WFP managed to feed 1.46 million people in critical need in the Somali region through the general food distributions and in the SNNP, Oromiya, Tigray and Somali regions through the TSFP.

The July Household Food Security Monitoring Bulletin indicates that among relief beneficiaries, the positive impact of increased levels of emergency food assistance is evident. The rate of inadequate consumption among this group has fallen by 41 per cent overall since February. It must be noted that while the situation is still critical and requires urgent, continued attention to ensure that the gains made are not eroded, these positive results are without a doubt evidence of how instrumental the CERF funds have been to improving food security. As a result of the CERF funds, beneficiaries in the Somali region were able to meet more than 50 per cent of their food needs.

With regard to results under the TSF programme, the CERF Fund has contributed to treating malnutrition in acutely malnourished children and women for a period of three months – the duration required to ensure beneficiary recovery.

#### **CERF'S ADDED VALUE**

The CERF fund was easily accessible and covered a critical shortfall. It was very instrumental at a time when donor contributions were very limited in spite of the continued and profound impact of *El Niño*. As a result of the CERF contribution, WFP was able to feed 1.37 critically food insecure people in Somali region through general food distributions and over 60,000 in the targeted supplementary feeding in other regions. Without the assistance obtained from CERF, the food insecurity in the Somali region would have been much worse, leading to more deaths and migration.

Without this assistance, malnutrition in drought-affected children would have progressed from moderate to severe with a very high risk of mortality. The assistance also prevented pregnant and lactating mothers from giving birth to babies with low birth weight with high risk of mortality and stunting. The food assistance also allowed nursing mothers to correctly breastfeed their children contributing to a healthier growth and prevention of illnesses.

In terms of coordination, WFP implemented all activities in collaboration with partners within the Food Cluster, taking the role of cluster lead and coordinating with other sectors through OCHA, and in close operational coordination with the GoE, through the prioritization committee where humanitarian response progress and challenges are thoroughly discussed and addressed. The representation of WFP in all the coordination forums has significantly improved during this emergency which has enabled it to address issues related to food security and advocate for more funding requirement from donors.

Each field office also participates in a Hubs and Spokes Committee comprised of WFP, DPPB, and local leaders/authorities that mainly track food movements, arrange escorts, and troubleshoot and resolve any operational bottlenecks. At Final Delivery Point (FDP) level, Food Distribution Committees (FDCs) composed of local leaders, elders, women, and religious leaders who are responsible for targeting, handling and distribution of food through the assistance from community (woredas) authorities.

| a) | Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries? | ? |
|----|--|---|
|    | Yes ☑ PARTIALLY ☐ NO ☐   |   |

At that critical time of the year when there were no reliable donor contributions, the CERF contribution enabled WFP to quickly respond to the crisis in Somali region for Relief and SNNPR\, Oromiya, Tigray and Somali Regions for the TSF. Commodity purchased through the Global Commodity Management Facility with the funds received from CERF ensured that food reached beneficiaries at half the normal lead time.

| b)  | Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs <sup>2</sup> ?  YES ☑ PARTIALLY ☐ NO ☐   |
|-----|---|
|     | e to the continued impact of <i>El Niño</i> and significant resources shortfall, the CERF support was very beneficial to filling the ical resource gap at end of 2015.  |
| c)  | Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources?  YES ☑ PARTIALLY ☐ NO ☐   |
| dor | h the assurance that the CERF funds would be received, WFP was able to focus on mobilizing resources from other nors for 2016. However, the donors' contributions have not been enough to fulfil the requirement of beneficiaries in P/Government operational areas.  |
| d)  | Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?  YES ☑ PARTIALLY ☐ NO ☐   |
| CE  | ordination amongst the humanitarian community with regard to the Food Cluster was facilitated by the receipt of the RF funds. WFP implemented all activities in collaboration with partners within the Food cluster, taking the role of cluster d, and coordinating with other sectors through OCHA, and in close operational coordination with the Government. |

### V. LESSONS LEARNED

| TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u>  |   |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Lessons learned  | Suggestion for follow-up/improvement  | Responsible entity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advance financing from CERF grants and purchase from WFP's FPF facilitated swift delivery of food assistance | This practise resulted in reducing the time to procure, transport and distribute food and should be continued in the future | WFP, CERF          |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR <u>COUNTRY TEAMS</u> |                                      |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--------------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Lessons learned                                | Suggestion for follow-up/improvement | Responsible entity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -  | -                                    | -                  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |                                      |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |                                      |                    |  |  |  |  |  |  |

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Time-critical response refers to necessary, rapid and time-limited actions and resources required to minimize additional loss of lives and damage to social and economic assets (e.g. emergency vaccination campaigns, locust control, etc.).

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

| TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS |  |           |            |              |              |                   |   |                       |                         |             |  |
|--------------------------|--|-----------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------|--|
| CER                      | CERF project information                     |           |            |              |              |                   |   |                       |                         |             |  |
| 1. A                     | gency:                                       | WFP       |            |              | 5. 0         | CER               | RF grant period:                                    | 01/11/2015 -          | - 30/04/2016            |             |  |
| 2. C                     | ERF project<br>e:                            | 15-RR-WF  | P-075      |              |              | 6. Status of CERF |   | ☐ Ongoino             | )                       |             |  |
| 3. C                     | luster/Sector:                               | Food Aid  |            |              | yı a         | ant:              |   | <b>⊠</b> Conclud      | ed                      |             |  |
| 4. P                     | roject title:                                | Respondir | ng to Hur  | nanitariar   | n Crises and | d Er              | nhancing Resilience                                 | to Food Insecu        | ırity                   |             |  |
|                          | a. Total funding requirements <sup>3</sup> : |           |            | US\$         | 606,254,62   | 26                | d. CERF funds for                                   | warded to imple       | ementing partner        | S:          |  |
| 7.Funding                | b. Total funding received4:                  |           |            | US\$         | 277,083,17   | 73                | <ul> <li>NGO partners<br/>Cross/Crescent</li> </ul> |                       |                         | US\$ 0      |  |
| 7.                       | c. Amount recei                              | ived from | US\$ 17,00 |              | \$ 17,003,92 | 28                | ■ Government Partners:                              |                       |                         | US\$ 88,280 |  |
| Ben                      | eficiaries                                   |           |            |              |              | ,                 |   |                       |                         |             |  |
|                          | Гotal number (pl<br>ling (provide a b        |           | _          |              | ) of individ | luals             | s (girls, boys, won                                 | nen and men) <u>c</u> | <u>lirectly</u> through | CERF        |  |
| Dire                     | ct Beneficiaries                             |           |            | Planned      |              |                   |   | Reached               |                         |             |  |
|                          |  |           | Fen        | nale         | Male         |                   | Total   | Female                | Male                    | Total       |  |
| Chil                     | dren (< 18)                                  |           | 7          | 11,286       | 656,5        | 71                | 1,367,857   | 377,939               | 386,329                 | 764,268     |  |
| Adu                      | lts (≥ 18)                                   |           |            | 35,354       | 78,7         | '89               | 164,143   | 357,549               | 338,418                 | 695,967     |  |
| Tota                     | al   |           | 79         | 96,640       | 735,3        | 60                | 1,532,000   | 735,488               | 724,747                 | 1,460,235   |  |
| 8b.                      | Beneficiary Profi                            | ile       |            |              |              |                   |   |                       |                         |             |  |
| Category                 |  |           | Numbe      | er of people | e (P         | lanned)           | Number of p   | eople (Reached        | )                       |             |  |
| Refugees                 |  |           |            |              |              |                   |   |                       | NA                      |             |  |
| IDPs                     |  |           |            |              |              |                   |   |                       |                         | NA          |  |
| Host population          |  |           |            |              |              |                   |   |                       |                         |             |  |
| Hos                      | t population                                 |           |            |              |              |                   | 1,367,857   |                       |                         | 1,398,422   |  |

This refers to the funding requirements of the requesting agency (agencies in case of joint projects) in the prioritized sector for this specific emergency.
 This should include both funding received from CERF and from other donors.

| Supplementary Feeding)  |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Total (same as in 8a)   | 1,532,000  | 1,460,235  |
| In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons: | enabled WFP to cover the requirement of exceeded the planning figure by 30,565 Feeding, the target number of beneficiaries | omali region, the CERF project support has f 1.37 million beneficiaries in one round. This beneficiaries. For Targeted Supplementary es was not reached as a result of higher than s Plus which meant that the planned tonnage |

| CERF Result Framework |   |                          |                         |
|-----------------------|---|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| 9. Project objective  | Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies   |                          |                         |
| 10. Outcome statement | Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals.  |                          |                         |
| 11. Outputs           |   |                          |                         |
| Output 1              | 232,000 children 6-59 months and pregnant and lactating women supported with specialised nutritious products to treat moderate acute malnutrition.  |                          |                         |
| Output 1 Indicators   | Description   | Target                   | Reached                 |
| Indicator 1.1         | MAM treatment default rate (%)  | <15%                     | 1.5%                    |
| Indicator 1.2         | MAM treatment recovery rate (%)   | >75%                     | 95%                     |
| Indicator 1.3         | MAM treatment non-response rate (%)   | <3%                      | 3.2%                    |
| Indicator 1.4         | Proportion of target population who participate in an adequate number of distributions  |                          | Not measured            |
| Output 1 Activities   | Description   | Implemented by (Planned) | Implemented by (Actual) |
| Activity 1.1          | MAM screening conducted systematically every month/quarter  | Regional MoH staff       | Regional MoH staff      |
| Activity 1.2          | Procurement and transportation of food.   | WFP/DRMFSS/DPPB          | WFP                     |
| Activity 1.3          | Distribution of food to beneficiaries   | DRMFSS/DPPB              | DRMFSS/DPPB             |
| Activity 1.4          | Monitoring distributions and reporting  | WFP/DRMFSS/DPPB          | WFP/DRMFSS/DPPB         |
| Output 2              | 1.3 million people in the Somali Region provided with emergency food assistance in a timely manner.   |                          |                         |
| Output 2 Indicators   | Description   | Target                   | Reached                 |
| Indicator 2.1         | Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food assistance, disaggregated by activity, beneficiary category, sex, food, non-food items, cash transfers and vouchers, as % of planned; | 1.3 million              | 100%                    |
| Indicator 2.2         | Quantity of food assistance distributed as % of planned;  | 21,505 MT                | 100%                    |
| Indicator 2.3         | 35% decrease in the proportion of households in the Somali Region with poor and very poor food  | 15%                      | 45%                     |

|                     | consumption scores.  |                          |                         |
|---------------------|--|--------------------------|-------------------------|
| Output 2 Activities | Description  | Implemented by (Planned) | Implemented by (Actual) |
| Activity 2.1        | Targeting and identification of relief beneficiaries established | DRMFSS                   | DRMFSS                  |
| Activity 2.2        | Procurement and transportation of food.                          | WFP/DRMFSS/DPPB          | WFP                     |
| Activity 2.3        | Distribution of food to beneficiaries                            | DRMFSS/DPPB              | DRMFSS/DPPB             |
| Activity 2.4        | Monitoring distributions and reporting                           | WFP/DRMFSS/DPPB          | WFP/DRMFSS/DPPB         |

# 12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:

The actual tonnage procured for Targeted Supplementary Feeding was lower than the planned tonnage as a result of a change in the food basket from CSB+ and vegetable oil to CSB++ which is more expensive, but had to be done as a result of a change in Nutrition Guidance/Protocol

# 13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:

WFP conducts regular monitoring activities including on site monitoring of distributions, post distribution visits to beneficiary households. The main purpose of WFP's monitoring is to follow up on implementation of the project and assess how the assistance is being used by the beneficiaries as well as to identify the achievements and challenges of the project.

In addition to monitoring through its field monitors, WFP receives regular reports from DPPB about distribution of supplies. The distribution reports include, among others, the number of beneficiaries who received the assistance, the amount of supplies transferred, the date distributions took place as well as implementation status against plan.

| 14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?  | EVALUATION CARRIED OUT |
|---|------------------------|
| WFP also produces bi annual Community and Household Surveillance (CHS) reports evaluating overall program outcome and food security situation of targeted beneficiary | EVALUATION PENDING 🛛   |
| households, particularly with regard to food consumption score and coping strategies index.  Based on the recent CHS data,  | NO EVALUATION PLANNED  |

## ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

| CERF Project Code | Cluster/Sector  | Agency | Partner<br>Type | Total CERF Funds<br>Transferred to<br>Partner US\$ |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------|-----------------|--|
| 15-RR-WFP-075     | Food Assistance | WFP    | GOV             | \$88,280   |

# ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

| CERF   | Central Emergency Response Fund                                |
|--------|--|
| CHS    | Community and Household Survey                                 |
| CSB++  | Corn Soya Blend Plus Plus                                      |
| DPPB   | Disaster Prevention and Preparedness Bureau                    |
| DRMFSS | Disaster Risk Management & Food Security Sector                |
| EHCT   | Ethiopia Humanitarian Country Team                             |
| FDP    | Final Delivery Point   |
| FDC    | Food Distribution Committee                                    |
| GCMF   | Global Commodity Management Facility                           |
| HRD    | Humanitarian Requirements Document                             |
| IDP    | Internally Displaced People                                    |
| IOM    | International Organization for Migration of the United Nations |
| MAM    | Moderate Acute Malnutrition                                    |
| OCHA   | United Nations Office of Humanitarian Affaires                 |
| NGO    | Non-Governmental Organizations                                 |
| SAM    | Severe Acute Malnutrition                                      |
| WFP    | World Food Programme   |
| UN     | United Nations   |