

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR  
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS  
NIGERIA  
RAPID RESPONSE  
CONFLICT-RELATED DISPLACEMENT  
MARCH 2015**

**RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR**

**Ms. Fatma Samoura**

## REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

- a. Please indicate when the After Action Review (AAR) was conducted and who participated.

Yes, an AAR was conducted at the ISWG with the participation of sector lead agencies including UNICEF, FAO, IOM, UNFPA, UNHCR and UNDP.

- 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

- 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

## I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response:		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	9,889,075
	COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND (if applicable)	-
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	148,608,510
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>158,497,585</b>

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 23-Mar-15			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
UNICEF	15-RR-CEF-035	Child Protection	403,254
UNICEF	15-RR-CEF-036	Nutrition	3,295,934
FAO	15-RR-FAO-014	Agriculture	2,199,134
UNFPA	15-RR-FPA-011	Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence	501,670
UNHCR	15-RR-HCR-017	Protection	1,109,375
IOM	15-RR-IOM-012	Emergency Shelter and Non-Food Items	1,479,870
UNDP	15-RR-UDP-004	Common Safety and Security	199,837
WFP	15-RR-WFP-024	Common Logistics	700,000
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>9,889,075</b>

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies /IOM implementation	7,384,144
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	1,868,569
Funds forwarded to government partners	636,362
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>9,889,075</b>

## **HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

The conflict in northeast Nigeria has led to widespread displacement, violations of international humanitarian and human rights law, protection risks, and a growing humanitarian crisis as a result of the Boko Haram insurgency. In 2015, the Boko Haram insurgency affected states some 24.5 million people in four states. An estimated of 5.6 million people<sup>1</sup> in the North-East of Nigeria were directly affected. Of these 5.6 million people, 1.2 million had been displaced<sup>2</sup>, 1.5 million were malnourished children and pregnant & lactating women; and 4.6 million people were food insecure people. In addition, 2.2 million people were in need of protection, 4.6 million in need of food security, 3.5 million in need of health care, 1.9 million in need of emergency shelter and NFIs, 2.2 million in need of WASH and 0.4 million in need of emergency education services.

According to the Displacement Tracking Matrix (DTM ) report released in February 2015, the majority of IDPs (892,873) were in Borno and Adamawa states; Borno registered 672,714 IDPs, while Adamawa had 220,159. Close to 90 percent of the IDPs were living with host communities. Nearly 200,000 people have fled to neighbouring Cameroon (27,000), Chad (66,000) and Niger (102,000) since May 2013. Over 7,000 fatalities were attributed to the insurgency and the crisis has left entire communities traumatized. Hundreds of children have been killed, injured, abducted or recruited to fight and more than 300 schools have been severely damaged or destroyed in the north-east. Women and girls have been trafficked, raped, abducted and forcibly married.

Inadequate health facilities(only about 40% were operational) in conflict affected areas, compounded by lack of adequate water and sanitation and increasing malnutrition posed a challenge as Nigeria was confronted by cholera, measles and meningitis outbreaks. It was estimated that, in the absence of well-targeted humanitarian assistance, as many as three million people would be unable to meet their basic food needs by July 2015. In the states of Borno, Yobe and Adamawa, from January to December 2014, the Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) burden for 2015 was projected to be over 58,000 SAM children.

The protracted nature of the insurgency added to increased risk to secondary separation as host families and communities find themselves unable to care for and support their children. Lack of adequate shelter exposed women and girls, making them more vulnerable due to lack of privacy. There have been increased media reports of sexual violence against women and girls in the Northeast including in the IDP camps. The insurgency has likewise added to the burden to provide for the family, with the women carrying the heavier load. The wet feeding in camps had limited the women's ability to provide nutrient options for their families. Men and boys have been targeted by insurgents for conscription and those who resisted have been killed resulting in a significant number of female-headed households.

Unstable security situation in the areas of origin and even in displacement sites, where intermittent bombing and attacks happen, is still experienced. This is worsened by vast distances, poor road conditions and the disruption in domestic commercial flights serving north-eastern Nigeria which is limiting humanitarian access to populations in need.

## **II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION**

Based on various references (as enumerated in section III), the HCT agreed on the following priorities in Nigeria: Protection, Food and Nutrition, Emergency Shelter/NFI, Security and Access/Logistics. The identified priority NE states were Gombe, Yobe, Adamawa and Borno based on high intensity of IDPs, vulnerability and most urgent gaps to be filled.

The implementing agencies agreed on key priorities based on the sectoral grouping. These were:

**Protection (UNICEF, UNFPA and UNHCR):** Establishment of effective system for the identification and interim care of Unaccompanied and Separated children (UASC), prevention and response to Sexual and Gender based Violence (SGBV) and improvement of the access to protection and assistance for IDPs and host communities.

**Nutrition (UNICEF):** Scaling up of community management of acute malnutrition and provision of nutrition-sensitive interventions in Yobe, Borno and Adamawa.

---

<sup>1</sup> Displacement Tracking Matrix, Round 2, IOM, February 2015

<sup>2</sup> The IDP population comprises 53 percent women and 47 percent men. 56 percent of IDPs are children, of which more than half are under 5 years old.

**Emergency shelter/NFIs (IOM):** Improve living conditions of people in camps, camp-like setting and host communities through the provision of emergency shelter and NFI assistance.

**Food Security (FAO):** Improve access to food and increase resilience of affected population through the provision of livelihood support.

**Security (UNDSS):** Increase security information-sharing and awareness to inform humanitarian operations in the Northeast.

**Access/Logistics (WFP):** Facilitate access and humanitarian response through air services to humanitarian partners.

### III. CERF PROCESS

The request for CERF funding was part of the integral process under the Regional Sahel application, together with Niger and Cameroon. The HCT- Nigeria tasked the Inter Sector Working Group to provide guidance for priority areas. All life-saving sectors were looked into and reviewed during the prioritization process in light of what would have been mobilized for the response from other sources. Gender considerations were given attention in all stages of the prioritization and project development. References used for the prioritization process included the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) in 2015, Multi-sectoral Needs Assessment 2014, FAO's food security assessment 2014, Nutrition surveillance in Borno and Yobe, and DTM February 2015.

Since resources were already mobilized for WASH and Health, the priorities for the CERF funding were: Protection, Food and Nutrition, Emergency Shelter/NFI, Security and Access/Logistics. The identified priority NE states were Gombe, Yobe, Adamawa and Borno. The bases for prioritizing these states were: high intensity of IDPs, vulnerability and most urgent gaps to be filled.

The CERF allocation was used to support the most vulnerable displaced people and host communities who have been directly affected by the insurgency. It helped in the provision of urgently needed humanitarian relief, protection and safety for thousands of people, especially women and children that have already experienced or witnessed horrific atrocities.

### IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR <sup>1</sup>									
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 5.6 million									
Cluster/Sector	Female			Male			Total		
	Girls (below 18)	Women (above 18)	Total	Boys (below 18)	Men (above 18)	Total	Children (below 18)	Adults (above 18)	Total
Child Protection	1,049		1,049	1,160		1,160	2,209		2,209
Nutrition	27,801		27,801	19,320		19,320	47,121		47,121
Agriculture	14,113	10,199	24,312	12,100	8,745	20,845	26,213	18,944	45,157
Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence	39,243	156,615	195,858	30,395	125,447	155,842	69,638	282,062	351,700
Protection	91,870	107,419	199,289	69,265	87,320	156,585	161,135	194,739	355,874
Non-Food Items	10,601	15,822	26,423	11,235	15,283	26,518	21,836	31,105	52,941
Common Safety and Security									
Common Logistics									921

<sup>1</sup> Best estimate of the number of individuals (girls, women, boys, and men) directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector.

## **BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION**

**Child Protection:** UNICEF is the only UN agency working with unaccompanied and separated children and partnered with Save the Children (in Borno state – seven of the IDP camps) and International Rescue Committee (in Adamawa state – IDP camps, and Sangare A, Sangare B, Daware, Uba, Lamorde). A case management system has been set up collectively by the partners to capture data and outcomes for unaccompanied and separated children. For the psychosocial support programme, children's attendance is recorded each time they participate. The total number of children attending is calculated at the end of every week and collated every month by the supervisors. A child is deemed to have benefited from the programme if they attend a minimum of 70 per cent of the available sessions in a month. International Rescue Committee is the only agency delivering this service in the project areas in Adamawa so double counting is avoided. As all unaccompanied and separated children attend the psychosocial support programme the number of unaccompanied and separated children reached (418) was subtracted from the total number of children attending the psychosocial support programme in Adamawa thereby avoiding double counting of beneficiaries.

**Nutrition:** The total number of under five children admitted into Community-based Management of Acute Malnutrition treatment sites in three states of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe and 36 Local Government Areas between May and October 2015 was 47,121 which is attributed to the support provided by CERF. The Severe Acute Malnutrition caseload was estimated at 75,859 under-five children for 2015 using the 2014 SMART survey results. From January to October 2015, 62,685 children were admitted into treatment. To avoid double counting, a standard monitoring system was used in which only new cases of children admitted to the programme were counted and reported in the final figure and appropriate attribution made to the different donors such as CERF which could be achieved as the sector received support for supplies from different donors at different times and then used these supplies in the treatment of children in the established sites over a set period of time. Thus it is easy to know the amount used at any time and the source of the supplies.

**Food Security:** The project covered residents in Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) phases 2 and 3 (stressed and crises food situation, respectively in the states of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe. Households were selected on the basis of having children and expectant and nursing mothers showing signs of malnutrition. By the end of the project, it benefitted 45,157 people or 6,451 Households composed of IDP children, pregnant and lactating women. Beneficiaries were composed of: 91% women headed households (21% pregnant and 62% lactating mothers) in Borno; 40 % female head of households in Adamawa and 51% women beneficiaries in Yobe. The project helped in a significant improvement of food coverage and diet quality. The Food Security Working Group (FSWG) served as the platform for sharing project objectives, activities and planning at national and state, among the food security partners. The 4W food security matrix provides information and data to the FSWG that help to avoid duplication of intervention in the same area. The Implementing partners on the field were assisted by the State Emergency Management Agency (SEMA) in Local Government Area (LGAs) and beneficiaries' identification, avoiding duplication and ensuring synergy of humanitarian interventions.

**SGBV:** The project benefitted at total number of 351,700 with 195,858 (55%) women and girls and 155,842 (44.3%) boys and men. Reach of the project activities for IDPs and host population differed with 246,190 (70%) and 105,510 (30%) respectively. Media sensitization activities undertaken during the project ensured broader reach beyond the 220,000 persons originally planned for the project. Records for one on one and group counselling were regularly updated to remove possibility of double reporting. Sensitization activities were also planned in a manner that ensured that different household populations were targeted at a point in time to reduce the possibility of double counting.

**ES/NFI:** The data included in the table above reflect the number of beneficiaries of the ES/NFI activities which include: cash vouchers, construction of shelters and distributions of NFI/shelter items. The issue of double counting has been addressed by ensuring that partners work in different geographical areas. Thus different IDP groups were supported by different partners. The beneficiary numbers were checked and monitored through regular field visits.

**Protection:** UNHCR was able to reach 355,874 IDPs through protection monitoring with National Human Rights Commission, psychosocial support and counselling with Nigeria Red Cross Society. In line with community based approach, UNHCR ensured that persons with specific needs were mapped and prioritised for assistance. Psycho-social interventions were provided to traumatized children and women and survivors at risk, identified through focused group discussions and the psychosocial project, implemented by UNHCR's implementing partner, Nigeria Red Cross.

UNHCR provided technical support to the Red Cross and closely monitored its implementation. UNHCR made referrals from the database of the vulnerability screening for persons with specific needs to the psychosocial project to ensure appropriate psychosocial support serves are provided.

**Common Safety and Security:** Funds received from CERF enabled UNDSS to respond in a timely and appropriate way to the requirements of humanitarian operations in NE Nigeria. Specifically to develop security mitigation measures to support the humanitarian actors by providing additional UNDSS security presence in Maiduguri and Yola.

**Common Logistics:** The numbers of beneficiaries stated represent the actual numbers of passengers from NGOs, UN agencies, donor organizations and diplomatic missions, transported between Abuja, Maiduguri, Yola, Bauchi and Gombe from commencement of UNHAS operations on 17-Aug-15 until 12-Nov-15, inclusive.

TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING <sup>2</sup>			
	Children (below 18)	Adults (above 18)	Total
Female	184,677	290,516 <sup>3</sup>	475,193
Male	143,475	237,255 <sup>4</sup>	380,730
<b>Total individuals (Female and male)</b>	<b>328,152</b>	<b>527,771</b>	<b>855,923</b>

<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

**Child Protection:** Unaccompanied and separated children are at acute risk of violence, exploitation, abduction and recruitment. Rapid identification of unaccompanied and separated children, assessment of their needs and care arrangements and placement in or support for safe appropriate care is critical for their survival. CERF funding allowed for the rapid establishment of a harmonised system of case management for unaccompanied and separated children, a harmonised information management system and the creation of a network of 494 trained foster carers able to provide unaccompanied and separated children with safe care. A total of 1,000 unaccompanied and separated children (498 girls and 502 boys) were identified and either supported to remain with their caregivers or placed in alternative care. Also, 1,627 children (864 boys and 763 girls) were provided with psychosocial support to help them to cope with the distress suffered due to the conflict. This number includes 418 unaccompanied and separated children supported in Adamawa State. Therefore the total number of children reached with Psychosocial Support (PSS), unaccompanied and separated children case management or both was 2,209 (1,049 girls and 1,160 boys). The project greatly exceeded the targeted number of unaccompanied and separated children (450) but fell slightly short of the 1,800 children targeted with psychosocial support. Following the CERF intervention, child protection partners are able to identify highly vulnerable unaccompanied and separated children, place them in safe care and ensure they are protected from violence, exploitation and abuse.

**Nutrition:** The CERF funding was used to procure 57,362 cartons of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food (RUTF) to support Community-Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) programme in three emergency states of Adamawa, Borno and Yobe states. The programme was implemented using the government primary health care system. The plan was to procure 45,925 cartons of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food, but an additional 11,437 cartons were procured with the budget provided by CERF which was possible following a negotiated reduction in price of supplies during the procurement process. As a result, procurement and distribution of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food to implementing partners, as well as timely identification of cases, the CERF specific planned target of reaching 45,925 children was exceeded. A cumulative total of 47,121 children (27,801 girls and 19,320 boys) with severe acute malnutrition in IDP camps and host community settings were treated between May and October 2015 which is three per cent above the target. A total of 34,171 children admitted into the Community-Management of Acute Malnutrition centres were discharged from the programme. Among the discharged children, 83 per cent (28,365) were discharged cured, 14 per cent (3,784) defaulted from the programme, 1.4 per cent (478) died and the remaining 1.6 per cent (547) did not recover. The performance indicators for the treatment programme are in line with the SPHERE minimum standards for emergency nutrition interventions. The CERF funding contributed to a reduction in mortality

<sup>3</sup> No sex disaggregation for beneficiaries of UNHAS, therefore, this figure includes the estimated 461 female adults benefitted by the UNHAS.

<sup>4</sup> Due to no sex-disaggregated data for UNHAS beneficiaries, this figure includes the estimated 460 male adults who benefitted from the logistics support.

amongst children identified and treated through the nutrition programme. There is a remaining stock of 10,241 cartons of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food which was utilized in November and December 2015.

**Food Security:** A total of 1,451.5 tons of food items consisting of rice, maize, and millet (387.1 tons), vegetable oil (38.7 thousand litres), palm oil (38.7 thousand litres), sugar (29 tons), salt (19.4 tons) and Maggie (19.4 tons) were distributed by three monthly allocations. Beneficiaries received the food basket three times from June to October 2015. Food quality was regularly assessed based of an inspection checklist of quality standards. In general, the food items were of good quality, with a quality average of about 85% over the months of food distribution. The food basket distributed is set to provide 2,009 Kcal/person/day to households of 7 individuals. The program has achieved the intended objective to improve the food and nutrition security of Internally Displaced People (IDPs) and the Host Families affected by the insurgency and reduce the burden on host communities. The distribution process was successful in providing diversified food to 6,451 vulnerable households to cover a crucial three (3) months lean period amidst the ongoing insecurity in the area, and other challenges encountered. All recipients received the exact quantities of the food basket as planned and utilisation of the food analysis shows that more than 96% of the beneficiaries consumed the totality of food basket. The food access was improved from severe food insecurity status to food secure level. The food security consumption score (FSCS) showed an improvement favouring the acceptable food consumption class by more than 23% increase for adults and children as well.

**GBV:** Equitable access to quality services for the treatment and management of GBV especially rape survivors has been a major gap in the humanitarian programming. The project funds assisted in building the capacity of 104 health workers on clinical management of rape survivors in Borno and Adamawa states. This contributed to the pool of skilled workers to deliver these services to survivors. In line with the focus of GBV communication, 111 health workers received training on basic skills on delivery of community sensitization on the prevention and response to GBV while 29,700 persons acquired knowledge on behaviour attitude that discourage/and protect women and girls from GBV. As a result, 217 rape and GBV survivors accessed specialized health services for rape and other forms of SV and GBV. Furthermore, 330,000 persons were sensitized on GBV and Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health (ASRH) related issues. The project supported mobilization of service providers to deliver psycho-social counselling services in host communities and IDP camps. As a result, 5,515 persons receive psychosocial counselling support. The project also supported capacity enhancement for referrals and 57 community actors gain skills to undertake referrals for GBV survivors and 165 persons receive referral assistance to higher level service providers. The project supported the inauguration of 64 members Project steering committees in Borno (22), Gombe (21) and Adamawa (21) and 22 rape and 6,000 dignity kits were procured and distributed to 1,320 persons in Borno and Adamawa.

**ES/NFI:** Through CERF funding, 47,383 IDPs living in camps and in host communities, in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe, received lifesaving support in the form of NFI and cash vouchers that enable them to prepare and consume food, have thermal comfort and meet their personal hygienic needs. In addition, 5,558 IDPs received emergency shelters support which gave beneficiaries the opportunity to upgrade and repair their shelters and live in conditions that ensure their access to privacy, safety and health while enabling essential livelihood activities to be undertaken.

**Protection:** Protection monitoring and psychosocial counselling and support was conducted through the CERF funding. The trauma of armed conflict severely impacted psychological wellbeing of children and families, which in turn undermined their ability to care for themselves. The damaged protective environment that is critical especially for women and children in times of emergency resulted in a prevalence of grave violations of children's rights, including forced recruitment into armed groups, attacks on schools and hospitals, sexual violence, lack of prevention measures in place and limited response services available to the victims. Psycho-social interventions were provided to 2,226 traumatized children and women and survivors at risk, identified through focused group discussions and the psychosocial project, implemented by UNHCR's implementing partner, Nigeria Red Cross in Taraba, Gombe, Adamawa, Borno and Yobe states. UNHCR provided technical support to the Red Cross and closely monitored its implementation. UNHCR made referrals from the database of the vulnerability screening for persons with specific needs to the psychosocial project to ensure appropriate psychosocial support services are provided.

**Common Safety and Security:** CERF funding also enabled the implementation of a large number of Security Risk Assessments (SRA) by Field Security Coordination Officers (FSCO) and separate security briefings in order to help mitigate the risks of the wider humanitarian community. In all, 8 SRAs and 16 analytical reports were issued. 40 briefings were conducted to the Area Security Management Team and 30 INGO meetings were conducted. In addition 88 daily situation reports and 28 weekly reports were issued. UNDSS also conducted 8 training sessions covering security related topics specific to the North East and conducted 32 field security support and assessment missions. All of this was in line with our expected targets.

**Common Logistics:** The CERF allocation enabled UNHAS to successfully provide safe, effective and efficient access to beneficiaries and project implementation sites for a total of 27 NGOs, UN agencies, donor organizations and diplomatic missions in Nigeria, transporting life-saving cargo including medical supplies in addition to providing a capacity for the evacuation of humanitarian staff.



Launched on 17 August 2015 and operating out of Nigeria's capital, Abuja, UNHAS transported 921 personnel and 3,970kgs of humanitarian cargo between Bauchi, Gombe, Maiduguri and Yola. During the reporting period, UNHAS exceeded its targets in terms of numbers of passengers transported monthly against planned, percentage of bookings served, tonnage of light cargo transported monthly against planned and the number of agencies using the service.

## **CERF's ADDED VALUE**

a) **Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

**Child Protection:** Unaccompanied and separated children were rapidly identified and provided with safe, supported care.

**Nutrition:** The Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food procured through CERF funds enabled a rapid scale-up of the programme through the provision of Ready-to-use Therapeutic Food to nutrition partners to increase the capacity to provide treatment to severely malnourished children. In addition to the treatment centres, the IDP camps were adequately stocked with supplies and regular weekly screenings to identify children with Severe Acute Malnutrition were scaled up in all IDP camps and communities which were covered by the nutrition program.

The CERF funding also increased the bonding among sector members as the supplies provided the means to scale-up their programmes.

**Food Security:** A significant number of IDP households are currently headed by women who now bear the sole responsibility of ensuring not only security of the family members but also lifesaving access to food. Hence the project's specific target was composed of 91% women headed households, nursing women and pregnant women and completed with households having malnourished children. The targeting of most special vulnerable groups as pregnant women, nursing women, disabled persons, and malnourished children was acknowledged as relevant relief option.

**SGBV:** The funding closed gaps for funding and ensured accelerated and sustained response to the protection needs of vulnerable women and girls. The initiatives supported by the project enabled a broader response to the immediate needs of women to maintain dignity and assure protection needs regarding to bodily integrity through the provision and distribution of dignity and rape kits. It also improved opportunities for access to services for GBV survivors in communities of focus in Borno and Adamawa states. The funds also contributed to the strengthening of the capacity of national actors to prevent and respond to GBV especially rape. In addition, GBV education and sensitization activities enabled community action to prevent SGBV utilizing indigenous mechanisms. Similarly, the funding helped to scale-up the response to meet the minimum initial service package for reproductive health in humanitarian settings (MISP). By providing for increased procurement and distribution of rape treatment kits the project helped in closing critical gaps for service provision for GBV survivors. ES/NFI: The funding helped to scale-up the response in term of ES/NFI across the affected area and ensured accelerated response to the acute needs identified in the sector.

**ES/NFI:** The funding helped to scale-up the humanitarian response in term of ES/NFI and ensured accelerated response to the acute needs identified in the sector. In order to allow for the fast delivery of assistance, the implementation of the CERF funded activities started prior to the disbursement of fund and the first beneficiaries received assistance as early as January 2015.

**Protection:** The funding enabled UNHCR to launch the much needed intervention prior to securing additional funding to address the immediate needs of traumatized children and women and other survivors at risk of further abuse and exploitation. The capacity of partners was promptly developed with the funds for the start off of the programme. The protection monitoring helped identify key protection gaps to be addressed.

**Common Safety and Security:** CERF funding enabled UNDSS to respond in a timely manner to all security situations as they arose and to provide timely mitigation strategies where and when needed.

**Common Logistics:** The CERF allocation ensured that humanitarian personnel were able to utilise UNHAS services to rapidly deploy personnel and time-critical supplies throughout their programmes in the north-east.

**b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs<sup>5</sup>?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

**Child Protection:** The number of unaccompanied and separated children were rapidly growing. It was imperative that a system be established to allow for these children to be identified and reached with critical services and support.

**Nutrition:** If children with severe acute malnutrition are left untreated, it will significantly increase their risk of mortality and morbidity. The CERF funding enabled the procurement of therapeutic foods which in turn allowed prompt admission of identified cases and quick treatment thus timely responding to the critical needs of the children.

**Food Security:** The beneficiaries did not have food reserve from their own production or income to purchase food, hence the life-saving effect of the food aid on the household beneficiaries in a crucial lean period.

**SGBV:** The funds helped to address essential protection, dignity and reproductive health needs of vulnerable women among IDPs and host communities. Women in situation of constant mobility or extreme restriction of mobility as a result of safety concerns may lack capacity to assure that their needs for dignity protection and basic reproductive health needs are met.

**ES/NFI:** CERF funds allowed for the provision of live saving emergency shelters and NFIs to vulnerable IDPs living in camps and host communities. The beneficiaries of the project were lacking essential household and hygienic items while others were living in open air or in makeshift shelters.

**Protection:** Most of the targeted populations were identified as being in Emergency and Crisis and thus required immediate lifesaving assistance. CERF funds were particularly timely and facilitated the timely start off of identification and psychosocial support to the beneficiaries to immediately alleviate prevalence of continuing violations of children's rights, sexual violence and exploitation. This provided response services to the victims to mitigate further abuse and confidence building. CERF funds enabled the protection monitoring to commence which provided the much needed data on the most vulnerable IDPs at household levels which facilitated intervention addressed towards identified needs.

**Common Safety and Security:** CERF funding allowed UNDSS to re-enforce our presence in Maiduguri thereby increasing our output in support of the overall humanitarian effort and to provide cover for periods when UNDSS colleagues were on leave. In addition it also allowed UNDSS to provide an FSCO in Yola to cover this area with the same services.

**Common Logistics:** The flexibility of the UNHAS operation ensured that, in addition to humanitarian personnel, time critical cargo, such as chilled medical supplies, vaccines and life-saving equipment, was able to be transported without delay

**c) Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

**Child Protection:** A small amount of additional funding was secured for unaccompanied and separated children programme through the Department for International Development (DFID). The success of the project has not yet translated into additional resource mobilisation.

**Nutrition:** The fund received from CERF was solely used for the procurement of therapeutic foods. As a result, implementing partners mobilized funds from other sources for meeting the operational costs of their nutrition programmes.

**Food Security:** The needs of food assistance were overwhelming. Partners inside the FSWG mobilized more funds for food assistance as a joint effort contributing to the Government overall assistance to the IDPs.

**SGBV:** The mechanism of the CERF strengthened coordination of GBV activities in the humanitarian situation by providing for frequent platforms for coordination and strategizing among partners. This helped elimination of duplication, reinforced learning and strengthened cooperation among key actors.

---

<sup>5</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.).

**ES/NFI:** The CERF allocation contributed to strengthen stakeholders and donors knowledge regarding the needs and gaps in this sector and to shed a light on IDPs plight. However, the funds allocated to this sector remain insufficient compared to the need identified on the ground.

**Protection:** The CERF fund helped UNHCR mobilise additional funding. Of the total need of USD 29,611,512 in 2015, 39% was funded. The CERF was 4% of the total funds received by UNHCR in 2015.

**Common Safety and Security:** The funds allocated were adequate for the mobilization of the additional UNDSS FSCOs and the security outputs met demand for the most part.

**Common Logistics:** In addition to contributions mobilised from other donors , amounting to a total of USD 2,108,863, the CERF allocation contributed to the operational costs of the UNHAS Nigeria operation.

d) **Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

**Child Protection:** The CERF funding on unaccompanied and separated children brought together the key government and non-government stakeholders at national and state levels to develop a harmonised case management system as well as an information management system for child protection, which greatly enhanced coordination among the partners.

**Nutrition:** The availability of the CERF funds provided a focus for all sector members to come together to discuss strategies and jointly expand service provision in the three states. The funds led to the signing of Program Cooperation Agreements with two International Non-Government Organizations, namely Save the Children and International Rescue Committee.

**Food Security:** The CERF project contribution to the implementing partners NGOs and government institutions helped in the activation and coordination of the FS Working Groups in the states and at national level as well. The international consultants and state based consultants were very helpful to the humanitarian coordination and the food security assessment that provided valuable data to feed in the HNO and HRP 2015 -16.

**SGBV:** The mechanism of the CERF strengthened coordination of GBV activities in the humanitarian situation by providing for frequent platforms for coordination and strategizing among partners. This helped elimination of duplication, reinforced learning and strengthened cooperation among key actors.

**ES/NFI:** The grant improved coordination and collaboration among humanitarian actors, including government partners, NGOs and affected communities. In addition, to providing ES/NFI assistance in Borno, IOM coordinated and monitor the delivery of assistance with Mercy Corp, IRC and ACF in Gombe, Adamawa and Yobe. Regular exchanges were organized among partners regarding the type of assistance to be provided as well as the areas and beneficiaries to be targeted for this project. The project contributed to the consolidation of relations, reporting and accountability in the shelter and NFI sector even though its coordination mechanisms still need to be reinforced, especially at state level.

**Common Safety and Security:** The grants improved coordination and collaboration with humanitarian actors in the North East of Nigeria.

**Common Logistics:** The CERF funding enabled the humanitarian community to coordinate their programmes throughout the northeast, utilising UNHAS scheduled services as opposed to the road transport network with the significant amount of time lost and the inherent security risks this posed to personnel. In order to ensure a needs based and coherent service, a key pillar of the UNHAS operation is to coordinate effective and principled humanitarian action in partnership with national and international actors. The service coordinated with both International Committee and Red Cross (ICRC) and Medecins Sans Frontieres (MSF-F) aviation sections to share aviation related information. A monthly User Group Committee (UGC) composed of NGOs, UN agencies and donor representatives was established in Abuja. Through this forum, UNHAS was able to lead coordination efforts for its activities and this improved the effectiveness of the service by ensuring a greater feedback mechanism system and accountability. Active participation of NGOs, UN agencies and donor representative in the UNHAS User Group Committee (UGC) was key in ensuring that the services provided responded to the aid community's needs.

**e) If applicable, please highlight other ways in which CERF has added value to the humanitarian response**

**Child Protection:** Without CERF funding, the child protection sub-sector would still be struggling to operationalise the system for unaccompanied and separated children. It also allowed an agreement to be drawn up on a harmonized information management system, although unaccompanied and separated children was the impetus for the development of the system, the system will be used more widely to monitor child protection interventions in the north-east.

**Food Security:** CERF has added value in strengthening the capacities of NGOs and Government implementing partners to deliver food assistance, developing synergies in interventions. FAO office capacity was also improved in human resources that contribute to the coordination of FSWG, HNO/HRP, and other humanitarian response needs evaluations.

**SGBV:** The funds also ensured a broader reach of humanitarian assistance and involvement of a greater number of actors for GBV. It contributed to the enlargement of a pool of skilled service delivery and the provision of services on more routine basis.

**Protection:** The monitoring exercise which sought to identify and profile the protection risks and needs of the most vulnerable IDP households (HH) in as many LGAs as possible, including often insecure areas, in camps, informal sites and host communities; compiles and analyses data from 17,534 vulnerable IDP households comprised of 128,511 individuals to give a comprehensive assessment of the protection environment in the North East. This has enabled effective humanitarian planning and targeted assistance by UNHCR and also provides same to other actors.

## V. LESSONS LEARNED

<b>TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u></b>		
<b>Lessons learned</b>	<b>Suggestion for follow-up/improvement</b>	<b>Responsible entity</b>
FAO: Sustainability becomes a concern at the end of the project as the IDPs have no alternative livelihood sources.	The project supported vulnerable households for three (3) months. At the end of the project need of food was still paramount among IDPs, and raised the sustainability issue as a the concern as the IDPs have no alternative livelihood sources. For successful recovery, livelihood assistance is needed to provide for agricultural and livestock production, and income generating. Underfunded areas should be taken into account to assist IDPs recovery.	OCHA and CERF SECRETARIAT
UNFPA: There is a need to improve flexibility of the CERF programming framework to ensure that major rapid changes of the humanitarian context is taken into consideration.	Programming framework to include an intent to take into consideration the fact that project locations and beneficiary focus (e.g. IDPs vs returnees) can be changed during CERF grant period in line with change in the dynamics of the humanitarian situation	OCHA
UNFPA: Need for more forums for information sharing and dissemination of best practices enabled by the CERF funds	Need to convene more forums that enable reporting on best practices and strategies that work for replication and guidance	CERF Secretariat
IOM: Common understanding on the purpose and intent of CERF should be promoted	Ensure out-reach at all levels for countries preparing CERF applications.	CERF secretariat, agencies

<b>TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR <u>COUNTRY TEAMS</u></b>		
<b>Lessons learned</b>	<b>Suggestion for follow-up/improvement</b>	<b>Responsible entity</b>
Despite the availability of supplies, the limited capacity in the country with regards to the number of NGO Nutrition partners (only 3), their reach and government capacity with regards to availability of trained health workers, in the three states remains a bottleneck.	Deliberate efforts need to be made in future to ensure additional capacity, mobilize skilled health workers in the affected areas and create mobile teams.	Humanitarian Coordination Team
Overwhelming needs compared to the available resources. Some beneficiaries had to share rations with other families as the number of households in need of relief assistance, is quite overwhelming.	There is a need to mobilize other donors, philanthropic organizations and the States Governments, to coordinate under the Food Security Working Groups, a much larger food assistance to reach out to more vulnerable groups at the same time and same coverage period.	HCT

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS						
CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNICEF		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	08/05/2015 – 07/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-CEF-035		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Child Protection			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Establishing an effective system of identification and interim care for unaccompanied and separated children displaced by the conflict in Adamawa State					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 3,810,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 1,855,565	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 270,967	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 403,254	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 17,999	
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) directly through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (below 18)	1,034	916	1,950	1,049	1,160	2,209
Adults (18 and above)						
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,034</b>	<b>916</b>	<b>1,950</b>	<b>1,049</b>	<b>1,160</b>	<b>2,209</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees						
IDPs	1,200		1,623			
Host population	750		586			
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>1,950</b>		<b>2,209</b>			
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>			The registration of unaccompanied and separated children and the establishment of the case management system for unaccompanied and separated children was implemented more rapidly and reached more beneficiaries than expected in Borno State, resulting in a larger number of unaccompanied and separated children being reached during the CERF funding period.			

<b>CERF Result Framework</b>			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Establish an effective system of identification and interim care for unaccompanied and separated children displaced by the conflict in Adamawa State		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Children who have been orphaned or separated from their families are provided with safe, appropriate interim care and supported to cope with distress in Adamawa State		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	450 unaccompanied and separated children provided with quality interim care		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of foster families identified	225	494 foster parents were identified and trained
Indicator 1.2	Number of unaccompanied and separated children supported in foster care	450	1,000 (498f, 502m) unaccompanied and separated children supported in foster care
Indicator 1.3	Percentage of foster families trained and supported	100 per cent	100 per cent of all foster families were trained and supported through regular visits
Indicator 1.4	Percentage of new foster families visited each month	100 per cent	100 per cent of all foster families were visited every month
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Map and identify existing and potential foster families in 4 local government areas	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children
Activity 1.2	Provide capacity building and support to 'foster families'	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children
Activity 1.3	Regularly monitor foster care placements	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children
Activity 1.4	Establish a case management system led by State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, (Borno and Adamawa) International Rescue Committee, Save the Children	Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children
<b>Output 2</b>	1,800 unaccompanied and separated children and children impacted by the conflict are supported to cope with distress in Adamawa State		

<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	Number of recreational Psychosocial Support kits (70) and Early Childhood Development kits (42) provided to the programme	112 (Psychosocial Support kits (70) and Early Childhood Development kits (42))	1,627 children (864m, 763f) reached with 125 kits through the child friendly spaces/psychosocial support programme
Indicator 2.2	Number community volunteers and supervisors trained	50	40 community volunteers and supervisors (21m, 19f) were trained in Adamawa
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Establish psychosocial support programmes in the target communities	UNICEF, State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, National Human Rights Commission, International Rescue Committee	UNICEF, State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, International Rescue Committee
Activity 2.2	Train community volunteers to implement the Psychosocial Support programme	UNICEF, State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, National Human Rights Commission, International Rescue Committee	UNICEF, State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development, International Rescue Committee
Activity 2.3	Provide standardised UNICEF recreational and Early Childhood Development kits for the Psychosocial Support programme and equipment for the child friendly spaces	UNICEF	UNICEF
<b>Output 3</b>	Unaccompanied and separated children suffering or at high risk of suffering abuse, violence and exploitation identified and referred to appropriate support services		
<b>Output 3 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 3.1	Percentage of targeted communities with functioning child protection committees	100 per cent	100 per cent - five target communities in Adamawa and seven camps in Borno have functioning child protection committees with trained committee members. Monthly meetings were carried out, while committees in the IDP camps in Borno met on a weekly basis. A total of 336 children were supported by the committees. The committees led a back to school campaign in local communities in Adamawa.
Indicator 3.2	Number of Internally Displaced Persons camps and host communities reached with communication messages on child protection	10,000	Seven IDP camps in Borno and five communities in Adamawa reached with child protection messages – it is estimated that over 10,000 adults were reached. In Adamawa 15,000 copies of leaflets on the importance of



			<p>supporting unaccompanied and separated children were produced in Hausa and English and distributed in Mubi and Yola Local Government Areas. Radio jingles were aired on Protection of unaccompanied and separated children on ABC FM Radio in Yola and a live phone-in programme was held with legal aid providers and the Ministry of Social Development to raise awareness on rights, protection and referral pathways. The radio station has a 300km radius. In Borno, leaflets (10,000) and posters were distributed in the IDP camps in Kanuri and Hausa on the prevention of secondary separation. The adult population of the camps</p>
<b>Output 3 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 3.1	Establish child protection committees at community level in the target communities	State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children	State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children
Activity 3.2	Establish referral pathways	State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children	State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (Borno and Adamawa), International Rescue Committee, Save the Children
Activity 3.3	Design and disseminate key prevention messages on child protection, in particular on family separation and importance of the MHPSS support for children affected by armed conflict	International Rescue Committee, State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development	International Rescue Committee, State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development

<b>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:</b>	
<p>The CERF funding allowed for the development and operationalisation of a robust system for identification, case management and placement in safe, supported, appropriate care of unaccompanied and separated children. Both Government and non-government partners were supported to develop a harmonised system of both case management and information management across the affected states. Standardised criteria were also developed for the selection of foster carers. Collectively, the partners reached 1,000 unaccompanied and separated children during the period of the CERF funding, far exceeding the target of 450. Few children needed to be removed from their current care arrangement due to being at risk of significant harm. The vast majority of children were supported with their current caregivers through training being provided to their foster parents and monthly visits being undertaken to ensure their safety. Care packages (including slippers, blankets, clothing soap) were also provided for each State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development in alternative care to support the families to care for them.</p>	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
<p>The Psychosocial Support intervention is community-based in design and approach. The project was initiated through a robust community consultation process to secure the buy-in of the community leaders and members. This approach ensured community ownership and helped to address the initial reluctance to send children to the programme due to the volatile security situation. The community members participated in the planning stage through identification of appropriate persons to serve as volunteers and also helped in designating suitable locations at which Child Friendly Spaces should be established. To promote ownership, the community leaders monitored the operation of Child Friendly Spaces in their communities.</p> <p>The Child Protection Committees established in the project areas provided feedback on the selection of foster parents and supported monitoring of placements of unaccompanied and separated children. The Committee members identified and referred unaccompanied and separated children and those who required additional support or required removal from the current care placement. The Committees also provided feedback on the design and content of the Information, education and Communication materials prior to their finalisation. Regular group meetings of foster parents allowed caregivers to give feedback to case workers and project managers on the challenges they were facing in their families and in their communities.</p>	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>The project has not been formally evaluated. However, the UNICEF Regional Specialist for Child Protection has visited Maiduguri on two occasions to assess the implementation of the Unaccompanied and Separated Children programme and to support government and non-government partners to strengthen the case management system. In addition, the UNICEF Chief of Child Protection visited the project sites in Borno and the UNICEF Child Protection Specialist visited Psychosocial Support and unaccompanied and separated children in both Borno and Adamawa, assessed project implementation and worked with partners to undertake corrective measures needed.</p>	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNICEF		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	08/05/2015 – 07/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-CEF-036		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Nutrition			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Nutrition intervention and response to the humanitarian crisis in North-East states under state of emergency in Nigeria					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 7.9 million	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 7,504,495	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 3,295,934	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (below 18)	22, 963	22,962	45,925	27, 801	19,320	47,121
Adults (above 18)						
<b>Total</b>	<b>22, 963</b>	<b>22,962</b>	<b>45,925</b>	<b>27, 801</b>	<b>19,320</b>	<b>47,121</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees						
IDPs	2,698		6,782			
Host population	43,227		40,339			
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>45,925</b>		<b>47,121</b>			
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>			The discrepancy between the target number and actual beneficiaries arises from the differences in the budgeted unit price and the eventual negotiated lower unit price of the ready-to-use therapeutic food which allowed a larger number of population that were covered.			

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Community management of acute malnutrition (CMAM) programme and nutrition sensitive interventions scaled-up in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe States to provide treatment for 45,925 severely acute malnourished children.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Timely identification and treatment for severe acute malnutrition in IDP camps and host communities will contribute to reduce mortality associated with severe acute malnutrition as well as build resilience among these most vulnerable populations.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	45,925 cartons of ready-to-use therapeutic food procured and delivered to treat children with severe acute malnutrition children through the government Primary Health Care system.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Cartons of ready-to-use therapeutic food procured	45,925	57,362
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Procurement of RUTF	UNICEF	UNICEF
Activity 1.2	Distribution of ready-to-use therapeutic food	Save the Children International, International Medical Corps, International Rescue Committee, Action Against Hunger, Cooperazione internazionale ong onius (COOPI), State Primary Health Care Development Agencies in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe.	Save the Children International, International Rescue Committee, Médecins Sans Frontières International, State Primary Health Care Development Agencies in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe
Activity 1.3	Monitoring of ready-to-use therapeutic food utilization	UNICEF	UNICEF

<b>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:</b>	
The projected number of under-fives targeted to be reached was surpassed because of larger coverage made possible from savings made on procurement cost of ready-to-use therapeutic food.	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
Accountability to affected population was ensured through their involvement and participation as community volunteers for active case findings and as members of support groups. Both men and women in camps and host communities were engaged in discussions and sensitization on nutrition intervention activities. Additionally, the affected population was involved in the process of monitoring and ensuring the implementation of the overall program at different coordination levels. Community and religious leaders were involved in the selection of volunteer community mobilizers (VCM) to ensure that those selected serve the community. Discussions with local leadership in the selection of mobile/outreach sites for nutrition activities hence empowering them to monitor the service delivery.	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
The program performance was continually monitored through the UNICEF Nutrition Specialists based in Borno and Bauchi supervised the project and ensured that the overall performance of the program was assessed using SPHERE standards. The program performance is well within SPHERE standard with respect to cure, death and defaulter rates.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	FAO		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	08/05/2015 – 07/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-FAO-014		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Agriculture			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Food Security and Livelihood Support for Most Vulnerable Households Affected by the Insurgency in N. E. Nigeria					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 2,400,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 2,400,000	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 263,934	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 2,199,134	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 130,619	
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	15,317	13,583	28,900	14,113	12,100	26,213
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	11,510	9,418	20,928	10,199	8,745	18,944
<b>Total</b>	<b>26,827</b>	<b>23,001</b>	<b>49,828</b>	<b>24,312</b>	<b>20,845</b>	<b>45,157</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>		<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>			
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>	49,828		45,157			
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>49,828</b>		<b>45,157</b>			
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>			Beneficiaries reached are 6,451 households. Reduction in beneficiaries' number is due to soaring food prices (Average of 74 USD compared to prevision of 66 USD per food basket) and 24 identified beneficiaries (1 in Maiduguri and 23 in Adamawa) did not show up.			

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	The objective of the project is to improve the food and nutrition security of Internally Displaced People (IDPs) and the Host Families affected by the insurgency and reduce the burden on host communities.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Most vulnerable households, especially children and women have better access to food and increased resilience facilitated through provision of food items.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	IDP households with pregnant and breastfeeding women and young children living in urban and rural host communities have received food items to reduce the acute food crisis and malnutrition, preventing debilitating effects in young children at this critical age.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of vulnerable food insecure households of IDPs with pregnant and lactating women and many young children living in host communities both in urban and rural areas identified and properly documented for targeting with food assistance.	49,828 people or 7,118 Households	45,157 people or 6,451 Households
Indicator 1.2	Reliable food suppliers preferably wholesalers with capacity to deliver and distribute in bulk identified and contracted to supply food for 3 months in the rural areas.	2 (most competitive suppliers and nearest to distribution points)	Three (3) food suppliers were selected
Indicator 1.3	A functional and fraud proof voucher system in place facilitated by national identification system.		One voucher printer was selected and a functional and fraud proof voucher system was designed with a different voucher for each of the three food distribution.
Indicator 1.4	A total of 7,118 most vulnerable households; receiving the stipulated food basket during the months of May, June and July 2015.	7,118 Households (directly benefiting)	6,451 Households.
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Identification and registration of very vulnerable households of Internally Displaced People with many young children and pregnant and lactating women.	NGOs (COOPI; Adamawa Peace Initiative (API), OXFAM), SEMAs community leaders and other Government agencies	State Primary Health Care Development Agency (SPHCDA), MoA, API, Save the Children, Christian Association of Nigeria (CAN), COOPI
Activity 1.2	Identification of suppliers in the target states, invitation for bids, evaluation bids and selection of suppliers/companies to supply and distribute clearly specified food baskets. The procurement process will follow FAO regulations and procedures	FAO in collaboration with SEMAs and NGOs.	FAO

Activity 1.3	Identification of voucher printers at central level, invitation for bids, evaluation bids and issue of tenders to print and supply vouchers for the three states. The procurement process will follow FAO regulations and procedures		One voucher printer was selected and a functional and fraud proof voucher system was designed with a different voucher for each of the three food distribution.
Activity 1.4	Monthly distribution of food baskets by selected suppliers with supervision and monitoring by partner NGOs and SEMAs in the target states.	NGOs and SEMA	3 NGOs and 2 Government agencies (and SEMA)
Activity 1.5	Due diligence by FAO and monitoring of project implementation and impact with partners.	FAO, NGOs and Government	FAO, NGOs and Government agencies
Activity 1.6	Evaluation and preparation of reports.	FAO	FAO, NGOs and Government agencies



<b>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:</b>	
<p>Beneficiaries reached are 6,451 households instead to the target 7,118 HH. The reduction in the number of beneficiaries is due to soaring food prices, averaging 74 USD compared to prevision of 66 USD per food basket. There were also 24 identified beneficiaries (1 in Maiduguri and 23 in Adamawa) who did not show up for the food distribution, hence, were not included in the final count of beneficiaries. In total, there were 45,157 people who benefited from the project, composing of 91% women headed households (21% pregnant and 62% lactating mothers) in Borno; 40 % female head of households in Adamawa and 51% women beneficiaries in Yobe.</p> <p>In general, the food items were of good quality, with a quality average of about 85% over the months of food distribution. Where shortfalls in quality existed, they were largely due to the presence of shaft in the beans, maize, and millet that was greater than allowed by the stringent standards.</p> <p>To reduce exposure to looting incidences, the Nigeria Civil Defence Corps provided security at distribution sites and the food convoy to Chibok in Borno State was conducted, under military escort. No security incident was reported during the monthly food distribution.</p>	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
<p>Beneficiaries' participation in the implementation process was key to the success of the project. The communities were informed about the project objectives, the food basket composition, the voucher system, the implementing partners and food suppliers. The communities and local authorities validated the beneficiaries' lists. The beneficiaries' opinion was monitored throughout the monitoring and evaluation process.</p>	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>At the end of each monthly distribution, the implementing partners conduct post distribution monitoring and reports were presented describing the activities undertaken, the achievements and the monitoring and evaluation results including beneficiaries' opinion. The final project evaluation was carried out by the implementation partners and reported on the effects and impact of the intervention of beneficiaries.</p> <p>The synthesis of implementing partners reports, with FAO monitoring field mission reports supported by some data analysis, constitute the essential of the over-all project evaluation.</p>	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNFPA		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	08/05/2015 – 07/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-FPA-011		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Prevention and Response to Sexual and Gender Based Violence (SGBV)					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 5,753,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 787,048	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 96,266	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 501,670	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 180,257	
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) directly through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	55,000		55,000	39,243	30,395	69,638
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	84,500	80,500	165,000	156,615	125, 447	282,062
<b>Total</b>	<b>139,500</b>	<b>80,500</b>	<b>220,000</b>	<b>195,858</b>	<b>155,842</b>	<b>351,700</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>	154,000			246,190		
<i>Host population</i>	66,000			105,510		
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>220,000</b>			<b>351,700</b>		
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	The change in project strategy in relation to mobilization of social workers with better reach in communities contributed to greater reach in beneficiaries. Also the project was able to reach greater number of beneficiaries than planned because of the media based information dissemination on GBV in states where activities were implemented. This is in addition to the services that were directly delivered through inter-personal communication at community and camp levels.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Prevention and Response to sexual and gender based violence for prioritized IDP camps and host communities in Borno and Adamawa States.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Protection and SRH services are accessed by survivors of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV)		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Improved capacity of health workers to provide appropriate services to vulnerable women and girls		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	# Of rape treatment kits procured and distributed	22	22
Indicator 1.2	# Of dignity kits procured and distributed	6,000	6,000
Indicator 1.3	#Of health workers trained	95	104
Indicator 1.4	# Of people reached with information on services	220,000	300,000
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Procure rape treatment and dignity Kits	UNFPA	UNFPA
Activity 1.2	Distribution of rape treatment kits and dignity kits to health care facilities	Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS)	NRCS
Activity 1.3	Conduct training workshops for 40 doctors and nurses on clinical management of rape	UNFPA and WHO	UNFPA and WHO colleagues provided technical guide to the selection of facilitators but could not participate at the training because of conflicting schedules
<b>Output 2</b>	Improved access to services (including medical and psycho-social services) to rape survivors and severely distressed persons through increased service availability and improved mobilization		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	# of people reached and accessing service	220,000	300,000
Indicator 2.2	# of SGBV survivors who access medical care for clinical management	400	217
Indicator 2.3	# of affected persons reached with community based psycho-social counselling (group counselling)	4,500	5,515
Indicator 2.4	# of distressed persons reached with one-on-one psycho-social counselling	340	551
Indicator 2.5	# of communities volunteers identified and trained to enhance community awareness and referral system	60	57
Indicator 2.6	# of survivors referred to higher level service providers	100	165

<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Mobilize 95 doctors and nurses to conduct information dissemination sessions on service sites.	UNFPA/ State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (MOWASD)	UNFPA/SMWASD
Activity 2.2	Mobilize 95 doctors and nurses to provide medical care for rape survivors	State Ministry of Health (SMOH)/ SMOWASD	SMOH/SMWASD
Activity 2.3	Mobilize 80 psycho-social counsellors to provide community-based psychosocial counselling to distressed persons in the camps and the host community	UNFPA/ SMOWASD	UNFPA/SMWASD
Activity 2.4	Mobilize 80 psycho-social counsellors to provide one on one counselling for 340 severely distressed persons in the camps and the host community	State Ministry of Health (SMOH)/ State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development (SMOWASD)	SMOH/SMWASD
Activity 2.5	Identify and train 60 community volunteers to enhance community awareness and referral system	SMOH/ SMOWASD	SMOH/SMWASD
Activity 2.6	Support 60 trained community volunteers to identify and refer 100 SGBV survivors and severely distressed persons to access services	UNFPA/ SMOWASD	SMOH/SMWASD
<b>Output 3</b>	Enhanced SGBV data availability for evidence based planning and service provision		
<b>Output 3 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 3.1	# of field monitoring and supportive supervision visits conducted	6	6
<b>Output 3 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 3.1	Monitoring and supportive supervision visits conducted in project implementation sites	SEMA/UNFPA/ SMOH/ SMOWASD	SEMA/UNFPA/ SMOH/ SMOWASD

<b>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:</b>	
The project was able to reach greater number of beneficiaries than planned because of the media based information dissemination on GBV in states where activities were implemented. This is in addition to the services that were directly delivered through health facilities, safe spaces, and inter-personal communication at community and camp levels. The greater reach of beneficiaries did not have higher cost implications.	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
Programme was designed with the input from key stakeholders through rapid assessments, discussions and observations prior to project implementation. Focus group discussions and feedback from beneficiaries through the safe spaces and health facilities informed both the design and implementation of the project. Project implementation was guided by government and NGO partners within states who were part of the implementation and monitoring.	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
The project design incorporates routine monitoring of project which was done by UNFPA and implementing partners through the tenure of project. Quarterly monitoring of sites for project implementation was undertaken to aid quality assurance and progress in line with project indicators.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNHCR		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	08/05/2015 – 07/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-HCR-017		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Protection			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Improved access to protection and assistance to the internally displaced persons (IDPs) and their host communities					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 23,024,553	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$1,109,375	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 237,496	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,109,375	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 307,487	
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	130,000	98,013	228,013	91,870	69,265	161,135
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	152,002	123,561	275,563	107,419	87,320	194,739
<b>Total</b>	<b>282,002</b>	<b>221,574</b>	<b>503,576</b>	<b>199,289</b>	<b>156,585</b>	<b>355,874</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>	503,576			355,874		
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>503,576</b>			<b>355,874</b>		
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	The discrepancy between the targeted figure of 503,576 and reached figure of 355,874 was mainly from protection monitoring in Maiduguri. While UNHCR planned to reach all the local governments in Borno, the security situation could only allow UNHCR to reach only 3 local governments.					

	<p>The 3 local governments were however, comprehensively covered. The number of IDPs counselled, number of IDPs supported were however, higher than the planned figure. This was made possible due to complementarity between the vulnerability screening conducted by UNHCR whereby vulnerable IDPs were already profiled and only referred to Nigeria Red Cross Society for counselling and psychosocial support in terms of cash vouchers.</p>
--	---

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Deliver coordinated and integrated protection interventions to people affected by emergencies		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Immediate protection needs of vulnerable IDPs (including women, boys, girls, men, elderly) in Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and Gombe States are adequately met		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Vulnerable IDPs in in Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and Gombe States profiled		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	per cent of vulnerable IDPs profiled in Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and Gombe with disaggregated data (Baseline:0)	50,357 (10% of 503,576 IDP estimate)	(111,804) = 22%
Indicator 1.2	# of profiling checklists developed per state	2	1
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Monitor movement of IDPs population in Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and Gombe	UNHCR/NRCS/SEMA	UNHCR/NRCS/SEMA
Activity 1.2	Establish profiles of vulnerable IDPs in Yobe, Borno, Adamawa and Gombe	UNHCR/NRCS/SEMA	UNHCR/NRCS/SEMA/NHRC
<b>Output 2</b>	Protection monitoring conducted in all the Local Government Areas in the 4 prioritized states of the North East.		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	# of Protection monitors trained in the 4 states	124	124
Indicator 2.2	# of state in the north east covered by protection monitors	4	4
Indicator 2.3	# of referred household supported with protection kits	3,250	3,235
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	3 days training workshop for Protection monitors on individual and community-level protection monitoring	NHRC	NHRC
Activity 2.2	Deploy Protection monitors to the 4 States of North East to cover all Local Government	NHRC	NHRC

	Areas on daily basis		
Activity 2.3	Refer protection incident reports to field based protection actors	UNHCR/NHRC/ Protection Sector Working Group (PSWG)	UNHCR/PSWG
Activity 2.4	Provide Protection kits to referred IDPs	UNHCR	UNHCR
<b>Output 3</b>	Psycho-social support to victims of SGBV is provided		
<b>Output 3 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 3.1	# of reported SGBV incidents for which survivors receive psychosocial counselling	1,000	2,300
Indicator 3.2	# of SGBV survivors/victims of violence receiving vouchers/cash grant	400	450
Indicator 3.3	# of SGBV survivors referred for support or psychosocial counselling	1,000	2,226
Indicator 3.4	# of reported SGBV incidents for which survivors receive psychosocial counselling	1,000	2,300
<b>Output 3 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 3.1	Develop a mechanism to identify and refer SGBV cases	UNHCR/Jama'atu Nasril Islam (JNI)/NRCS	UNHCR/SEMA/NRCS
Activity 3.2	Establish referrals pathways for psychosocial/SGBV response	UNHCR/JNI/NRCS	UNHCR/SEMA/NRCS
Activity 3.3	Implement psycho-social services to SGBV victims in the 4 States.	UNHCR/JNI/NRCS	UNHCR/SEMA/NRCS
Activity 3.4	Recruit and deploy local psycho-social expert in the field to respond to SGBV cases	JNI, NRCS	NRCS
Activity 3.5	Provide sectorial cash grants or vouchers to SGBV survivors/victims of violence	JNI, NRCS	NRCS



<b>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:</b>	
<p>UNHCR, in collaboration with National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) launched a widespread protection monitoring project, collecting and reporting critical protection information. In collaboration with SEMA and NRCS, 17,534 vulnerable IDP households comprised of 128,511 individuals were assessed to give a comprehensive assessment of the protection environment in the North East to enable effective humanitarian planning and targeted assistance.</p> <p>The vulnerability database offers credible data that will allow UNHCR, partner agencies and government actors (including SEMA, NEMA, NRCS) to have a systematic method of identifying the most vulnerable IDP households for targeted assistance and tailored protection interventions. UNHCR worked with the Immigration department, SEMA, NEMA and NRCS in Adamawa and Borno states to establish a registration system for 20,433 returnees from Cameroon, Chad and Niger and ensured that registration information at the border and within the camps was managed in a manner that enhanced credibility of the information and fosters proper channel of sharing the same. UNHCR monitored returnees situation and worked with authorities in Nigeria to advocate for and support full compliance of return movements with international standards aimed at ensuring dignity and safety of returnees.</p> <p>During implementaiton, funds were transferred to NRCS for easy of management as UNHCR had existing agreement with NRCS. NRCS however, worked jointly in the field with JNl in implementation of the activities. The SGBV results, which exceeded the target for, was made possible due to complementarity between the vulnerability screening conducted by UNHCR whereby vulnerable IDPs were already profiled and only referred to Nigeria Red Cross Society for counselling and psychosocial support in terms of cash vouchers. The pre-identificuation of persons who need support helped in suppassing the target.</p>	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
<p>UNHCR in partnership with NHRC implemented a protection monitoring project through which the situation of persons of concern was regularly monitored, protection issues identified, analysed and flagged for responses/interventions. In line with community based approach, UNHCR ensured that persons with specific needs were mapped and prioritized for assistance including NFIs distribution and provision of psychosocial and livelihood supports provided under programs operated respectively by Nigerian Red Cross Society (NRCS) and American University in Nigeria (AUN).</p> <p>Participatory assessments were conducted through focus group discussions. Community based protection and community engagement sensitization sessions were conducted through training sessions, protection monitoring, vulnerability profiling and assessments to understand the context of displacement and to prioritize humanitarian response. 139 IDP leaders in all states were trained on Age Gender Diversity Mainstreaming (AGDM) and participation; orienting community leadership structures with AGD approach; roles of community leaders in protection monitoring and flagging issues. Mapping of community leadership structures was conducted in all States to help strengthen partnership.</p> <p>UNHCR collaborated with government authorities to coordinate response activities and to make maximum use of their expertise and structures to support IDPs. In Adamawa state, the military and NEMA/SEMA played a key role in diffusing religious and ethnic tensions in IDPs camps.</p>	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
UNHCR Field Units regularly coordinated and monitored the activities of the protection monitors and ensured coordination between the monitors and key forums like Protection Sector Working Groups.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	IOM		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	01/03/2015 – 31/08/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-IOM-012		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Non-Food Items			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Emergency Shelter & NFI Assistance for affected populations in North East Nigeria					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 3,761,050	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 1,479,870	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ 999,906	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,479,870	▪ Government Partners:			
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) directly through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (below 18)	11,703	10,378	22,081	10,601	11,235	21,836
Adults (above 18)	9,195	8,154	17,349	15,822	15,283	31,105
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,898</b>	<b>18,532</b>	<b>39,430</b>	<b>26,423</b>	<b>26,518</b>	<b>52,941</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees						
IDPs	39,430		52,941			
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>39,430</b>		<b>52,941</b>			
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	The number of beneficiaries reached through this project is 52,941 IDPs instead of the initial target of 39,430 individuals. The increase in the number of beneficiaries is due to the fact that IOM and implementing partners (Mercy Corp and IRC) were able to reach more beneficiaries than initially planned. For IOM, the shelter and NFI kits distributed to beneficiaries was less costly than initially planned for which allowed for more IDPs to be targeted. As for IRC, part of their intervention consisted in building communal shelters which benefit high numbers of IDPs. Finally, for Mercy Corp, the change in exchange rates and the devaluation of the naira allowed for additional cash vouchers to be distributed to IDPs.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Contribute to improving living conditions of IDPs located in camps, camp-like settings and host communities in Adamawa, Borno, Gombe and Yobe		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	IDPs have increased access to adequate shelter, basic goods and supplies through Emergency shelter and NFI assistance		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Improved shelter is provided to the most vulnerable IDPs		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	# Number of IDP households receiving emergency shelter items support through in kind distribution, or vouchers	39,429	52,941
Indicator 1.2	# Number of the most vulnerable IDP households in camp and camp-like setting receive additional shelter assistance	150	165
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Beneficiary selection	International Rescue Committee (IRC), Action Contre la Faim (ACF), Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, Mercy Corps, IOM
Activity 1.2	Procurement of ES items or identification of vendors	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, Mercy Corps, IOM
Activity 1.3	Building of emergency shelter for most vulnerable IDP households	IRC	IRC
Activity 1.4	Distribution of ES kits to IDP households	ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, Mercy Corps, IOM
Activity 1.5	Distribution of paper/electronic vouchers	ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	Mercy Corp
Activity 1.6	Sensitization activities and technical guidance on the use of ES kit items	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, Mercy Corps, IOM
Activity 1.7	Post-distribution monitoring	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, Mercy Corps, IOM
<b>Output 2</b>	Non-food item support is provided to the most vulnerable IDPs		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	# Number of households receiving essential NFIs	5,135	6,456
Indicator 2.2	# Number of households receiving information on the safe use of NFI package	5,135	5,456
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Beneficiary selection	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM
Activity 2.2	Procurement of NFIs or identification	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, ACF, IOM

	of vendors		
Activity 2.3	Distribution of NFI items including mattresses, sleeping mats, blankets, bedding, utensils, kitchen and cooking materials, etc.	IRC, IOM	IRC, ACF, IOM
Activity 2.4	Distribution of paper/electronic vouchers	ACF, Mercy Corp, IOM	Mercy Corp
Activity 2.5	Sensitization activities on the use of NFI kit items	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, ACF, IOM
Activity 2.6	Post-distribution monitoring	IRC, ACF, Mercy Corps, IOM	IRC, ACF, IOM

<b>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:</b>	
The difference between the planned and actual outcomes with regards to the number of beneficiaries who received emergency shelter through voucher or cash distribution is due to the fact that partners focus on NFI distribution in order to address some of the most pressing needs identified on the ground.	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
The affected population and most especially the most vulnerable IDPs living in camps and host communities were involved at every stage of the project implementation. The selection of beneficiaries was done in close collaboration with traditional and community leaders while the distribution and provision of ES/NFI material was done in consultation with the target population. In addition, beneficiaries were interviewed for the post distributions monitoring assessments that were conducted in the locations where the distributions took place. The result of these assessments will inform future program and contribute to improve the assistance provide in term of ES/NFI.	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
In order to account for the progress of activities, implementing partners submitted financial and narrative reports during the implementation phase of the program. In addition, post distribution monitoring assessment has been conducted in the locations targeted through this project.  An evaluation of the programme is planned for the second trimester of 2016.	EVALUATION PENDING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNDP		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	20/05/2015 – 19/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-UDP-004		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Common Safety and Security			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	UNDSS Security Support for Humanitarian Operations					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 2,409,684	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 199,837	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 199,837	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>						
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>						
<b>Total</b>						
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>						
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>						

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To provide dedicated security support for the expanded lifesaving humanitarian operations in North Eastern Nigeria for a period of four months.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Security support provided to UN humanitarian workers and their implementing partners to fulfil their mandates in a more safe and secure fashion.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Increased security information sharing and awareness in support of humanitarian operations in north-eastern Nigeria		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Enable effective delivery of humanitarian aid through provision of quality security risk assessments (SRA) and analytical reports and advisories	8 SRAs to be conducted and 16 analytical reports and advisories issues	8 SRAs conducted and 16 analytical reports and advisories issued
Indicator 1.2	Increase security information sharing and cooperation on security issues through regular security briefings at UN Area Security Management Team (ASMT) and INGOs meetings	40 briefings provided at ASMT (10) and INGO meetings (30)	40 briefings provided at ASMT (10) and INGO meetings (30)
Indicator 1.3	Ensure situational awareness and effective operational planning through provisions of security reports (daily, weekly, alerts)	88 daily situation reports & 28 weekly security reports to be issued + alerts in a timely manner when required	88 daily situation reports & 28 weekly security reports issued
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Conduct Security Risk Assessments and security analysis - compile and distribute respective documents	UNDSS FSCO	UNDSS FSCO
Activity 1.2	Establish and hold regular security briefings at UN and INGO meetings – built effective security cooperation through networking	UNDSS FSCO	Approximately 16 ASMT/INGOs scheduled briefings/meetings has taken place in addition to a number of <i>ad hoc</i> meetings
Activity 1.3	Establish effective security information collection and reporting mechanisms. Compile Daily Sitreps, Weekly reports and alerts - and share these effectively.	UNDSS FSCO	UNDSS FSCO
<b>Output 2</b>	Security training and operational support to humanitarian organizations operating in north-eastern Nigeria		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	Improve security coordination and management in Yola and Maiduguri through UNDSS presence & increased security capacity	Establishment of UNDSS offices and cooperation with UN and INGOs operating in the area	Established two (2) sub offices (one in Yola and one in Maiduguri)

Indicator 2.2	Increase security awareness of personnel of humanitarian organisations through targeted training	160 humanitarian staff trained	160 humanitarian staff
Indicator 2.3	Provision of timely operational security support to humanitarian organisations in Borno and Adamawa States	32 field support missions scheduled and conducted as per requirements of humanitarian organisations (priorities to be coordinated by OCHA)	32 field missions
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Establish UNDSS office in Yola and Maiduguri	UNDSS	UNDSS
Activity 2.2	Conduct of 8 Security Awareness Training (SAT) courses	UNDSS FSCO	UNDSS FSCO
Activity 2.3	Conduct 32 field security support and assessment missions	UNDSS FSCO	UNDSS FSCO

<b>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:</b>	
N/A	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
N/A	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	WFP		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	13/05/2015 – 12/11/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-RR-WFP-024		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Common Logistics			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Provision of humanitarian air services in response to the Nigerian Crisis (UNHAS)					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 2,825,432	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 2,825,432	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 700,000	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>						
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>						921
<b>Total</b>			<b>750</b>			<b>921</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>						
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>	750			921		
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>750</b>			<b>921</b>		
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	Note that due to administrative delays with clearances, the project only became operational in August and not May as originally planned.					



CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Providing safe, effective and efficient access to beneficiaries and project implementation sites for NGOs, UN agencies, donor organizations and diplomatic missions in support of the Nigeria crisis humanitarian response; transporting life-saving cargo including medical supplies and high-energy foods; provide adequate capacity for emergency evacuation of humanitarian staff.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Humanitarian staff can access beneficiary sites to implement vital humanitarian projects.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Facilitate the humanitarian communities life-saving response to the Nigeria humanitarian crisis Nigeria through facilitating access to beneficiaries and implementation sites		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of Needs Assessments carried out	4	2
Indicator 1.2	Number of passengers transported monthly against planned	250	307
Indicator 1.3	Percentage of bookings served	95 per cent	100%
Indicator 1.4	Tonnage of light cargo transported monthly against planned	1	1.32
Indicator 1.5	Number of agencies using the service	15	27
Indicator 1.6	Locations served	6	5
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Conduct Aviation Security mission	WFP (UNHAS)	WFP UNHAS
Activity 1.2	Contracting of aircraft	WFP (UNHAS)	WFP UNHAS
Activity 1.3	Deployment of Aviation staff	WFP (UNHAS)	WFP UNHAS
Activity 1.4	Deployment of aircraft	WFP (UNHAS)	WFP UNHAS
Activity 1.5	Provision of scheduled air services	WFP (UNHAS)	WFP UNHAS

**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:**

UNHAS does not track gender of passengers as its KPI's are based on passengers and cargo transported.

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

**14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?**

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

The project was constantly monitored and evaluated and the service adapted as required in order to meet the demands of the humanitarian community as the situation in the north-east evolved. Feedback received from users on the destinations served and the frequency of flights was extremely positive and the operation continuously solicited user feedback in order to provide a needs-based service.

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

## ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

CERF Project Code	Cluster/Sector	Agency	Partner Type	Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner US\$
15-RR-CEF-035	Child Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$180,969
15-RR-CEF-035	Child Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$89,998
15-RR-CEF-035	Child Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$17,999
15-RR-FAO-014	Food Assistance	FAO	GOV	\$99,864
15-RR-FAO-014	Food Assistance	FAO	INGO	\$121,500
15-RR-FAO-014	Food Assistance	FAO	INGO	\$98,704
15-RR-FAO-014	Food Assistance	FAO	GOV	\$30,755
15-RR-FAO-014	Food Assistance	FAO	NNGO	\$43,730
15-RR-IOM-012	Shelter & NFI	IOM	INGO	\$325,000
15-RR-IOM-012	Shelter & NFI	IOM	INGO	\$350,000
15-RR-IOM-012	Shelter & NFI	IOM	INGO	\$324,906
15-RR-HCR-017	Protection	UNHCR	GOV	\$254,507
15-RR-HCR-017	Protection	UNHCR	RedC	\$237,496
15-RR-HCR-017	Protection	UNHCR	GOV	\$52,980
15-RR-FPA-011	Gender-Based Violence	UNFPA	INGO	\$14,382
15-RR-FPA-011	Gender-Based Violence	UNFPA	INGO	\$81,884
15-RR-FPA-011	Gender-Based Violence	UNFPA	GOV	\$180,257

## ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

ACF	Action Contre La Faim
AGDM	Age Gender Diversity Mainstreaming
API	Adamawa Peace Initiative
ASRH	Adolescnet Sexual and Reproductive Health
ASMT	Area Security Management Team
AUN	American University in Nigeria
CAN	Christian Association of Nigeria
CMAM	Community Management of Acute Malnutrition
CP	Child Protection
DFID	Department for International Development
ECD	Early Childhood Development
ES/NFI	Emergency Shelter/Non Food Items
FSCO	Field Security Coordination Officer
FSCS	Food Security Consumption Score
FSWG	Food Security Working Group
HH	Households
HNO	Humanitarian Needs Overview
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IDPs	Internally Displaced People
INGO	International Non-Government Organizations
IPC	Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
IRC	International Rescue Committee
JNI	Jama'atu Nasril Islam
LGA	Local Government Area
MISP	Minimum Integrated Service Package
NEMA	National Emergency Management Agency
NHRC	National Human Rights Commission
NRCS	National Red Cross Society
PSS	Psychosocial Support Services
PSWG	Protection Sector Working Group
RUTF	Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food
SEMA	State Emergency Management Agency
SAM	Severe Acute Malnutrition
SGBV	Sexual and Gender based Violence
SMOH	State Ministry of Health
SMoWASD	State Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development
SPHCDA	State Primary Health Care Development Agency
SRA	Security Risk Assessment
UASC	Unaccompanied and Separated Children
UGC	User Group Committee
VCM	Volunteer Community Mobilizer