

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR  
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS  
TURKEY  
RAPID RESPONSE  
UNDERFUNDED EMERGENCY/ROUND I 2015**

**RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR**

**Mr. Kamal Malhotra**

## REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

12.1.2016

UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR, RCO

The After Action Review was held on 12 January 2016. All participating agencies, UNICEF, WHO, UNFPA, WFP, UNHCR and the RC Office were represented. In the AAR, the RC Office outlined the process leading up to the CERF proposal in 2014/2015 and the previously agreed objectives of the response. The RC Office further presented a brief overview of the reporting process, requirements and timeline.

As part of the AAR the agencies discussed what had worked well and what had worked not so well. It was noted that the UN assistance to the refugees in Suruç started shortly after the refugee influx in September 2014 and that part of the CERF funds received in 2015 in some instances were used to cover the financial gap of the initial 2014 response. The UN agencies also discussed how the off-camp versus in-camp needs had changed from the proposal phase to the implementation phase leading to a change in actual beneficiaries of the CERF assistance. Several agencies broadened their response scope to assist refugees outside Şanlıurfa too. Lastly, it was noted that changes in the political and security environment during the implementation phase delayed implementation for some agencies.

It was agreed that each sector lead was to draft a paragraph explaining the needs targeted with the CERF funds within the broader humanitarian context, prioritization and if the actual targeting differed from the original plan.

- 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: USD 156,895,770		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	8,999,844
	COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND (if applicable)	
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	84,356,847

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 17-Feb-15			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
UNICEF	15-UF-CEF-008	Protection	840,000
WFP	15-UF-WFP-008	Food Security	4,800,393
WHO	15-UF-WHO-001	Health	806,951
UNFPA	15-UF-FPA-001	Health	872,900
IOM	15-UF-IOM-004	Non-Food Items	845,000
UNHCR	15-UF-HCR-002	Non-Food Items	834,600
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>8,999,844</b>

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	4,007,842
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	4,952,002
Funds forwarded to government partners	40,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,999,844</b>

### HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

The humanitarian needs in Turkey are still growing and by the end of 2015 the number of registered Syrians was 2.5 million, out of which some 950,000 were registered in 2015 alone. Turkey continued to be the world's largest refugee host.

As of 31 December 2014, after the influx of the Kobane refugees in September 2014, a total of 1,552,838 Syrians were registered with the Turkish authorities, marking a significant increase from the 559,994 who were registered as of 1 January 2014. Some 229,000 Syrians were hosted in 22 camps, with three more camps under preparation at the time, in order to meet the needs of the growing numbers of refugees. However, despite the significant investment made by the national authorities, and the efforts undertaken by the international community, national services were overwhelmed, and the resources available were far from sufficient to address the magnitude of needs inherent with the presence of over 1.65 million Syrian refugees, and a growing number of asylum-seekers and refugees of other nationalities and the resulting impact on host communities.

As most Syrian refugees had exhausted their own resources after years of displacement, negative coping mechanisms such as begging, child labour and early marriages have become matters of increasing concern. The impact of the large numbers of persons of concern on the Turkish population has led to some sporadic social tensions, calling for opportunities for positive interactions between the two communities.

In September 2014, Turkey witnessed a new major influx of Syrian refugees subsequent to the ISIS offensive in the northern Syrian town of Kobane. As of 31 December 2014, government statistics showed that since September 2014 194,290 Syrians had crossed the border into Turkey in this largest single influx to Turkey since the onset of the Syrian crisis.

The Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD) and the local governorates established temporary transit shelters to accommodate the Syrians, who arrived en masse. However, given the limited capacity of these facilities, only 20,000 Syrians had been placed in these centres while the others had found shelter within host communities, supported by their friends and relatives or struggling on their own. Reports showed many newly arrived Syrians from Kobane in 2014 had been living in cramped housing conditions without proper access to basic services and WASH facilities.

AFAD opened a refugee camp in Suruç to accommodate the new arrivals from Kobane in January 2015. The UN was approached by the authorities in late October 2014 to provide support with infrastructures and core relief items, to which it has responded positively.

Although Turkey received an increased level of contributions in 2015, the gap between needs and the resources available were growing, due to the continued pace of arrivals and the increased destitution of refugees after five years of displacement.

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

### **Basic Needs and Essential Services**

This sector focused on support to the newly established Suruç camp, as well as newly arrived Syrians living outside of the camp in Şanlıurfa Province. Two participating agencies (UNHCR, IOM) had a division of labour, whereby UNHCR focused on the basic NFI support to the new camp, and IOM focused on the WASH facility support to the new camp and NFI support to non-camp refugees. In the implementation phase IOM consulted with the authorities on the need for the WASH containers who responded that the camp had all the containers required in place already in the newly established camp. IOM then decided to shift these allocated funds toward winterisation assistance based on the needs assessed on the ground.

### **Health**

The health sector focused on strengthening state capacity in providing health care to the Syrian refugees, in particular in Suruç District of Şanlıurfa Province, but also outside Suruç District as most refugees moved on to other districts and even other provinces. WHO focused on supporting the provision of primary health care, and UNFPA focused on supporting reproductive health needs and addressing gender-based violence.

### **Food Security**

The AFAD survey on *Syrian Women in Turkey* reported that 78 percent of Turkey's female guests have responded negatively to the question "Do you have a sufficient amount of food for the next 7 days or do you have money to purchase a sufficient amount of food for the next 7 days?"

WFP was to focus on providing electronic food vouchers to refugees in camps and non-camp locations in the South East of Turkey. However, WFP received other funds earmarked for the off-camp program, which fully covered the proposed activities. In the end, CERF funds were used to support in-camp populations only.

### **Child Protection**

The AFAD survey conducted covering host communities published in December 2014 observed that more than half (51 per cent) of Syrians cite the need for some form of psychosocial support for themselves or their families. UNICEF took the necessary steps to support provision of psychosocial support to children affected by the emergency through child friendly spaces, which have proven to

be an appropriate avenue to reach children in need. For the long term mental welfare and stability of these children it is an imperative to continue to support them at this particular juncture of the emergency response.

### III. CERF PROCESS

The CERF strategy was developed as a result of close consultation between UN agencies who are providing life-saving support to the South East of Turkey, in particular but not restricted to Suruç. It is noteworthy that Suruç District has a local population of around 100,000, according to the state population statistics of 2012. The large presence of refugees stretched local resources and public services in a small town, which had already hosted many Syrian refugees who arrived prior to the Kobane influx.

During the development of the proposal, gender issues were highlighted by all participating agencies. In addition, the proposal from UNFPA had a specific focus on reproductive health and gender-based violence.

The selection criteria for the activities proposed included:

- CERF life-saving criteria;
- The request from the Government of Turkey, in particular AFAD;
- The needs and gaps identified at various inter-agency and taskforce meetings.

Close collaboration with implementing partners who has been working in the area for a long time such as Harran University and International Middle East Peace and Research Center (IMPR) contributed to processes at many different levels and included identifying the needs, planning, implementation and monitoring. Urfa, Suruç and other neighbouring districts are areas where these institutions provided humanitarian response from the beginning of the influx.

### 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: 200,000 excluding host communities									
Cluster/Sector	Female			Male			Total		
	Girls (< 18)	Women (≥ 18)	Total	Boys (< 18)	Men (≥ 18)	Total	Children (< 18)	Adults (≥ 18)	Total
Protection	19,822		<b>19,822</b>	19,649		<b>19,649</b>	39,471		<b>39,471</b>
Food Security	14,202	12,657	<b>26,859</b>	14,882	12,108	<b>26,990</b>	29,084	24,765	<b>53,849</b>
Health	25,800	23,500	<b>49,300</b>	27,500	23,200	<b>50,700</b>	53,300	46,700	<b>100,000</b>
Non-Food Items <sup>1</sup>	15,449	18,282	<b>33,731</b>	20,247	14,738	<b>34,985</b>	35,696	33,020	<b>68,716</b>

<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

Within the Food Security sector and the Protection sector one UN Agency (WFP and UNICEF respectively) led the implementation in each sector respectively, making double counting less likely.

UNHCR and IOM were both contributing to the NFI sector. However, as IOM was targeting non-camp refugees and UNHCR in-camp refugees the total number beneficiaries are the combined number of the two agencies' beneficiaries.

UNFPA and WHO contributed to implementation within the health sector. UNFPA reached a total of 100,000 beneficiaries (through the utilization of RH kits distributed to local partners and MoH). According to the influx, the total number of beneficiaries in need was

<sup>1</sup> Estimated breakdown of planned and reached individuals is the same as it is based on 3RP averages and due to the fact that the foam mattresses were purchased and handed over to AFAD for distribution.

around 200,000 in the immediate emergency situation. However the number of people fluctuated; a significant number of the incoming refugee population stayed with relatives in the area; some moved to other big cities such as Ankara, Istanbul, Izmir; and some of them moved to small villages in neighbouring Urfa; while yet another group returned to Kobane by the time of implementation. The total health estimate is based on the highest number that the two agencies contributed to the sector (UNFPA figure of 100,000 individuals) since it is also covers WHO beneficiaries.

**TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING<sup>2</sup>**

	Children ( < 18)	Adults ( ≥ 18)	Total
<b>Female</b>	66,921	51,190	118,111
<b>Male</b>	70,277	51,635	121,912
<b>Total individuals (Female and male)</b>	<b>137,198</b>	<b>102,825</b>	<b>240,023</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.

The total number of beneficiaries reached has been estimated to be 240,023 people. The geographical coverage varied from agency to agency. UNHCR targeted almost exclusively the Suruç camp population via AFAD. However, it is estimated that the camp population never reached above 25,000 refugees. IOM, on the other hand, targeted an off-camp population – an approved deviation from the original proposal. This deviation increases the total number of beneficiaries as the two NFI agencies targeted different groups.

WFP reached 53,849 people across 11 camps in the South East, but not in the Suruç camp as the CERF funds were released at the peak of its funding crisis. The approved WFP assistance outside Suruç district and Şanlıurfa province contributed to the total number of beneficiaries reached being higher than the total number of refugees coming into Suruç from Kobane in 2014. The CERF grant was received as an Underfunded Emergency Window, which allowed some agencies to use part of the grant or the whole grant to cover their funding gaps in a broader geographical area rather than only the area arising from the immediate response to the Kobane refugee influx in 2014.

UNICEF reached a total of 39,471 children, which was well beyond their planned target. Of those children reached, 5,252 children were reached in Suruç camp during the implementation and reporting period from April to December 2015. Approximately 41% of beneficiaries at the Suruç CFS were girls, 59% were boys. The 5,252 beneficiaries (2154 being girls and 3099 boys) are likely to be overlapping with the beneficiaries reached by UNHCR.

There is no officially available data on the age and gender breakdown of the refugee camp population in the Southeast. UNICEF primarily reached children in camp settings in Şanlıurfa province, not only the Suruç camp. Based on estimations from the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP), the Syrian refugee population in the camps consisted of 22.8 % men, 23 % women, and around 54 % children, of whom 28 % were boys and 26 % girls. It is estimated that there is little overlap between the health sector beneficiaries and the other sectors as the UN health sector agencies and partners primarily targeted health institutions and personnel throughout the Southeast.

#### *Geographical coverage*

CERF funds were to be used for food assistance to Syrians refugees in and outside of camps. However, the WFP CERF funds were used to only support in-camp populations in Şanlıurfa and neighbouring provinces. WFP Turkey utilized CERF fund for 11 camps which were still assisted after its January 2015 funding crisis namely: Adıyaman, Akçakale, Beydağı, Ceylanpınar, Harran, Islahiye 1, Karkamış, K.Maraş, Osmaniye, Sarıçam, Viranşehir. WFP did not assist the Suruç camp using the CERF funds. IOM undertook house to house assessments and distributions in both the urban and rural areas of Halfeti, Birecik, Suruç and Harran districts of Şanlıurfa. Child Friendly Spaces were provided and operated in Ceylanpınar, Akçakale, Viranşehir, and Harran; 4 in Suruç; and 2 in Urfa City centre (1 in Eyubbiye Community Center and 1 mobile CFS). WHO conducted training programs targeting health staff not only in Suruç, but also in Hatay, Şanlıurfa, Gaziantep, Mardin, Şırnak and Kilis provinces. UNFPA carried out its distribution of assistance through three channels: Harran University in Şanlıurfa, IMPR (Şanlıurfa), AFAD and Provincial Health directorate in various locations.

## **CERF RESULTS**

### *Beneficiaries and outcomes*

Overall, the UN agencies collectively reached a refugee population which was above the planned number of beneficiaries. This was partly due to the depreciation of the Turkish Lira against the US Dollar, which allowed the CERF contribution to go further than originally anticipated, but also a result of effective cooperation with implementing partners such as Turkish Red Crescent. All agencies reached either their targets with regards to number of beneficiaries reached (UNFPA, WHO, UNHCR and IOM) or performed well beyond their planned targets (UNICEF and WFP).

During the Kobane crisis in September 2014, the Turkish Government identified several needs of the refugees who had fled to Turkey. WASH containers were among the needs identified by the authorities in either the transitional camps or temporary shelters where refugees were living. Upon the receipt of the CERF grant, the Government of Turkey had established a camp in Suruç to house the majority of Syrians who were living in the transitional camps and temporary shelters. IOM consulted the authorities on the need of WASH containers and was informed that the newly established camp had all the containers required in place already. IOM then decided to shift these allocated funds toward winterisation assistance based on the needs assessed on the ground. In Suruç villages, IOM supported families directly with stoves and coal. UNHCR provided standard NFIs to 6,000 camp families, which included mattresses, blankets, kitchen sets, cooking facilities and hygiene items. 30,000 individuals via AFAD (most of them in the Suruç camp) received foam mattresses as a result of the UNHCR CERF support.

WFP reached well beyond its planned beneficiary targets. CERF funds were to be used for food assistance to Syrians refugees in and outside of camps. However, CERF funds were used to support the in-camp population only. The flexibility of CERF funds for either camp or off-camp populations was highly valued and allowed WFP to further support Syrians in camps since the proposed off-camp population was already covered while the in-camp population was underfunded. Another factor which allowed the increase in actual beneficiaries reached was the devaluation of the Turkish Lira against the US Dollar. There was a minor change in gender breakdown primarily due to the difference in in-camp versus off-camp populations. WFP started its assistance to the incoming refugees well before the receipt of the CERF grant. WFP was implementing mobile kitchen activities until February 2015. CERF funds arrived in March 2015 and contributed to sustaining food assistance through an electronic voucher for refugees living in camps across the South East of Turkey.

UNICEF reached well above their planned target of beneficiaries, with almost triple the number of children benefitting from psychosocial support (PSS) services in both camps and host communities. The reasons for this significant increase can be attributed to detailed planning and preparation by UNICEF and its implementing partner TRCS, as well as successful outreach activities and fruitful collaboration with schools. Due to the situation on the ground, UNICEF also increased its target of supporting 9 Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) to 10; 8 in camp settings, one at a community center in Eyubbiye district and one mobile CFS in Urfa city. UNICEF did not reach the planned target of children identified and referred for specialized services for a number of reasons. In camp settings, where the vast majority of the programme was implemented, limited services were available on-site and the process for referring identified children was complicated by security and logistical considerations. It proved to be difficult to obtain the necessary permissions from camp management and refugee parents to move children in and out of the camps.

The delivery of health services was strengthened after the CERF interventions. Health service gaps, which occurred due to sudden influxes, were compensated at the public health centres and hospital clinics responsible for the camp and urban refugees through the provision of optimal health life-saving services and needs. Technical support and capacity building activities were provided to the district health crisis management team in coordinating, prioritizing and planning the response via sharing technical information, conducting trainings and providing IT equipment in order to strengthen the health information system. The health interventions related to the refugee influx from Kobane went beyond Şanlıurfa province. WHO provided technical support to the district health crisis management team in order to coordination, prioritization and planning the response with all the partners so as to further strengthen health service delivery at public health centers responsible for camp and urban refugees through the provision of optimal health live saving services to newly arrived refugees. Capacity development activity for 10 health professionals was changed from Field Epidemiology Training Programme to Hospital Contingency Planning Training upon the request of the Ministry of Health in order to improve the response to public health crises. UNFPA reached its objective, which was to increase access to both life-saving sexual and reproductive health and gender based violence prevention and response services by Syrian women and girls in Suruç and Şanlıurfa through strengthening and supporting the emergency SRH/GBV response capacity of local service providers.

Distribution of the assistance was carried out through different channels: Harran University, IMPR, AFAD and by the Provincial Health directorate in different locations identified. Under the CERF project, distribution was completed end of July 2015. Since then, the total number of reported beneficiaries reached through clinical services in the field through Harran University and IMPR was 13,009 in a five month period.

### *Change in the Humanitarian Situation*

During the reporting period no new officially available needs assessment or humanitarian surveys were conducted by UN agencies or by the Government of Turkey in the Suruç area. Moreover, direct access to available key humanitarian data remains limited in Turkey. It is therefore challenging to assess the exact impact of the CERF response and the change in the humanitarian situation on the ground.

At the national level, in 2015, Turkey continued to advance the implementation of the Temporary Protection (TP) Scheme despite the enormous strain on its resources. The Directorate General of Migration Management (DGMM) launched its registration database GOC-NET in May 2015, with significant technical and financial supports from 3RP partner, resulting in a streamlined national registration for all foreigners, including refugees and asylum-seekers. In addition, the much anticipated secondary regulation on access to labour market agreed by the Government of Turkey in January 2016 will allow all Syrians under TP to attempt to access formal employment.

The population of Suruç camp continued to increase during the month of March 2015, with more than 16,000 people residing there at the start time of CERF project implementation. During the CERF implementation period, the situation on the ground in Suruç and surrounding areas was volatile and the needs of beneficiaries changed rapidly. The Kobane crisis occurred in September 2014 and the CERF grant was disbursed in March 2015. At that time some refugees had moved on to other locations and/or some of the most urgent needs had changed – for instance the need for winterisation equipment and food vouchers rather than readymade meals.

The 20 July 2015 suicide bombing that killed 32 students and activists who had travelled to the South-eastern town of Suruç to join efforts to rebuild Kobane affected both the camp refugees and the implementing agencies. Seven kilometres from Suruç, the newly established refugee camp housed roughly 20,000 Kobane refugees. The Suruç bombing in July had an immediate impact on residents of the camp. For a week afterwards, residents say, they were not allowed to enter or exit<sup>2</sup>. As of May 2015, out of the estimated 192,000 people who fled to Turkey during the fighting in 2014, approximately 62,500 people had returned to Kobane and neighbouring areas, despite the extensive presence of unexploded ordnances and landmines in both rural and urban settings. However, in June 2015, fighting between various armed groups in Syria resulted in a new influx of nearly 25,000 refugees to Şanlıurfa, Turkey. To date, the situation in an around Kobane remains volatile and insecurity remains extremely high.

Another challenge encountered during the implementation of the CERF grant was the long national election period, which de facto lasted from June till November 2015. During this period it was time-consuming to reach formal agreements with the government, which affected the timeliness and efficiency of implementation, especially whenever national institutions and personnel were target beneficiaries.

## **CERF's ADDED VALUE**

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

CERF funds were flexible and effective in sustaining the level of assistance. The funds were delivered soon after the final proposal submission by the UN in Turkey. National authorities started to use extra resources to respond to new refugee influxes and UN agencies responded fast enough to compensate the needs and reached the targeted beneficiaries in a timely manner. The UNHCR supply team was quickly able to procure and deliver, along with partners, the NFI items to the camps. Still, CERF funding was not received until March 2015, and by then the humanitarian situation in Şanlıurfa had changed. The funds therefore supported less a rapid delivery of emergency assistance, but rather helped sustain the level of assistance and supported government efforts in both camps and host communities. It is important to note that that the Suruç population had almost tripled due to the refugee influx. CERF funding also had a significant and positive impact on the programmes of UN agencies in Şanlıurfa district, and enhanced the capacity of UN counterparts to ensure a stronger and more rapid response in the case of a future emergency with regards to health, protection, food security and NFIs.

### **b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs<sup>3</sup>?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The core relief items delivered to the refugee population in the Suruç camp provided necessary relief to meet the basic needs

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://reliefweb.int/report/turkey/how-can-turkey-protect-itself-and-save-syrians>

<sup>3</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.).

of camp families. Even though the allocation and approval of funds took time, the implementation was still fast enough to respond in a timely manner. The actual implementation period was quite short and still timely to meet critical needs. As mentioned above, due to the delay in receiving the funds, CERF funds were not used during many agencies' rapid response to the crisis in September and October 2014. Still, CERF funding was instrumental in expanding UNICEF's PSS programme considerably in the affected areas – tripling the targeted number of children – and helped enhance the capacity and rapid response mechanisms of implementing partners. For WFP, CERF funds arrived shortly after its funding crisis which forced WFP to cut its assistance to vulnerable Syrians. The funds helped prevent pipeline breaks in sustaining food assistance to Syrians in camps. For UNFPA CERF helped strengthening local health infrastructure with the provision of reproductive health kits serving population of 100.000.

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The CERF funds helped raise visibility of the severity of this humanitarian operation with the international community. The CERF funds helped meet critical needs. In the meantime, other channels of resource mobilization were identified primarily through the 3RP. As donors are increasingly looking for joint efforts, the CERF funds became part of UNHCR's overall NFI and WASH support to the Suruç Camp co-funded by several donors. The WFP project required multi-donor action, and the CERF funds allowed WFP to receive funds from other donors who had expressed interest in this programme and thereby ensuring its sustainability. The CERF contribution helped sustain the programme and contributed to overall resource mobilization efforts. UNICEF was the only UN agency which did not use the CERF funds to generate additional donor funding.

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The CERF funding improved coordination amongst the humanitarian community only partially. It was a challenging period for all UN agencies in terms of understanding the CERF process. Nonetheless, when preparing the CERF fund request, the UN agencies active in humanitarian assistance discussed overall needs, each other's' programmes and the allocation of funding. This was an important moment of information sharing. In addition, coordination amongst the humanitarian community (at Ankara and field levels) was undertaken through the mechanisms already in place: in particular the Child Protection Working Group. Two coordination meetings were held regarding CERF fund use: the first in March 2015 to discuss general humanitarian response coordination, and the second in January 2016 to discuss the reporting schedule and requirements. The entire CERF proposal was prepared through close inter-agency coordination. UNHCR and IOM coordinated their proposals for the delivery of NFIs to camp and non-camp new arrivals. The initial discussion of priority areas also helped avoid overlaps and duplication in efforts among agencies - not only during implementation, but also vis-a-vis the broader refugee response.

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

The CERF funding was particularly valuable in enabling UN agencies to respond robustly to a sudden emergency, without having to borrow or allocate resources from other programmes over a longer period of time. In this particular situation, while CERF funding could not contribute to the rapid humanitarian response, it nevertheless was critical in allowing UNICEF to strengthen and expand its PSS activities in the areas affected by the initial crisis and reach significant numbers of Syrian refugee children. Additionally, the CERF funding added specific value by allowing the printing of more Information Education and Communication (IEC) materials designed to meet the needs of the Syrian refugee influx into Suruç, including those who moved on to other provinces to live with their relatives. UNFPA through refugee centers operated by local partners were able to distribute RH commodities to the Syrian population in need.

## 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>
A very short implementation period is often difficult in Turkey.	In the future implementation period should remain as 9 months to ensure consistency in programmes.	CERF Secretariat
On-camp versus off-camp needs and priorities may change from the onset of a humanitarian crisis to the time of implementation (mobility of people)	Maintain geographical flexibility	CERF Secretariat
On-camp versus off-camp needs and priorities may change from the onset of a humanitarian crisis to the time of implementation (this is also dependent on what other actors and host government have provided by this stage)	Maintain flexibility regarding items delivered (food vouchers vs hot/ready meals, winterisation vs WASH containers)	CERF Secretariat

<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>
Quicker to apply for CERF funds when humanitarian crisis situation arise	Monitoring of humanitarian situation and opportunities to apply for Rapid Response Grants and Underfunded Emergency Window	RCO
Limited inter-sector coordination after CERF grants are received. Good coordination within each sector.	One coordination meeting with all relevant UN agencies after the first 3 to 6 months of implementation would be helpful in the future to better coordinate efforts and report on any additional communication and coordinating needs.	RCO and UN Agencies
Procurement, transportation, storage and distribution are not easy steps and take time	These steps should be planned in advance through standardised templates by the respective agencies.	UN Agencies
The preparatory phase of the projects in accordance with CERF guidelines was challenging.	Familiarisation with the application process in advance needed	RCO and UN agencies

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS						
<b>CERF project information</b>						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNICEF		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	17/03/2015 – 31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-CEF-008		<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>	Şanlıurfa Province Child-focused Syrian crisis response					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 2,484,948	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 2,484,948	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 672,999	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 840,000	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
<b>Beneficiaries</b>						
<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>						
<b>Direct Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Planned</b>			<b>Reached</b>		
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	3,225	3,225	6,450	10,762	11,058	21,820
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>						
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,225</b>	<b>3,225</b>	<b>6,450</b>	<b>10,762</b>	<b>11,058</b>	<b>21,820</b>
<b>8b. Beneficiary Profile</b>						
<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of people (Planned)</b>		<b>Number of people (Reached)</b>			
<i>Refugees</i>			6,000		21,333	
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>			450		487 (13%)	
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>			<b>6,450</b>		<b>21,820</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>	UNICEF reached well above our planned target of beneficiaries; with almost triple the number of children benefitting from psychosocial support (PSS) services in both camps and host communities. The reasons for this significant increase can be attributed to detailed planning and preparation by UNICEF and its implementing partner TRCS, as well as successful outreach activities and fruitful collaboration with schools. Due to the situation on the ground, UNICEF also increased its target of supporting 9 Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) to 10: 8 in camp settings, one at a community center in Eyubbiye district and one mobile CFS in Urfa city.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Families and communities are strengthened, engaged and empowered to contribute to their own protection solutions, while the most vulnerable girls and boys are identified and their needs addressed through appropriate services and interventions across the Şanlıurfa province		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Girls and boys affected by the Syria crisis benefit from community-based protection and psychosocial support interventions through inclusive and specialised support to the most vulnerable in both camp and non-camp settings as well as children at risk are promptly identified and referred to specialised child protection services in accordance with the national framework.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Nine child-friendly spaces are operational supporting child protection services across all settings		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of supported frontline youth workers	22	22
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Equipment and agreements for the operationalization of the CFS	UNICEF	UNICEF
Activity 1.2	4 Capacity-building seminars <sup>4</sup> , monitoring and guidance through the online platform as well as regular field visits and attendance of capacity-building seminars, in partnership with local authorities and national child protection system actors	UNICEF/TRC	UNICEF/TRC
<b>Output 2</b>	Children are included, supported and protected throughout the province		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	Number of adolescents trained and equipped to act as volunteers	130	292
Indicator 2.2	Number of children with access to psychosocial support services	6,450	21,820
Indicator 2.3	Number of children identified and referred to specialised services from qualified frontline workers	530	52
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Provision of psychosocial support to children through nine child-friendly spaces (camp, in-city, and mobile)	TRC	TRC
Activity 2.2	Identification, referral and follow-up for extremely vulnerable children, including survivors of GBV and other forms of violence, children with no access to basic services and those requiring special protection measures	TRC/UNICEF	TRC/UNICEF

<sup>4</sup> 4 capacity-building seminars will be organized tentatively in April, June, September and November. Youth workers will receive an Orientation training; a Leadership training; What is Youth Work training and a Child Rights training.

**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:**

With CERF funding, UNICEF and TRCS continued their fruitful collaboration which started in 2014 and supported Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) in the camps and host community throughout the period covered by this report. Thanks to well-planned outreach activities and successful collaboration with local schools, UNICEF reached well above the planned targets, almost tripling the number of children (in camps and non-camp settings) benefitting from improved well-being via PSS services and inclusive programmes focused on the most vulnerable children.

During the implementation period, and due to increased needs assessed on the ground by field teams, UNICEF increased the number of CFS supported from 9 to 10: 1 each in Ceylanpınar, Akçakale, Viranşehir, and Harran; 4 in Suruç; and 2 in Urfa City centre (1 in Eyubbiye Community Center and 1 mobile CFS). The services provided by these CFS were supported by two social workers hired by TRCS and UNICEF, and monitored by UNICEF and a TRCS field team (one Field Coordinator and two Programme Assistants). In addition, a team consisting of a psychologist, a translator and a social worker supported case management at Urfa Eyubbiye Community Center.

Special attention was paid to (then-new) Suruç Camp in Şanlıurfa province to strengthen the protective environment of the camp's CFS and establish alternative recreational activities with an inclusive approach. Outreach activities at Urfa Community Center were also supported and, thanks to fruitful cooperation with local schools and encouragement by both UNICEF and TRCS, ties to the host community were developed and strengthened – as evidenced by rising numbers of Turkish children who participated in CFS activities.

A number of capacity building seminars were conducted during the reporting period, including:

1. TRCS Orientation training on 16 November 2015
2. Youth Worker Training and Evaluation Workshop (17-21 November 2015, Gaziantep)
3. Child Protection in Emergencies Training (10-12 December 2015, Gaziantep) which focused on child rights, emergency response, child and youth participation and PSS.

UNICEF did not reach the planned target of children identified and referred for specialized services, for a number of reasons. In camp settings, where the vast majority of the programme was implemented, limited services were available on site and the process for referring identified children were complicated by security and logistical considerations – the camps are situated far from urban centres, and it proved difficult to obtain the necessary permissions from camp management and refugee parents to move children in and out of the camp.

In addition, recruitment of qualified social workers who can support identification and referral of children in the camps was delayed – given the high demand for social workers nationwide, TRCS faced challenges identifying qualified candidates willing to work in a volatile security environment. Thus for most of the duration of the programme, youth workers were used to support this activity – however, because youth workers are not adequately trained in this field, and also had their primary responsibilities to tend to, the number of children who were identified and referred remained lower than originally hoped. However, UNICEF and TRCS have since taken a number of steps to accelerate the recruitment processes and overcome barriers to accessing specialized services in camp settings.

In the host community, this intervention was stronger thanks to a more robust infrastructure and availability of services. UNICEF and TRCS also established a case management team within the Community Center who directly supported youth workers on identification and referral of cases, and followed up with appropriate child protection authorities as needed.

The total budget requirement was increased from the original proposal due to the evolving needs on the ground, which increased significantly since the initial planning/design phase

Given the evolving needs on the ground during the reporting period, UNICEF also used CERF funding to expand our partnership with the Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and the Danish Demining Group (DDG) on a landmine and explosive remnants of war risk education (ERW/RE) initiative in Şanlıurfa and Hatay. The objective of this partnership was to reduce the number of potential casualties due to mines and ERW by increasing the awareness of their risks and hazards, and promote safe behaviour amongst

Syrian children, including those affected by the events in Kobane. Under this programme, which was outside the scope of the original CERF proposal, UNICEF reached a total of 3,662 children (48% boys and 52% girls) via outreach activities during the reporting period.

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

During the planning stages of this programme, UNICEF developed this programme based on information and observations provided by UNICEF and TRCS protection teams in the field. During the design and implementation of the programme, UNICEF received and took into account feedback from direct beneficiaries, through organized focus group discussions and field visits. A participatory approach was followed by TRCS, who involved young Syrian volunteers in the planning and implementation of recreational activities on a weekly basis.

Implementation of the programme was closely monitored by the UNICEF Child Protection team through: a) weekly field reports submitted by youth workers via the online platform; b) monthly and quarterly reports submitted by TRCS, and c) quarterly Steering Committee meetings.

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

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

UNICEF's PSS Programme is one of the core elements of the overall Syria refugee response, which was initiated in 2013. The response was externally evaluated in 2015, and the evaluation report noted that UNICEF's approach of providing support through CFS was an optimal solution to addressing the psychosocial needs of children in the camps. The collaboration between UNICEF and TRC was also judged in very positive terms. The CERF-funded programme was conducted under the framework of a PCA with TRCS, and regular monitoring activities were conducted as described above. The PCA with TRCS will be further evaluated through two spot checks, and followed by a more comprehensive Partnership Review, scheduled for Q2/Q3 2016. .

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	WFP		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	10/04/2015– 31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-WFP-008		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Food Security			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Vital Food Assistance for Syrian Refugees in Turkey					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 104,045,515	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 69,507,007	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ 4,005,668	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 4,800,393	▪ Government Partners:			
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)	11,036	11,992	23,028	14,202	14,882	29,084
Adults (above 18)	9,601	9,167	18,768	12,657	12,108	24,765
<b>Total</b>	<b>20,637</b>	<b>21,159</b>	<b>41,796</b>	<b>26,859</b>	<b>26,990</b>	<b>53,849</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees	41,796		53,849			
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>41,796</b>		<b>53,849</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>	<p>Change in planned beneficiaries: Increase over the reached figures is due to devaluation of the Turkish Lira against US Dollar.</p> <p>Minor change in gender breakdown: is due to fluctuation over in-camp populations.</p>					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies: Support access to food for the most vulnerable population impacted by the Syrian crisis and promote utilisation of diversified and quality food.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for target households and/or individuals		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Vouchers distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and in a timely manner to targeted beneficiaries		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Total value of e-vouchers distributed to targeted beneficiaries ( in cash) and as percentage of planned distribution 5	100%	129%
Indicator 1.2	Number of women, men, girls and boys receiving WFP assistance disaggregated by sex, as percentage of planned distribution 6	100%	129%
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Provision of food assistance through electronic vouchers in camps and in off-camp settings to 41,796 beneficiaries.	WFP/TRC	WFP/TRC
Activity 1.2	Monitoring activities (see section 13c for more details)	WFP/TRC	WFP/TRC
<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>			
Implementation: CERF funds were to be used for food assistance to Syrians refugees in and outside of camps. In the end, CERF funds were used to support in-camp populations only. The reason for this is that WFP received funds earmarked for the off-camp program which fully covered the proposed activities. The flexibility of CERF funds for either camp or off camp populations was highly valued and allowed us to further support Syrians in camp when the proposed off camp population was already covered.			
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• C&amp;V (cash and voucher) monitoring, control &amp; compliance: Monitor financial systems and reports for unusual activities/transactions and investigate anomalies.</li> <li>• WFP with its implementing partner the Turkish Red Crescent (TRC) established helpdesks to ensure regular possibility for beneficiaries to contact WFP and TRC staff directly with queries and complaints. Beneficiaries may approach staff to report broken, stolen or lost cards or other technical issues for resolution.</li> <li>• 72% of beneficiaries expressed they were well informed about the programme. Beneficiaries were trained on the use of the card. They received information leaflets in Arabic/Turkish and SMSs with updates. Explanatory posters were displayed at the participating supermarkets. Inside camps, TRC was attending to issues and complaints. 98% of the assisted population did not experience safety problems when going to or from WFP programme sites.</li> </ul>			

<sup>5</sup> Disaggregated by type of beneficiary, "in-camp" or "off-camp"

<sup>6</sup> Disaggregated

<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This project was implemented under WFP's Regional Emergency Operation (EMOP) 200433. An evaluation of EMOP 200433 for the period 2011-2014 was finalised in 2015 The date of the next evaluation has not been determined yet.</li> <li>• On monitoring, WFP uses a harmonized data collection system, including post-distribution monitoring tools, price monitoring forms and distribution reports associated with each activity. The monitoring and evaluation (M&amp;E) of the implementation of CERF fund is part of the subject WFP emergency programme. WFP carries out M&amp;E reports quarterly. WFP Turkey's second quarter M&amp;E report (April to June 2015) revealed that WFP food assistance remains the main source of income for 90% of the interviewed beneficiaries. Overall, the food security situation of the Syrian refugees in the 11 camps WFP is operating in, remains stable throughout the reporting period. With an average of 97% of the assisted population having an acceptable food consumption score (FCS), Turkey is the country with the highest percentage of acceptable FCS amongst the assisted Syrian population in the region. With 3%, the overall percentage of individuals with a borderline FCS remains very low.</li> </ul>	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	WHO		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	07/04/2015 – 31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-WHO-001		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Health			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Provision of emergency health services to most vulnerable Syrian refugees newly arrived in Turkey following the recent events in the city of Kobane and surrounding areas					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 1,152,106	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 806,951	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 806,951	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i> <span style="float:right">US\$ 40,000</span>			
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
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	22,610	23,430	46,040	22,610	23,430	46,040
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	19,890	19,070	38,960	19,890	19,070	38,960
<b>Total</b>	<b>42,500</b>	<b>42,500</b>	<b>85000</b>	<b>42,500</b>	<b>42,500</b>	<b>85,000</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
<i>Refugees</i>	85,000			85,000		
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>85,000</b>			<b>85,000</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>	Provision of technical support to the district health crisis management team in coordinating, prioritizing and planning the response with all the partners to strengthen the health service delivery at the public health centers responsible for the camp and urban refugees in the provision of optimal health live saving services to the newly arrived refugees.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Ensured access to quality health services in Şanlıurfa, Suruç and surrounding towns for newly displaced Syrian refugees have.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
Output 1	85,000 Syrian refugees newly arrived from the Kobane area have better access to quality health care		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Health care facilities in the Suruç district report during the project time frame sufficient supplies and equipment to cater for the additional patients	100%	100%
Indicator 1.2	During the reporting period number of targeted vaccine preventable disease outbreak in the target population in Suruç is reported	0	0
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Technical and logistic support to strengthening the disease surveillance and health information system to capture sufficiently disaggregated data of the recent Syrian refugees	WHO, MoH	WHO, MoH, Suruç subgovernorate
Activity 1.2	Capacity development of 10 health professionals to respond to public health crises	WHO, MoH (Field Epidemiology Training Programme)	WHO, MoH(Hospital contingency planning)
Activity 1.3	Technical and logistic support to the public health directorates to develop health information material on prevention, diagnosis and treatment of communicable diseases in Arabic and Kurdish language	WHO, MoH	WHO, MOH
Activity 1.4	Procurement, storage and distribution of essential medicines, medical and surgical supplies as well as diagnostic and emergency room equipment based on a needs assessment for the new camp and health facilities targeting 85,000 refugees in Suruç	WHO, MoH	WHO, MoH, Suruç subgovernarate
Activity 1.5	Capacity development of 75 Syrian refugee health professionals to ensure that existing health facilities in hosting areas are able to provide health care to Syrian refugees in Arabic and with sufficient female health workers	WHO, MoH, Gaziantep University	WHO, MoH, Gaziantep University
Activity 1.6	Technical support to supplementary immunization activities for Syrian refugee children with focus on several mop up rounds against polio and measles outbreaks	WHO, MoH	WHO, MoH

<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>	
Activity 1.2 The training changed to Hospital Contingency Planning Training upon the request of MoH.	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
WHO and MoH monitored all activities during the implementation period	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
If evaluation has been carried out, please describe relevant key findings here and attach evaluation reports or provide URL. If evaluation is pending, please inform when evaluation is expected finalized and make sure to submit the report or URL once ready. If no evaluation is carried out or pending, please describe reason for not evaluating project.	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>	16/03/2015 – 31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-FPA-001		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Health			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Emergency Sexual and Reproductive Health (SRH) and Gender Based Violence (GBV) Response for Syrian Women and Girls					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 8,900,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 2,600,000	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 872,900	▪ <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)	25,800	27,500	53,300	25,800	27,500	53,300
Adults (above 18)	23,500	23,200	46,700	23,500	23,200	46,700
<b>Total</b>	<b>49,300</b>	<b>50,700</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>49,300</b>	<b>50,700</b>	<b>100,000</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees	100,000			100,000		
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>100,000</b>			<b>100,000</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>	Saving from transportation and storage were used for procurement of extra hygiene and dignity kits allowed to agency to higher number of beneficiaries reached.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To increase the access to life-saving sexual and reproductive health services and gender based violence prevention and response services by Syrian women and girls in Suruç and Şanlıurfa via strengthening/ supporting the emergency SRH/ GBV response capacity of the local service providers.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Capacity of service provision on sexual and reproductive health strengthened to: ensure emergency obstetric care, safe delivery, pregnancy, and motherhood; prevent and treat sexual violence and HIV/STIs; and secure healthy child delivery spaces for Syrians.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Provision of medical equipment and supplies for life saving sexual and reproductive health services and GBV prevention and response.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of Syrian women (families) who received hygiene-dignity kits	22,910	25,770 (Dignity Kits)
Indicator 1.2	Number and type of RH kits received by the health facilities	11 sets of total 76 boxes	11 sets of total 76 boxes
Indicator 1.3	Number of Syrian women and newborns receiving emergency obstetrics, neonatal, antenatal, and postnatal health care	100%	%100
Indicator 1.4	Number of births given by Syrian women attended by skilled health personnel	100%	%100
Indicator 1.5	Number of women referred for emergency obstetrics from the primary level to the Suruç District Hospital and from there to the provincial tertiary level	100%	%100
Indicator 1.6	Number of Syrian women assisted with pregnancy complications including emergency obstetric care and caesarean sections	100%	%100
Indicator 1.7	Number of Syrians who received family planning methods	10,000 (men/women received FP commodities/ methods)	10,000
Indicator 1.8	Number of distributed SRH/GBV IEC materials in Arabic	25,000 sets of 9 brochures	2,157,500; 6 sets of brochures and 1000 WGSS guideline
Indicator 1.9	Number of visits to health facilities in the region	Visits in every two months to all facilities	Yes, even more frequent than two months.

Output 1 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 1.1	Procurement and Distribution of Hygiene-Dignity Kits	UNFPA, IMPR (NGO) and AFAD	UNFPA, IMPR (NGO), Harran Uni, MoH and AFAD
Activity 1.2	Procurement and Distribution of Reproductive Health Supplies	UNFPA, MoH, IMPR (NGO) and Harran University	UNFPA, IMPR (NGO), Harran Uni, MoH
Activity 1.3	Printing and disseminating Information Education and Communication (IEC) materials on safe motherhood, prevention of GBV, STIs, infection prevention, family planning, etc. in Arabic.	UNFPA, MoH, IMPR and Harran University	UNFPA, IMPR (NGO), Harran Uni, MoH
Activity 1.4	Field monitoring and technical support for effective/ quality SRH and GBV services	UNFPA, MoH, IMPR and Harran University	UNFPA, IMPR (NGO), Harran Uni, MoH

<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>	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
It was ensured by governmental Partners AFAD, MoH as well as committed IPs such as Harran University and NGO's during project design, implementation and monitoring.	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If evaluation has been carried out, please describe relevant key findings here and attach evaluation reports or provide URL. If evaluation is pending, please inform when evaluation is expected finalized and make sure to submit the report or URL once ready. If no evaluation is carried out or pending, please describe reason for not evaluating project.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	IOM		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	12/03/2015 – 31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-IOM-004		<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>	Rapid Relief Assistance to Syrian refugees and other vulnerable population living in South east of Turkey (Suruç and the surrounding areas)					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 4,780,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 5,000,000	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 273,335	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 845,000	▪ <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>	9,432	10,080	19,512	7,589	11,847	19,436
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	8,280	8,208	16,488	11,382	7,898	19,280
<b>Total</b>	<b>17,712</b>	<b>18,288</b>	<b>36,000</b>	<b>18,971</b>	<b>19,745</b>	<b>38,716</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>	36,000			38,716		
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>36,000</b>			<b>38,716</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 support the Government of Turkey in the provision of emergency humanitarian assistance through the purchase and distribution of non-food-items and WASH support in order to improve the living conditions of vulnerable Syrians living in south east of Turkey including those who fled Kobane since late September 2014.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	36,000 affected individuals provided with NFIs and have access to WASH services to enhance their living conditions.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Up to 36,000 Syrian refugees have access to core relief items and WASH.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of non-camp Syrian refugees receiving core relief items	36,000	38,716
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Procure relief items in the shortest possible time according to standard, emergency procurement procedures	IOM	IOM and implementing partner
Activity 1.2	Work with AFAD and the municipality and its partners to distribute NFI in identified sites for selected beneficiaries	IOM	IOM
<b>Output 2</b>	15 WASH containers provided inside and outside camps		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	Number of WASH containers provided to enhance hygiene and sanitation	15	0
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Procure WASH units and establish it in temporary shelters to enhance sanitation and hygiene in those shelters.	IOM/AFAD	NA
<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>During the Kobane crisis in September 2014, the Turkish Government identified several needs for the refugees who fled to Turkey. WASH containers were among the needs requested by the authorities to be established in either the transitional camps or temporary shelters where refugees were living. Upon the receipt of the grant, the Government had established a camp in Suruç to house the majority of Syrians who were living in the transitional camps and temporary shelters. IOM consulted with the authorities on the need of the WASH containers and the answer was that the camp had all the containers required already in place in the newly established camp. IOM decided to shift these allocated funds toward winterisation assistance based on the needs assessed on the ground.</p>			

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

During the design of the project, IOM conducted several visits to Şanlıurfa, mainly to the districts of Suruç, Halfeti, Birecik, and Harran in order to assess the needs of refugees. Several interviews were conducted with the affected population as well as with key stakeholders (including AFAD, the sub-governor, municipality as well as other organisations working in the area). During the implementation of the project, IOM was constantly in touch with the refugees, making sure that assistance provided was in line with their continuous needs. During project implementation, IOM undertook house to house assessments and distributions in both the urban and rural areas of Halfeti, Birecik, Suruç and Harran districts of Şanlıurfa. For winterization assistance, IOM partnered with an NGO to support families in Halfeti and Birecik with vouchers that enabled them to purchase winterization and NFI items directly from selected vendors. This approach gave families a choice to purchase the needs they require most. In Suruç villages – IOM supported families directly with stoves and coal.

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

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

No evaluation planned

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNHCR		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	04/03/2015 – 31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-HCR-002		<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>	Provision of core relief items to the new refugee camp in Suruç					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 35,533,201	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 12,957,785	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>			
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 834,600	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
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)	7,860	8,400	16,260	7,860	8,400	16,260
Adults (above 18)	6,900	6,840	13,740	6,900	6,840	13,740
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,760</b>	<b>15,240</b>	<b>30,000</b>	<b>14,760</b>	<b>15,240</b>	<b>30,000<sup>7</sup></b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees	30,000			30,000		
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>30,000</b>			<b>30,000</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>	As the refugee camps are managed by the Prime Ministry Disaster and Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD), UNHCR does not have the demographic breakdown of the camp population.					

<sup>7</sup> Estimated breakdown of planned and reached individuals is the same as it is based on 3RP averages and due to the fact that the foam mattresses were purchased and handed over to AFAD for distribution.

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Provide basic and domestic items to vulnerable refugee families in the newly established Suruç Camp		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Population has sufficient basic and domestic items		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	6,000 families in Suruç Camp receive core relief items		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	30,000 individuals receive foam mattresses	14,760 female, 15,240 male	30,000 individuals
Indicator 1.2	6,000 families receive sleeping mats (3 mats per family)	6,000 families	6,000 families
Indicator 1.3	6,000 families receive kitchen sets	6,000 families	6,000 families
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Procurement of core relief items	UNHCR	UNHCR
Activity 1.2	Distribution of core relief items	UNHCR/AFAD/TRC	UNHCR/AFAD/TRC
<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>			
All planned activities were completed. The camp capacity was planned as 6,000 families/30,000 individuals. UNHCR provided the NFIs according to the planned figure requested by AFAD. All items have been handed over to AFAD. The physical distribution is done by AFAD/TRC in camps.			
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>			
Since the beginning of the Syrian crisis, UNHCR has been supporting the refugee camps managed by the Turkish authorities through AFAD with tents, NFIs and WASH facilities. In response to the Suruç Emergency, AFAD set up a new refugee camp in Suruç, and requested UNHCR's NFI support for the camp families. UNHCR provided standard NFIs to camp families as to other refugee camps, which included mattress, blankets, kitchen sets, cooking facilities, hygiene items, etc. These items were provided with the support of the CERF contribution and other donors.			
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>		EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>	
The refugee camps are managed by the Turkish authorities (AFAD), who is coordinating NFI distributions as well. UNHCR field teams visits refugee camps on daily basis, to observe NFI distributions. AFAD provides UNHCR with periodic NFI distribution summary reports by camps; however due to AFAD policy on confidentiality, individual information of beneficiaries is not included in these reports.		EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>	
		NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS**

<b>CERF Project Code</b>	<b>Cluster/Sector</b>	<b>Agency</b>	<b>Partner Type</b>	<b>Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner US\$</b>
15-UF-WFP-008	Food Assistance	WFP	RedC	\$4,005,668
15-UF-IOM-004	Shelter & NFI	IOM	INGO	\$273,335
15-UF-WHO-001	Health	WHO	GOV	\$40,000
15-UF-CEF-008	Child Protection	UNICEF	RedC	\$561,873
15-UF-CEF-008	Child Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$111,126

## ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

3RP	Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan
AFAD	Turkey Disaster and Emergency Management Authority
CFS	Child Friendly Spaces
DGMM	The Directorate General of Migration Management
GBV	Gender Based Violence
IMPR	International Middle East Peace Research Center
MoH	Ministry of Health
PSS	Psychosocial support
RH	Reproductive Health
SRH	Sexual and Reproductive Health
TP	Temporary Protection
TRC	Turkish Red Crescent