

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS
IRAQ
RAPID RESPONSE
DISPLACEMENT 2017**

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Lise Grande

REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

The AAR was conducted on 8 November 2017, facilitated by the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) and attended by the communications and donor relations focal point of the World Food Programme (WFP). Additional consultations took place between OCHA, WFP and the Food Security Cluster Coordinator.

- b. Please confirm that the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) Report was discussed in the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) and/or United Nations Country Team (UNCT) and by cluster/sector coordinators as outlined in the guidelines.

YES NO

The draft report was shared with the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), which includes UN agencies, international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the International Committee of the Red Cross (as an observer), and key donors, for their review before being finalized by the RC/HC.

- 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

The report once finalised with the CERF secretariat will be shared with relevant in-country stakeholders including the CERF recipient agencies, their implementing partners and clusters.

I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: 331,000,000 ¹		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	10,000,001
	COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND (if applicable)	26,419,742 ²
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	263,398,041 ³
	TOTAL	299,817,784

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 01/05/2017			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
WFP	17-RR-WFP-033	Food Aid	10,000,001
TOTAL			10,000,001

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct United Nations (UN) agencies/IOM implementation	10,000,001
Funds forwarded to NGOs and Red Cross / Red Crescent for implementation	
Funds forwarded to government partners	
TOTAL	10,000,001

HUMANITARIAN NEEDS

Towards the end of 2016, as many as 11 million people in Iraq – including over 3 million internally displaced persons (IDPs) – were in need of immediate humanitarian support as a direct consequence of violence and conflict linked to the seizure of Iraqi territory by the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL) since 2014 and a series of counter-insurgency operations launched by the Government and its allied forces.

On 17 October 2016, the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) commenced their campaign to reclaim Mosul city. The response to address imminent humanitarian needs arising from the fighting in Mosul and the surrounding villages was envisaged to be one of the largest and most complex humanitarian operations in the world.

¹ The funding requirement for the Mosul emergency operations under the [2017 Iraq Humanitarian Response Plan \(HRP\)](#).

² The Iraq Humanitarian Fund (IHF) allocations in 2017 towards partner projects implemented in Mosul city and surrounding areas.

³ The 2017 HRP received generous donor contributions of \$892 million, which covered 91 per cent of the Plan's total funding requirement of \$985 million, according to [OCHA Financial Tracking Service](#) accessed on 6 February 2018. Since the corresponding HRP project codes were not available for the majority (\$512 million) of these contributions at the time of this reporting, the bilateral and multilateral funding towards the HRP projects with the Mosul response components was estimated by prorating the total contributions to the HRP against the percentage funding requirement for the Mosul emergency operations.

In the anticipation of this response, the HCT with the support from clusters and partners launched a Flash Appeal on 20 July 2016, requiring US\$284 million to cover emergency preparedness and response activities to assist up to 1.5 million people who could be directly impacted and require immediate life-saving assistance. Emergency shelter was highlighted as the overwhelming sector in which support would be required, followed by food security, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), health and protection. The HCT revisited the Flash Appeal in October 2016 and calculated that an estimated \$367 million would be required to cover the urgent life-saving assistance during the first three months of the Mosul humanitarian operation.

Facing unexpectedly fierce resistance from the ISIL, the ISF were forced to change their battle plan by early December 2016. The military operations were likely to last much longer than two to three months expected at the start of the battle⁴. By the time this CERF grant request was submitted in May 2017, over 500,000 people had been displaced due to the military operations in Mosul, according to IOM's Displacement Tracking Matrix⁵. Further, intensifying clashes in western Mosul were expected to result in a sharp increase in displacement. It was estimated that as many as 500,000 people remained in the districts controlled by the ISIL in western Mosul, including some 400,000 in the densely populated Old City, where reports indicated severe shortages of food, medicine and other basic services due to extremely constrained access to supplies.

Extensive resource mobilization in 2016 had enabled initial immediate life-saving assistance for the Mosul response. This included the \$18.7 million CERF Rapid Response grant which was allocated in December 2016 and played a critical role in scaling up the time-critical shelter/non-food items (NFIs) and health assistance. Nevertheless, prolonged military operations exacerbated the suffering of civilians directly and indirectly affected by the conflict, including displaced families, vulnerable stayee populations and the host communities, thereby requiring humanitarian partners to readjust planning scenarios and respond to greater needs⁶. The 2017 Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) launched in February 2017 estimated that an additional \$331 million was required for the Mosul emergency operations by the end of the year. Yet by the end of April 2017, the HRP was only 18 per cent funded.

II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

Humanitarian partners in support of the Government began scaling up operational presence and pre-positioning aid supplies and services in the area in mid-2016. They worked around the clock to set up displacement camps and emergency sites and to provide immediate life-saving assistance to those who fled Mosul and the surrounding villages affected by the counter-ISIL military operations. Most of the displaced population from Mosul had fled to the south of the city; up to 80 per cent were staying in camps and emergency sites while the remainder had primarily found shelter in the retaken neighbourhoods of eastern Mosul.

Food assistance was considered critical for families fleeing the neighbourhoods that had been deprived of basic food commodities for months due to the offensive. Reports from displaced people and key informants still trapped in besieged neighbourhoods of Mosul indicated that supply routes into western Mosul had been cut since mid-November 2016 and that the depletion of food which was hoarded and hidden from the ISIL was forcing families to resort to negative coping mechanisms. An inter-agency rapid needs assessment conducted in April 2017 found that, in over one third of the 45 surveyed neighbourhoods in eastern and western Mosul, more than half of the population (between 51-75 per cent) did not have sufficient access to food in the preceding seven days. In over 80 per cent of the surveyed neighbourhoods, people were eating on average two meals per day, while just one meal per day in Al-Ghadeeda neighbourhood in western Mosul. Acute shortages of medical supplies and potable water were also reported, as well as the lack of electricity.

The families who escaped the fighting had to wonder on foot for two to four days before humanitarians could reach them and were often found in dire need of immediate food assistance. The most acutely affected were infants, pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and the chronically ill.

⁴ The military campaign to retake Mosul city lasted until early July 2017 (the Prime Minister of Iraq formally declared victory in Mosul on 9 July 2017), while sporadic fighting continued in parts of Mosul in the following weeks and a subsequent military campaign to retake neighbouring Telafar was launched in August 2017.

⁵ The crisis in Mosul surpassed the worst-case planning scenarios of humanitarian partners, displacing over 1 million people from Mosul city and Ninewa Governorate.

⁶ Some of the most vulnerable population affected by the military operations remained in the newly retaken areas inside Mosul city.

Key constraints for the humanitarian partners included limited access to the affected communities due to the volatile security situations, constant changes to the operational context, and stretched organizational capacity vis-a-vis the surge in humanitarian needs. These challenges became more prominent when the military operations moved to western Mosul in February 2017, forcing the Government and the HCT to adjust their response plans. By late April, the Government confirmed that food was one of the most immediate unmet needs in western Mosul.

Under the original agreements between the Government and food security sector stakeholders, WFP was to provide Immediate Response Rations (IRRs) containing three-day family food rations to all civilians fleeing Mosul city and to vulnerable people remaining in Mosul. The Iraqi Red Crescent was then responsible for providing one-month food parcels to displaced families. The Government was committed to providing food parcels after the first month to all citizens through its Public Distribution System (PDS). WFP expected to provide family food parcels only to highly vulnerable families in camps and in neighbourhoods where it took the Government longer than expected to re-establish the PDS.

However, this sequencing did not occur. The Government, despite its best intentions, was not able to reinstate the PDS nor would it be able to in the foreseeable future. As this critical gap could not be bridged through national resources, the Government requested WFP and its partners to urgently step in to provide Family Food Rations (FFRs) for three months to the affected families who had reached the relative safety of a camp or a shelter in the newly accessible areas of eastern Mosul.

The number of highly vulnerable people requiring IRR and FFR support became far greater than originally projected. Planning figures from the working scenario, upon which the Mosul Flash Appeal and the 2017 HRP were based, were already exceeded by April, and it was feared that additional hundreds of thousands of people might be displaced and in need of urgent food assistance.

III. CERF PROCESS

Facing the escalating humanitarian needs and in particular the imminent critical gap in food security assistance, which was not envisioned during the earlier response planning for the Mosul crisis, the RC/HC in consultation with the HCT decided to request another CERF Rapid Response grant. The prioritization process was led by the RC/HC, supported by the HCT and the Inter-Cluster Coordination Group and informed by strategic priorities as identified in the 2017 HRP and funding analysis.

With alternate funding sources expected to address other less time-critical sectoral needs, the HCT agreed to focus the CERF grant request on a single project of WFP to provide immediate food rations for newly displaced families and other vulnerable populations affected by the military operations.

WFP and its food security sector partners had already been distributing ready-to-eat IRRs along the displacement routes, complemented by ready-to-use supplementary food as a preventive treatment for moderate acute malnutrition for children under the age of five. Partners were also providing IRRs and FFRs to IDP families at screening centres and families who managed to stay in their homes in the accessible parts of western Mosul. The IRR was a key component of the Rapid Response Mechanism (RRM) assistance, which provided life-saving support to displaced people on the move with bottled water, hygiene and dignity kits in addition to the food parcel. Further, in certain areas, especially inside Mosul city, WFP's IRR was part of the multi-sectoral emergency package (MSEP), which was provided together with assistance by the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA).

Through jumpstarting the urgent procurement and distribution of IRRs and FFRs, CERF funds were expected to support WFP's life-saving assistance to both displaced families and the vulnerable population who remained inside Mosul city. Specifically, WFP proposed to use the CERF funds to: 1) provide emergency food assistance (IRR and FFR) to people who were displaced from Mosul and arrived in established camps and host communities for two months; and 2) provide life-saving food assistance (IRR) to people remaining in newly liberated areas within Mosul city that have experienced destruction and market disruption as a result of the military offensive and people remaining in ISIL-controlled areas that were experiencing extensive destruction and siege conditions.

As part of its gender-responsive programming, WFP aimed to facilitate the receipt of food assistance by women and female-headed households in order not to exacerbate any gender gaps. The project would deliver food assistance to all eligible beneficiaries, with priority given to female-headed households and PLW. Further, women and young girls were to play prominent roles in community consultations to ensure that women had an opportunity to provide feedback on assistance.

Furthermore, as was the case with the preceding CERF Rapid Response grant which was allocated in December 2016, this grant was requested to complement concurrent allocations of the Country-Based Pooled Fund in Iraq. In anticipation of the Mosul crisis, the Iraq

Humanitarian Fund (IHF) allocated \$45.3 million towards emergency response preparedness in 2016: \$4.3 million through a Reserve Allocation to strengthen the supply chains of four UN agencies to procure and pre-position critical life-saving items; and \$41 million as part of the second Standard Allocation to support Mosul preparedness projects which could be implemented immediately. In addition, the first Standard Allocation of 2017 included additional \$26.4 million towards projects supporting the Mosul response.

These IHF allocations funded projects in various sectors through flexible programming modalities; the majority of the funds (57 per cent) were allocated to NGO partners, including 13 per cent directly to national NGOs. In contrast, this CERF grant request was put together to address an emerging, time-critical gap in the life-saving food security sector by channelling funds through a single UN agency (WFP). The relatively short implementation period of the CERF Rapid Response grant was also taken into consideration; WFP's project aimed for rapid food procurement followed by distribution activities to be completed over two to three months and was considered an appropriate match for the CERF Rapid Response grant.

IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR ¹									
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: Up to 1.5 million people in Mosul city and additional people affected by the military operations in the surrounding towns and villages									
Cluster/Sector	Female			Male			Total		
	Girls (< 18)	Women (≥ 18)	Total	Boys (< 18)	Men (≥ 18)	Total	Children (< 18)	Adults (≥ 18)	Total
Food Aid	378,290	464,265	842,555	412,680	464,265	876,945	790,970	928,530	1,719,500

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

BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

WFP estimated the number of beneficiaries for this project by multiplying by six (an average number of individuals per household) the number of family households reached by the CERF-funded IRR and FFR distribution. Families that received multiple rounds of food rations were discounted to avoid double-counting. Since there was only one project under this CERF grant, the estimated reached beneficiary figures of the WFP project, representing those of the entire food security sector (as elaborated in Table 4), were also used for the total direct beneficiaries reached through the CERF funding (Table 5).

TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING ²			
	Children (< 18)	Adults (≥ 18)	Total
Female	378,290	464,265	842,555
Male	412,680	464,265	876,945
Total individuals (Female and male)	790,970	928,530	1,719,500

² 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

This CERF project was integrated into WFP's larger multi-donor project that covered needs as identified in the 2017 HRP. Individual grants from different donors were utilized to fund portions of the larger project. During the project implementation, the CERF funds were directed entirely to food purchases while other donations covered the overhead costs and the sub-grants for implementing partners that were anticipated when the CERF project proposal was developed. As a result, WFP was able to reach a significantly higher number of

beneficiaries than originally intended. The CERF funds were used to purchase the following food assistance commodities: 1,519.392 metric tons of IRRs and 7,473.938 metric tons of FFRs, which together reached an estimated 1,719,500 people. Specifically:

- **Distribution of IRRs:** WFP reached 197,750 households (1,186,500 people) with life-saving IRRs, of which approximately 148,313 households received them as soon as they reached screening sites. Additional rounds of IRRs were distributed to large size households, families that experienced multiple displacements (e.g. families that had to move through multiple transit centres and had limited access to cooking facilities), families that were held for several days at screening centres, and men who underwent prolonged screening processes. In total, 237,300 IRRs were distributed. As part of the multi-sectoral RRM assistance and MESP, these IRRs enabled immediate, life-saving food supply to reach within 72 hours highly vulnerable families including those fleeing conflict, those located in hard-to-reach areas, and those caught at checkpoints or stranded between military front lines. The IRR distribution was an entry point for food security sector partners to address people's immediate food needs, which was followed by monthly FFRs once families settled in the relative safety of displacement camps, emergency sites or with host communities.
- **Distribution of FFRs:** Families that reached a displacement camp or emergency site or were temporary hosted in the newly accessible areas of eastern Mosul were provided with a minimum of two months of FFRs to address their household food needs. In total, these FFRs were distributed to 88,833 households (533,000 beneficiaries), the vast majority (72,400 households) of whom in displacement camps and emergency sites. As large-size households received more than one FFR kit, the total number of kits distributed was 106,600. About 16,443 stayee families (98,700 beneficiaries) also received food rations for two months in anticipation of the PDS resuming its food distributions. The FFRs consisted of wheat flour, rice, vegetable oil, chickpeas, lentils, sugar, salt and bulgur wheat. They were sourced from Turkey and were nutritionally designed to provide a family of six with 80 percent of their daily intake requirements for one month, at around 1,800 kilocalories per person per day.

Amid the worsening humanitarian crisis in Mosul and challenges with resource mobilization, the CERF grant allowed WFP to maintain the two-pronged response to the crisis by providing immediate life-saving rations when people were on the move and monthly food rations once they settled in camps or with host communities. The severity of the situation and the relief that came with WFP's assistance was repeatedly underscored by beneficiaries. According to WFP's Food Security Outcome Monitoring conducted in western Mosul in June 2017, 100 per cent of the households interviewed both before and after receiving multi-sectoral assistance said that food was their top priority need. Prior to receiving assistance, almost half of the households were eating poorly or at marginally poor levels. After receiving assistance, all households were eating at acceptable levels. Overall, the CERF grant allowed WFP to help decrease the usage of negative coping strategies among the beneficiary households. Families were less likely to rely on less preferred or expensive food, borrow food or rely on help from friends and relatives, or reduce the number of meals eaten per day. WFP's assistance also decreased the households' monthly food expenditure, from 66 per cent to 38 per cent, which in turn allowed families to use their resources to cover other basic needs.

CERF's ADDED VALUE

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

The CERF funds enabled the speedy and systematic delivery of life-saving food assistance (IRRs) within the first 72 hours of displacement through the RRM mechanism, which was followed by medium-term food assistance in the form of monthly food rations (FFRs) as families settled in displacement camps or with host communities.

b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs⁷?

YES PARTIALLY NO

The CERF funds allowed WFP to address the urgent and time-critical food and nutrition needs of conflict-affected people as they came out of situations with severely limited to no access to food for several months at the frontline of response. It ensured a prioritised response where food among the most urgent needs was addressed at humanitarian responders' first contact with the

⁷ 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.).

beneficiaries. After reaching displacement camps or emergency sites, displaced families received a more comprehensive emergency assistance, including shelter/NFIs, food, WASH, health care, education and specialized protection.

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

YES PARTIALLY NO

The CERF funds addressed a critical funding gap in food security assistance as it emerged and brought a temporary relief to WFP's pipeline with which the organisation was able to mobilize additional contributions from other funding sources. WFP's traditional donors welcomed CERF's contribution and pledged additional resources, thus allowing a longer-term assistance to vulnerable Iraqis affected by the conflict.

d) Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?

YES PARTIALLY NO

Through enabling uninterrupted procurement and distribution of IRRs which formed part of RRM assistance and MESP, the CERF funds contributed to inter-agency coordination among WFP, UNICEF and UNFPA, as well as inter-cluster coordination among prioritised life-saving sectors, i.e. food security, WASH and health.

CERF also reinforced coordination at the inter-cluster level as the grant request was approved based on coordinated needs assessments and a joint response implementation strategy developed by all clusters.

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

CERF facilitated partnerships and complemented other funding sources: While there were no sub-grants disbursed to implementing partners under this CERF allocation, WFP worked with NGO partners (Women Empowerment Organization, Norwegian Refugee Council, Mercy Hands and Muslim Aid) which undertook the distribution of IRRs and FFRs. CERF funds were spent on the procurement of food items while the implementation partnerships were supported by other funding sources.

V. LESSONS LEARNED

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE CERF SECRETARIAT

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Low transactional costs of CERF grant application and allocation were appreciated	The transactional costs of preparing, submitting, reviewing, approving and allocating the CERF grant were significantly lower compared to similar grants from other sources. This in turn allowed staff to dedicate more time to mobilize resources from other donors.	CERF Secretariat
Alignment of agency-specific budget structure to CERF's budget template was challenging	For this particular grant, CERF's budget template proved too rigid for WFP's budget structure. CERF's budget template should allow for a greater flexibility to accommodate different types of projects and operating contexts of grant recipient agencies.	CERF Secretariat
More training on CERF proposal drafting and reporting would be helpful	Given the specific criteria for CERF's funding windows and related proposal requirements, the CERF secretariat, UN agencies/funds/programmes, HCT/UNCT and field UN/OCHA offices responsible for facilitating in-country CERF process should more proactively conduct in-person workshops and webinars and share relevant training materials. This would provide field-level resource mobilization staff of the grant recipient agencies with the CERF-specific knowledge and analytical skills needed to quickly put together a CERF project proposal and effectively report on it.	CERF Secretariat, CERF focal points at UN agencies/funds/programmes headquarters, HCT/UNCT, field UN/OCHA offices responsible for facilitating in-country CERF process

TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Estimating beneficiary numbers was challenging	Throughout the Mosul response, the HCT/UNCT faced a significant challenge with estimating beneficiary numbers, particularly in western Mosul and the Old City where humanitarian space was limited.	HCT/UNCT
Training on CERF proposal drafting and reporting would be helpful	Given the specific criteria for CERF’s funding windows and related proposal requirements, the CERF secretariat, UN agencies/funds/programmes, HCT/UNCT and field UN/OCHA offices responsible for facilitating in-country CERF process should more proactively conduct in-person workshops and webinars and share relevant training materials. This would provide field-level resource mobilization staff of the grant recipient agencies with the CERF-specific knowledge and analytical skills needed to quickly put together a CERF project proposal and effectively report on it.	CERF Secretariat, CERF focal points at UN agencies/funds/programmes headquarters, HCT/UNCT, field UN/OCHA offices responsible for facilitating in-country CERF process

VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS						
CERF project information						
1. Agency:	WFP		5. CERF grant period:	10/05/2017 - 09/11/2017		
2. CERF project code:	17-RR-WFP-033		6. Status of CERF grant:	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
3. Cluster/Sector:	Food Aid			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
4. Project title:	Emergency Assistance to Populations Affected by the Iraq Crisis					
7. Funding	a. Total funding requirements ⁸ :	US\$ 113,000,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i> ▪ <i>Government Partners:</i> 			
	b. Total funding received ⁹ :	US\$ 97,689,198				
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 10,000,001				
Beneficiaries						
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).						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (< 18)	104,016	110,232	214,248	412,680	378,290	790,970
Adults (≥ 18)	123,091	121,661	244,752	464,265	464,265	928,530
Total	227,107	231,893	459,000	876,945	842,555	1,719,500
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees						
IDPs	263,500			1,620,902		
Host population						
Other affected people	195,500			98,598		
Total (same as in 8a)	459,000			1,719,500		

⁸ This refers to the funding requirements of the requesting agency (agencies in case of joint projects) in the prioritized sector for this specific emergency.

⁹ This should include both funding received from CERF and from other donors.

<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 project reached a significantly higher number of beneficiaries than intended as resources were directed to food purchases with other donations covering the overhead costs and sub-grants which were initially anticipated under this project proposal.
--	---

CERF Result Framework			
9. Project objective	Meet urgent food and nutrition needs of IDPs and vulnerable people while protecting lives to enable safe access to food and nutrition for girls, women, boys and men.		
10. Outcome statement	Displaced and conflict-affected children and adults are able to meet their minimum dietary needs.		
11. Outputs			
Output 1	459,000 vulnerable Iraqis receive IRRs		
Output 1 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 1.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving Immediate Response Rations	459,000	1,186,500
Indicator 1.2	Proportion of beneficiaries who receive Immediate Response Rations within 72 hours of trigger for response	100%	100%
Output 1 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 1.1	Procurement of 1,264 MT of IRRs	WFP	WFP
Activity 1.2	Distribution of IRRs to Cooperating Partners	WFP	WFP
Activity 1.3	Distribution of IRRs to beneficiaries	Women Empowerment Organization, Norwegian Refugee Council and Muslim Aid	Women Empowerment Organization, Norwegian Refugee Council and Muslim Aid
Output 2	263,500 vulnerable Iraqis received FFRs		
Output 2 Indicators	Description	Target	Reached
Indicator 2.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving Family Food Rations	263,500	533,000
Indicator 2.2	Total amount of in-kind Family Food Rations provided (metric tons)	7,390 MT	7,473.938 MT
Output 2 Activities	Description	Implemented by (Planned)	Implemented by (Actual)
Activity 2.1	Procurement of 7,390 MT of mixed food	WFP	WFP
Activity 2.2	Distribution of FFRs to Cooperating Partners	WFP	WFP
Activity 2.3	Distribution of FFRs to beneficiaries	Mercy Hands and Muslim Aid	Mercy Hands and Muslim Aid

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

The project was able to reach a significantly higher number of beneficiaries than intended, as resources were directed to food purchases with other donations covering the overhead and operational costs initially anticipated under this proposal. Similarly, sub-grants to WFP's implementing partners (Women Empowerment Organization, Norwegian Refugee Council, Mercy Hands and Muslim Aid) for the distribution of IRRs and FFRs were covered by complementary funds as part of the WFP's larger project in Iraq.

In the context of the ongoing large-scale emergency response, WFP Iraq prioritized operational actions to provide immediate first-line emergency food assistance to vulnerable Iraqis affected by the ongoing conflict and, due to an oversight, failed to communicate the shift of resources.

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

The objective of WFP's AAP commitments is to facilitate participation of affected people in WFP's programmes by ensuring that programme design, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation processes and decisions are informed by and reflect the views of affected people. To operationalise these commitments, WFP focuses on three key areas: information provision; consultation; and complaints and feedback mechanisms. This strategy adopts a two-phased approach to achieve WFP's vision for more accountable programmes. Phase One focuses on getting the basics right and laying the foundation for a more ground-breaking system in the future, while Phase Two capitalizes on those foundations and takes the innovations to scale.

In Iraq, WFP and its partners carried out focus group discussions with projects' beneficiaries to ensure that the content of the IRR and of the FFR baskets were tailored to the preferences and nutritional requirements of the affected population. During the Mosul humanitarian response, this also meant reaching populations as close to the front-lines as possible, minimizing the time it took to support people in need. The accountability work was also promoted through the Iraq IDP Information Centre (IIC), which provided a dedicated channel for direct feedback from people impacted by the crisis. WFP and its partners continue to engage with the Iraq IIC to ensure that the centre operators are trained and informed, and that feedback from beneficiaries is heard and addressed.

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

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

With support from WFP's Office of Emergencies and the Regional Bureau in Cairo, the Iraq Country Office plans to conduct a full L3 Emergency lessons learned exercise in 2018. Key relevant findings will be shared with the CERF Secretariat in due course.

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

Since the operating costs of WFP's implementing partners for the distribution of the food commodities were covered by complementary funds as part of the larger WFP's project in Iraq, there were no sub-grants disbursed to implementing partners under this CERF allocation.

ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

AAR	After Action Review
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
DTM	Displacement Tracking Matrix
FFR	Family Food Ration
HCT	Humanitarian Country Team
HRP	Humanitarian Response Plan
IDP	Internally Displaced Person
IHF	Iraq Humanitarian Fund
IIC	IDP Information Centre
IRR	Immediate Response Ration
ISF	Iraqi Security Forces
ISIL	Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant
MSEP	Multi-Sectoral Emergency Package
NFI	Non-Food Item
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PDS	Public Distribution System
PLW	Pregnant and Lactating Women
RC/HC	Resident / Humanitarian Coordinator
RRM	Rapid Response Mechanism
UN	United Nations
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme