United Nations Central Emergency Response Fund

YEAR: 2018

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS BURKINA FASO RAPID RESPONSE DROUGHT 2018

RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR

Metsi Makhetha

| REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY |
|--|
| Please indicate when the After-Action Review (AAR) was conducted and who participated. The AAR meeting took place on 11 April 2019 with agency focal points from WFP, FAO and UNICEF as well as members of the Humanitarian Country Team. |
| b. Please confirm that the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) Report on the use of CERF funds was discussed in the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team. |
| YES NO NO |
| c. Was the final version of the RC/HC Report shared for review with in-country stakeholders (i.e. the CERF recipient agencies and their implementing partners, cluster/sector coordinators and members and relevant government counterparts)? |
| YES NO NO |

PART I

Strategic Statement by the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator

This CERF allocation provided a targeted response to the most vulnerable households for urgent assistance in food security and nutrition sectors as well as the implementation of integrated interventions to strengthen their resilience capacities. This also enabled UN agencies and partners to reach targeted populations in insecurity affected and remote areas. As well, complementary interventions of partners in the same areas have brought a full and consistent package to the targeted population. This CERF allocation served as a catalyst to alert and mobilize the donor community to the alarming levels of food insecurity and malnutrition situation, most worrying in the areas affected by insecurity. This CERF allocation definitely served as a catalyst to alert and mobilize the donor community (humanitarian and development) to the alarming levels of food insecurity and malnutrition situation, most worrying in the areas affected by insecurity.

1. OVERVIEW

| 18-RR-BFA-30726 TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$) | | | | |
|---|------------|--|--|--|
| a. TOTAL AMOUNT REQUIRED FOR THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE | | | | |
| FUNDING RECEIVED BY SOURCE | | | | |
| CERF | 9,015,030 | | | |
| COUNTRY-BASED POOLED FUND (if applicable) | 0 | | | |
| OTHER (bilateral/multilateral) | 7,915,568 | | | |
| b. TOTAL FUNDING RECEIVED FOR THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE | 16,930,598 | | | |

| 18-RR-BFA-30726 TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY PROJECT AND SECTOR (US\$) | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| Allocation 1 – date of of | Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 24/05/2018 | | | | | |
| Agency Project code Cluster/Sector Amount | | | | | | |
| FAO | 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Security - Livestock | 1,035,022 | | | |
| UNICEF | 18-RR-CEF-060 | Nutrition – Nutrition | 3,000,000 | | | |
| WFP | 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Security - Food Aid | 2,999,616 | | | |
| WFP | 18-RR-WFP-037 | Nutrition – Nutrition | 1,980,392 | | | |
| TOTAL | 9,015,030 | | | | | |

| 18-RR-BFA-30726 TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$) | | |
|--|--------------|--|
| Total funds implemented directly by UN agencies including procurement of relief goods | 7,122,154.63 | |
| - Funds transferred to Government partners* | 736,998.62 | |
| - Funds transferred to International NGOs partners* | 527,790.75 | |
| - Funds transferred to National NGOs partners* | 628,086 | |

| - Funds transferred to Red Cross/Red Crescent partners* | 0 |
|---|--------------|
| Total funds transferred to implementing partners (IP)* | 1,892,875.37 |
| TOTAL | 9,015,030 |

^{*} These figures should match with totals in Annex 1.

2. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT AND NEEDS

The humanitarian situation in Burkina Faso has quickly deteriorated in recent years. The impact of drought, worsened by a volatile security situation had sharply increased the humanitarian needs of the vulnerable population, causing alarming levels of food insecurity and malnutrition. The situation in the most affected Sahel region in northern Burkina Faso is further compounded by rising instability and a humanitarian situation that has progressively deteriorated since 2017. Having exhausted all their coping mechanism, the affected populations have become increasingly vulnerable, facing severe food insecurity, high risk of malnutrition, and the health status of children degrading at alarming pace.

Impact of the humanitarian situation and needs:

Food insecurity:

The lean season in 2018 started abnormally early, in January instead of June. The dry spells caused by irregular rainfalls, the Fall armyworm attacks (mainly on maize, rice and sorghum) across several parts of the country, as well as reported granivorous bird outbreaks, have resulted in a decrease in the estimated cereal production of 11.03% and 11.65% compared, respectively, to the previous and the average last five years.

A WFP field assessment showed a significant reduction in the availability of cereals products in local markets, with drops reaching up to 70%, compared to the same period in 2017 in the communes identified as being at risk of severe food insecurity. Consequently, price increases range between 40% to 50% compared to the same period last year, namely in the main markets in Dori and Fada in April. Cereal prices are even higher in the provinces as local production has been completely exhausted.

Additionally, the crisis deeply affects the pastoral situation, with 15 provinces out of 45 deficient in forage availability. An assessment by the Ministry of Animal and Fisheries Resources (MRAH) indicates that if no action is taken, at least 207,150 heads of cattle and 831,742 heads of small ruminants could be lost. Such a loss represents an estimated value of almost \$112 million for thousands of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists who rely on selling their animals to buy cereals and other basic food for survival. In addition, the livestock/grains terms of exchange (TOE) continue to deteriorate at the expense of pastoralists and agro-pastoralists, due to high cereal prices. Compared with the last five years, the average has dropped by 3% in Djibo market (the country's largest livestock and round-up market) and by 22% in Youba market (retailing market). Farmers are therefore forced to sell more animals to buy the same amount of grain.

All these factors have severely degraded the food security situation. Partners indicate that certain provinces (Koumandjari, Gnagna in the East region) have very little or no food being sold in the weekly markets. According to the March 2018 Cadre Harmonisé, the projected situation for the lean season shows a 271% increase in the population affected by food insecurity (Phases 3 and 4) compared to the previous year, with 2,671,900 people "under stress" (Phase 2,); 864,177 people in "crisis" (Phase 3) and 90,138 people in "emergency" (Phase 4). People falling under Phase 3 and 4 total 954,315 persons and are mainly found in the Sahel (21%), East (18%), and Centre-West (17%) regions.

Malnutrition:

The nutritional situation, already characterized by high levels of malnutrition with "serious" and "critical" levels in some areas, had worsened in 2017, exacerbating existing vulnerabilities. The national Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rate has increased from 7.6% in 2016 to 8.6% in 2017, while the national Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) prevalence has increased from 1.4% to 2.0% (National Nutrition Survey, September 2017). An estimated 789,000 people are malnourished and in need of humanitarian assistance, including 187,177 children under five years old suffering from severe acute malnutrition who urgently require

immediate assistance to survive. Overall, 12 provinces (Oudalan, Kossi, Gourma, Tapoa, Tuy, Lorum, Zandoma, Seno, Soum, Yagha, loba and Yatenga) registered a GAM rate of above 10% (WHO's critical threshold) with the highest rate in Oudalan (Sahel) of 15%. This situation is expected to continue to deteriorate if early and sustained action is not taken. The 2018 estimated SAM burden is higher than in 2017 (Figure 2) and varies across and within regions. The Sahel, Est, Centre Nord and Nord regions registered the highest SAM burden, reaching 31,658, 21,280, 20,361 and 18,629 respectively, representing 49% of the national SAM caseload. Based on economic, security, and climate events from December 2017 to April 2018, and using the upper confidence interval figures of the projections made in 2017 to estimate a 2018 worst-case scenario, UNICEF is preparing for an additional 56,153 children affected by SAM – reaching a total of 243,330 children.

Insecurity:

Furthermore, escalating violence in the Sahel region of northern Burkina Faso has further compounded humanitarian needs increasingly complicating access for the delivery of assistance to those in need. Throughout 2017, attacks by non-state armed groups were concentrated in northern Burkina Faso, with 78 of the 89 incidents occurring there. The frequent attacks have triggered a surge in internal displacement. In recent months, an estimated 20,000 IDPs have sought refuge in Soum province and are in urgent need of life-saving assistance. Additionally, the complex situation in Mali has had a growing impact on the north of Burkina Faso. Close to 24,000 Malians live in two refugee camps in the Sahel region and out-of-camp in Soum and Oudalan. The delivery of humanitarian assistance to the refugees is jeopardized by the violence.

In March 2018, the Government sent a letter to the FAO Representative acknowledging that the situation in terms of Nutrition and Food Security had further worsened since the Government Response Plan to Support the Vulnerable Population (PRSPS in French) had been issued and called upon Nutrition and Food Security actors to work with the Government to respond.

Through joint planning with UN and NGOs, the Government has formulated in 2017 an Emergency Program for the Sahel region of Burkina (PUS), which appeals for 455.34 billion FCFA (\$819 million) from 2017 to 2020. The Government has also developed, with the contribution of FAO, UNICEF and WFP, as well as NGOs, and approved in March 2018, the Emergency Food Security Response Plan with a cost of 81.72 billion FCFA (\$147 million).

3. PRIORITIZATION PROCESS

Under the leadership of the Red Cross, partners jointly developed the overall CERF strategy following the Cadre Harmonisé results indicating a further deteriorating food security situation. Government, partners and UN agencies conducted a multi-sector joint assessment of the situation with the affected populations, particularly the pastoral and agro-pastoral communities, as well as local government authorities in the areas affected. The operations concept document of the food security sector partners took into consideration the suggestions and concerns from key stakeholders including the implementing and cooperating partners and donors.

The cooperating partners continued to discuss the targeting of beneficiaries and involvement of the communities in the planned response and interventions. Several factors were considered namely to ensure that the targeted communities are also informed of the services that they will be provided as well as the implementation of the projects. Existing community committees will be reinforced from the targeting process until the implementation, used to provide all information continuously and to be able to adapt the response to the evolving needs. Thus, the involvement of the Government, the partners, targeted communities, donors and relevant stakeholders was critical throughout the process.

The criteria used to select implementing partners for the CERF funding was based on their capacity and experience in the targeted areas and communities and who have direct knowledge of the areas have been privileged. To ensure efficiency and value for money, an audit system is in place within WFP. WFP will ensure that this audit system is applied as well for cooperating partners. Moreover, bidding process is established for any procurement issue. Furthermore, gender considerations have been given due consideration in the prioritization process by WFP through their gender strategy which has been defined by gender experts.

Prioritization for the CERF request was based on a four-step process, namely;

- I. Analysis of the most critical lifesaving needs which culminated into the elaboration by each sector of their individual strategies following consultations with Government, UN agencies and partners. This involved identification of the most vulnerable households and screening / identification of malnourished children under 5 years old and reference of the SAM cases to the centers covered by UNICEF to ensure the most appropriate treatment is provided.
- II. With the coordination support of OCHA, three agencies were identified, namely FAO, UNICEF and WFP and agreed to focus on food security including both food aid and livestock assistance and nutrition sectors as critical for the CERF funding.
- III. Further, it was agreed that CERF funding would target those regions in phases 3 and 4 according to the Cadre Harmonisé, with the highest levels of food insecurity in the country. For nutrition, the prioritization was based on the SMART approach, considering the villages exposed to food insecurity and the most vulnerable children suffering from MAM and SAM. To better focus the CERF interventions, WFP shared information on the targeted families with FAO regarding their pastoral situation.
- IV. For malnutrition, three regions (Sahel, Centre Nord and Est) with the highest incidence of both food insecurity and malnutrition were identified. The Sahel region (priority 1) takes precedence over the East and Centre Nord regions (priority 2) because of the high level of risk and vulnerability linked with insecurity that is specific to Sahel region and which is affecting the normal flow of economic goods, including food, and access of humanitarian actors to the population in need.

During the prioritization process, consideration was given to the established coordination mechanisms at all levels. This coordination ensured that the activities undertaken by the three agencies and their implementing partners, including those receiving funding through the CERF grant, respond to the objectives expressed in the Emergency and Resilience Plan and follow its sectoral response strategies. Since the plan was developed in a joint manner by Government and NGOs and UN agencies from the affected sectors, coordination mechanisms of the different actors ensure consistency in the interventions including CERF and adequation to the agreed sectoral and overall response strategy.

More importantly, the three agencies requesting the CERF (WFP, UNICEF and FAO) had agreed to merge their different coordination structures into one, following the signing of a joint letter, on 16 January, committing to increased synergy and complementarity. Critical decisions were also taken to reinforce coordination between the involved state structures, mainly the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Agriculture (Secretariat Executif pour la Securite Alimentaire) to reinforce coordination between the state structures, the UN and the NGOs not only to develop the response plan but also to adopt a common strategy to identify the beneficiaries to be targeted, to establish a mapping of the interventions, and to coordinate the monitoring of activities. This proved useful in the implementation of the CERF grant.

4. CERF RESULTS

The CERF allocation of US\$ 9,015,030 million for drought in Burkina Faso made it possible for UN agencies and implementing partners to address the life-saving food and nutrition assistance to about 90,650 people in the areas most affected by targeting the most critical needs for the benefit of the most vulnerable populations/communities whilst strengthening coordination among humanitarian actors, NGOs and government actors. The multisectoral and coordinated approached used during implementation of the CERF grant ensure greater complementarity and synergy. Overall, the CERF allocation was of great importance as it served as a catalyst to alert the donor community to the alarming levels of food insecurity and malnutrition situation, most worrying in the areas affected by insecurity.

Food Security - Food Aid -WFP

CERF Funding allowed WFP and its partners to provide much needed assistance to 82,600 vulnerable persons including 42,952 women and 39,648 men with assistance in three of the four priority areas (Centre north, East and Sahel regions). Due to low food availability in local markets and high food prices in the targeted areas (as evidenced by the market analysis), in-kind food

assistance was provided to beneficiaries. The monthly ration consisted of 12 kg of cereals, 3 kg of pulses and 0.75 kg of oil, per person. A total of 2,562 mt of cereals, 735 mt of pulse and 248 mt of vegetable oil were distributed to the vulnerable population. Throughout the project implementation, WFP ensured that the needs of women, men, girls and boys were met equally, through targeting a female participation rate of a minimum of 50 percent. During this period, 52 percent of beneficiaries who received targeted food assistance were women. A coordination framework gathering humanitarian actors was set up to ensure adequate assistance was provided to affected persons during the lean season. This helped to avoid duplication, address gaps and better harmonize targeting and data collection.

Food Security - Livestock - FAO

Project 18-RR-FAO-015, entitled OSRO/ BKF/802/CHA "Emergency Assistance to Vulnerable Pastoralists and Agropastoralists Affected by the Pastoral Crisis in Burkina Faso" was implemented by FAO from June 2018 to March 2019 in the Sahel, North Central and East Regions of Burkina Faso. This was done in collaboration with the regional departments of the Ministry of Livestock and NGOs and local associations in the beneficiary regions.

The project provided 6850 households, including 1565 female-headed households, with (i) the vaccination of more than 13617 cattle and 36721 small ruminants; (ii) the distribution of 1.39 t of livestock feed and 19 t of licking stone; and (iii) capacity building in animal nutrition and health.

The project's contributions made it possible to (i) secure herds by limiting sales and deaths, (ii) avoid soaring livestock feed prices on local markets, (iii) fatten certain animals before sale, (iv) preserve the labour force of draught animals and (v) maintain milk production in households.

Nutrition (Under 5 years) - UNICEF

Through this CERF funding, UNICEF and its partners provided nutritional screening of 2,143 children under five; referred 256 malnourished children for treatment; trained 7 staff in management of severe malnutrition; provided nutritional supplies and equipment benefiting estimated 300 children; provided education on nutrition to 634 pregnant and lactating women; and sensitized 75 community support facilitators on infant feeding practices. The project assisted a total of 26,344 people and allowed for maintaining the malnutrition indicators within the SPHERE standards.

Nutrition - WFP

WFP and its partners through this CERF UFE, assisted a total of 50,706 people during the lean season (June to September) a period during which people living in rural areas adopt various strategies to feed themselves and their families as they live on their food reserve until the next harvest. This allowed to maintain the malnutrition indicators within the SPHERE standards (95.63%) in the Centre North, East and Sahel regions

5. PEOPLE REACHED

CERF funding boosted resilience building activities for the most vulnerable populations. To maximize the impact of these interventions and the number of persons reached, the approach used was a multisectoral one, aimed at linking the emergency response with ongoing development projects. The activities implemented with the CERF funds therefore served to reinforce the capabilities of the partners while at the same time seeking to ensure ownership by the communities, thus strengthening resilience. The complementarity of the food distribution interventions by WFP with support of the livelihoods (agricultural and pastoral) by FAO will also contribute to strengthen population resilience before future shocks. Furthermore, WFP was able to assist more beneficiaries (50,706) than planned because of the dollar fluctuation that allowed to purchase more nutritional products for blanket feeding.

To avoid duplication when it came the number of people to be targeted for the CERF funding, FAO was able to purchase animal feeds and to sensitize pastoralists and agro-pastoralists on livestock flock management to mitigate against substantial loss of animals. The funding therefore boosted the available existing resources (\$500 000) and allowed FAO to increase its coverage from 0,9% to 26,32% of the total urgent needs for pastoralists and agro-pastoralist affected by the crisis. Similarly, to counter the malnutrition situation, CERF funding was critical in providing life-saving treatment to the most vulnerable children suffering

from SAM in the prioritized areas. As a result, UNICEF was able to cover up to almost 50% of the total need of the targeted areas, treating 36,650 children.

| 18-RR-BFA-30726 TABLE 4: NUMBER OF PEOPLE DIRECTLY ASSISTED WITH CERF FUNDING BY SECTOR | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|--------|
| | | Female | | | Male | | | Total | |
| Cluster/Sector | Girls (< 18) | Women (≥ 18) | Total | Boys (< 18) | Men (≥ 18) | Total | Children (< 18) | Adults (≥ 18) | Total |
| Food Security - Food Aid | 32,356 | 10,596 | 42,952 | 30,267 | 9,381 | 39,648 | 62,623 | 19,977 | 82,600 |
| Food Security - Livestock | 11,797 | 9,575 | 21,372 | 11,383 | 8,345 | 19,728 | 23,180 | 17,920 | 41,100 |
| Nutrition - Nutrition | 37,190 | 12,723 | 49,913 | 37,443 | 0 | 37,443 | 74,633 | 12,723 | 87,356 |

| 18-RR-BFA-30726 TABLE 5: TOTAL NUMBER OF PEOPLE DIRECTLY ASSISTED WITH CERF FUNDING | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|---------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|---------|
| | Female | | | Male | | | Total | | |
| | Girls (< 18) | Women (≥ 18) | Total | Boys (< 18) | Men (≥ 18) | Total | Children (< 18) | Adults (≥ 18) | Total |
| Planned | 58,503 | 25,344 | 83,847 | 63,061 | 14,255 | 77,316 | 121,564 | 39,599 | 161,163 |
| Reached | 81,343 | 32,894 | 114,237 | 79,093 | 17,726 | 96,819 | 160,436 | 50,620 | 211,056 |

| 18-RR-BFA-30726 TABLE 6: PEOPLE DIRECTLY ASSISTED WITH CERF FUNDING BY CATEGORY | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|--|--|--|
| Category | Number of people (Planned) | Number of people (Reached) | | | |
| Refugees | 4,000 | 4,000 | | | |
| IDPs | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Host population | 152,163 | 207,056 | | | |
| Affected people (none of the above) | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Total (same as in table 5) | 161,163 | 211,056 | | | |

6. CERF's ADDED VALUE

| a) | Did CERF funds lead to a <u>fast delivery of assistance</u> to people in need? | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| | YES 🖂 | PARTIALLY [| NO 🗌 | | | | |
| The implementation of CERF funding activities has made it possible to respond quickly to the needs of the population in the p sectors. In terms of agricultural, CERF funds made it possible to assist more than 6,500 pastoralist and agro-pastoralist house during the 2017/2018 pastoral crisis period, including 1,000 refugees affected by the pastoral crisis and food insecurity in the S North and Central North regions. CERF has enabled a rapid response for food assistance to severely food insecure families. On the needs of 45 million, the CERF had contributed around 5 million, which is a little more than 10%. The added value in this rewas in the fast delivery of the food assistance to those most in need. | | | | | | | |
| | responses and linkage with ongoing de | esilience building activities for the most vulnivelopment projects. This in turn served to reinstrain by the communities, thus strengthening | force the capabilities of the partners while at | | | | |

distribution interventions by WFP with support of the livelihoods (agricultural and pastoral) by FAO also contributed to strengthening population resilience before future shocks.

CERF funding for nutrition made it possible to provide fast delivery of nutritional assistance to children aged 6 to 59 months who were victims of severe acute malnutrition. The fund replaced the input stocks used by partners to provide an emergency nutritional response in the targeted areas. CERF funding has also helped to strengthen the capacity of health personnel to manage common diseases in targeted areas, strengthen the number of quality staff in health facilities, provide health facilities with emergency health kits, distribute MILDAs and condoms and monitor diseases with epidemic potential in sites for internally displaced persons. In another example, CERF funding has improved community and specialized care mechanisms for beneficiaries, including the systematization of case referrals (assistance) and the rapid acquisition of post-rape and dignity kits.

| | | rapid acquisition of post-rape and dignity kits. | or beneficiaries, including the systematization | | |
|----|--|--|---|--|--|
| b) | Did CERF funds help respond to tin | ne-critical needs? | | | |
| | YES 🖂 | PARTIALLY 🗌 | NO 🗌 | | |
| | allowed many households to have ad The provision of financing before the le further. This livestock aid covered the of against pasteurellosis in cattle and sm The CERF funding helped reduce the t | ingage in activities that have improved their income equate food and livestock and enable them to see an season was timely in preventing the food situal distribution of 1389,375 tons of livestock feed, 162 all ruminants, deworming of animals and vaccinate tensions that existed within some households. The land their livestock, thereby reducing the impaing to feel over-stretched. | end their children to school at a critical time. ation of several households from deteriorating 250 kg of licking stone, vaccination of livestock tion of 85000 small ruminants against plague. rough the project's intervention, much needed | | |
| c) | Did CERF improve coordination am | ongst the humanitarian community? | | | |
| | YES 🖂 | PARTIALLY 🗌 | NO 🗌 | | |
| | CERF funding has improved coordination within the humanitarian community both in the prioritization process and implementation of the projects both at national and local levels. For example, in the elaboration of the operations concept document, partners too into consideration the suggestions and concerns from all key stakeholders including the implementing and cooperating partners are donours. There were a number of coordination meetings in-country amongst the cooperating partners to discuss the targeting beneficiaries and involvement of the communities in the planned response and interventions. All sectors worked to ensure there we an integrated response in an effort to maximize the impact of their interventions. The different coordination structures of the agencies involved were merged into one to avoid duplication and ensure synergy and complementarity. The decision to reinforce coordination with the government entities, NGOs and key partners was an added value of the CERF. | | | | |
| d) | Did CERF funds help improve resor | urce mobilization from other sources? | | | |
| | YES 🗌 | PARTIALLY 🖂 | NO 🗌 | | |
| | evolving and highly volatile situation | oonse is that it has made it possible to draw the a in Burkina Faso. Other funding (though limite situation and address growing needs, in accorda | ed), has been raised from other sources to | | |
| e) | | ways in which CERF has added value to the e household income through the practice of fatte , etc. | | | |

7. LESSONS LEARNED

| TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u> | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Lessons learned | Suggestion for follow-up/improvement | | | |
| The late arrival of additional funds from other sources in addition to the CERF affected the amount of assistance provided to some households as initially planned for the overall humanitarian response. | It is highly desirable that other donors participate in the strategic and coherent planning of the humanitarian response and other sources of funding as a complement to CERF encouraged in a timely manner. | | | |
| The main constraints that impacted project implementation related to access due to insecurity and poor road conditions in the targeted areas, availability of products in the already stressed markets, insufficient funding for the overall response. | Despite the threats of land mines, local transporters had indicated their ability to transport goods in the Soum and Oudalan provinces. The transporters are well known by the authorities and respective communities can get real-time information from them. As follow up and to mitigate against this risk, less preferred roads can be utilized as a safety measure, however bearing in mind that this would require added time and costs to the transportation of assistance to those in need. | | | |
| The level of insecurity in the Sahel and East regions had led to the temporary closure of some health centres; namely: - In February 2019, four health facilities are closed in Sahel Region, 10 had reduced activities and 20 are at risk of closure considering their situation close to border. - The situation remains unknown in East region The lesson learned was that the situation had a negative impact on access to health and nutrition services by the population. | There needs to be more advocacy to ensure there is access to the vulnerable populations. For the CERF nutrition project, the strategy for SAM treatment had been adopted at community level with CBHW and 42 sites were put in place in insecure zones of Sahel Region. | | | |
| Delays in procurement of RUTF due to the production capacity of the local supplier who had previously received a large amount of order from UNICEF with other donors. This had led to a delay in treatment of SAM children. Nonetheless, UNICEF ensured 100% of expenditure of allocated CERF funds prior to the expiry date. | At end of January 2019, 17,800 cartons of RUTF were distributed to treat 19,778 SAM children. The remaining quantity of 16,950 cartons will allow to treat 18,833 SAM children in February and March 2019. Distribution of the remaining quantities of RUTF had been done to ensure treatment of 18,833 SAM children in February and March 2019. | | | |
| Nationally, the estimated caseload for SAM children for 2018 was 187,177, and 94,903 SAM children have been treated at end of December 2018, a proportion of 51% of targeted. Potential causes of this situation could be the fact that the effect of the nutrition crisis in Burkina Faso proved to be less than what was expected, or the effect of deteriorating security on access to quality nutrition interventions in Sahel, Nord, and Est regions. The other factors could be linked to the weak referral system of screened children to nutrition services and insufficient communication around the CMAM program to population leaving far from health facilities | Followed up with enhanced supervision missions by health districts teams to improve the quality of screening of acute malnutrition with CBHW and strengthen the organization of referral system of SAM children to treatment centres. | | | |

| TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| Lessons learned | Responsible entity | | | | |
| The question of reporting language was raised by some agencies that manage several reports, most of which were in English. | Agree that the language of proposal and report writing should be in French for Burkina Faso and that agencies should take steps to this effect. | L' Equipe Humanitaire- Développement Pays (EHDP) | | | |
| Planning figures for interventions were submitted with delays by the Government and this subsequently delayed the delivery of assistance in some targetted areas. | Early preparation with the Government is essential to agree on planning figures and accelerate delivery of assistance given the time-critical nature of the CERF Grant. | L' Equipe Humanitaire- Développement Pays (EHDP) | | | |

| Following a series of attacks by non-state armed groups in some of th taegtted areas and the hijacking of humanitarian vehicles, WFP organized awareness campaigns in three provinces in the Sahel region (Oudalan, Séno and Soum) and one in Centre-North (Sanmatenga). All these efforts contributed to secure interventions in the field. Humanitarian principles were presented in regular discussions with the authorities, traditional and religious leaders, through local radio stations and awareness raising activities were conducted by cooperating partners. | To mitigate against security risks, awareness campaigns and advocacy surrounding humanitarian principles (humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence) need to be regularly organized in insecure zones that also corresponded to priority regions and provinces for humanitarian interventions. | L' Equipe Humanitaire- Développement Pays (EHDP) |
|--|--|---|
| Increased and well coordinated food assistance interventions allowed for optimal use of resources mobilized by all humanitarian actors. | To strengthen the system to reduce delays in providing humanitarian food assistance (targeting process). In addition, to encourage timely contributions from other donors sources. | L' Equipe Humanitaire- Développement Pays (EHDP) |
| From August to October, WFP elaborated and shared a progress report on the CERF implementation three times a week. | This practice needs to become systematic to allow for better manage the response and to have better accountability. | L' Equipe Humanitaire- Développement Pays (EHDP) and Food Security Sector |
| With WFP's internal advance mechanisms and prepositioning of food stocks acquired through the Global Commodity Management Facility (GCMF), a timely response in some regions. Advances helped to: • reduce the gap that could have been registered between the time a contribution is confirmed and food distribution to beneficiaries; • pre-finance the purchase of food commodities until contributions were effectively received; • prepositioning food commodities at strategic handover locations, especially those that become inaccessible in July due to poor road conditions caused by the heavy rains. | This practice needs to continued inorder to increase the efficiency of imlementation and avoid delays. | L' Equipe Humanitaire- Développement Pays (EHDP) and Food Security sector |

PART II

8. PROJECT REPORTS

8.1 Project Report 18-RR-FAO-015 - FAO

| 1. Project Information | | | | | | | |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Agenc | y: | FAO | 2. Country: | Burkina Faso | | | |
| 3. Cluste | r/Sector: | Food Security - Livestock | 4. Project Code (CERF): | 18-RR-FAO-015 | | | |
| 5. Project | t Title: | nes de la crise pastorale au | | | | | |
| 6.a Origin | nal Start Date: | 07/06/2018 | 6.b Original End Date: | 06/12/2018 | | | |
| 6.c. No-c | ost Extension: | 06/03/2019 | | | | | |
| | all activities conclu NCE date) | | | | | | |
| | a. Total requiren | US\$ 5,700 000 | | | | | |
| | b. Total funding | US\$ 1,535 022 | | | | | |
| | c. Amount receiv | US\$ 1,035,022 | | | | | |
| 7. Funding | d. Total CERF fu | US\$ 156 548 | | | | | |
| 7. F | Governme | ent Partners | US\$ 38,676 | | | | |
| | Internation | nal NGOs | US\$ 14,734 | | | | |
| | National N | /GOs | | US\$ 103,138 | | | |
| | Red Cross | s/Crescent | US\$ 0 | | | | |

2. Project Results Summary/Overall Performance

Le projet 18-RR-FAO-015, intitulé OSRO/ BKF/802/CHA « Assistance d'urgence aux pasteurs et agropasteurs vulnérables victimes de la crise pastorale au Burkina Faso » a été mis en œuvre par la FAO de Juin 2018 à Mars de 2019 dans les Régions du Sahel, du Centre Nord et de l'Est du Burkina Faso. Cela a été fait en collaboration avec les directions régionales du ministère en charge de l'élevage et des ONGs et associations locales des régions bénéficiaires.

Le projet a permis à 6850 ménages, dont 1565 ménages dirigés par des femmes, de bénéficier (i) de la vaccination de plus de 13617 bovins et 36721 petits ruminants ; (ii) de la distribution de 1,39 t d'aliment bétail et 19 t de pierre à lécher, (iii) du renforcement de capacités en alimentation et santé des animaux.

Les apports du projet ont permis de (i) sécuriser les troupeaux en limitant les ventes et les mortalités, (ii) éviter la flambée des prix de l'aliment bétail sur les marchés locaux, (iii) mettre en embouche certains animaux avant la vente, (iv) de préserver la force de travail des animaux de trait et ; (v) maintenir la production du lait dans les ménages.









Lancement de la campagne de vaccination

Distribution des pierres à lécher

Distribution de l'aliment bétail

3. Changes and Amendments

Initialement prévu pour être mis en œuvre de juin à décembre 2018, le Projet OSRO/BKF/CHA a connu des difficultés dans sa mise en œuvre. Il s'agit principalement de l'insécurité dans certaines zones et le retard dans les achats des intrants zoosanitaires. Les appels d'offres ont été repris trois fois pour insuffisance de fournisseurs. Ceci a occasionné le retard dans la mise en œuvre de certaines activités à savoir (i) Prophylaxie et déparasitage des animaux des bénéficiaires, (ii) Suiviévaluation de la santé des animaux ; (iii) Renforcement des capacités des pasteurs et agro-pasteurs en soins sanitaires et en hygiène des habitats des animaux ; (v) Distribution des pierres à lécher.

Au regard de cette situation, la FAO a bénéficié auprès du CERF d'une prolongation sans coût jusqu'au 06 mars 2019 pour mener à bien les différentes activités restantes. Cette prolongation a permis de cibler en plus 350 bénéficiaires amenant ainsi le nombre de ménages bénéficiaires de 6500 initialement prévu à 6850.

4. People Reached

6850 ménages pasteurs et agropasteurs dont 1000 ménages réfugiés soit 41100 personnes ont bénéficié de l'appui du CERF. Parmi les ménages on dénombre 1565 ménages dirigés par des femmes et 70 ménages dirigés par des jeunes.



Vues partielles des bénéficiaires dans les Régions de l'Est et du Sahel

4a. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by age group and sex

| | | Female | | Male | | | Total | | |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|--------|
| | Girls (< 18) | Women (≥ 18) | Total | Boys (< 18) | Men (≥ 18) | Total | Children (< 18) | Adults (≥ 18) | Total |
| Planned | 10,624 | 8,616 | 19,240 | 10,244 | 7,516 | 17,760 | 20,868 | 16,132 | 37,000 |
| Reached | 11,797 | 9,575 | 21,372 | 11,383 | 8,345 | 19,728 | 23,180 | 17,920 | 41,100 |

4b. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by category

| Category | Number of people (Planned) | Number of people (Reached) |
|----------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Refugees | 4,000 | 4,000 |
| IDPs | 0 | 0 |

| Host population | 33,000 | 37,100 |
|---|--|--|
| Affected people (none of the above) | 0 | 0 |
| Total (same as in 4a) | 37,000 | 41,100 |
| In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons: | L'écart enregistré entre la programmatio l'augmentation du nombre de ménages b prolongation sans coût. | n et les résultats enregistrés est dû à énéficiaires (350) obtenus au cours de la |

5. CERF Result Framework

Project objective

Improving food security and saving lives by restoring livestock production capacities of vulnerable households affected by the pastoral crisis and food insecurity in the Sahel, North-Central and Eastern regions of Burkina Faso (Améliorer la sécurité alimentaire et sauver des vies en restaurant les capacités productives en élevage des ménages vulnérables affectés par la crise pastorale et l'insécurité alimentaire dans les régions du Sahel, du Centre Nord et de l'Est du Burkina Faso).

| Output 1 | 6,500 ménages vulnérables reçoivent de l'aliment bétail pour la période de soudure pastorale dans les zones ciblés par le projet | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|---------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Indicators | Description | Target | | Achieved | Source of verification | | | |
| Indicator 1.1 | Nombre de ménages vulnérables bénéficiaires des distributions de l'aliment bétail | 6500 | | 6850 | Rapports des partenaires, rapport du projet | | | |
| Explanation o | f output and indicators variance: | | enages de plus ont été ciblés au cours de la prolongation sans coût du projet ecevoir de la Pierre à lecher pour leurs animaux | | | | | |
| Activities | Description | | Implem | ented by | | | | |
| Activity 1.1 | Sélection des ONG partenaires et signature d | e contrat | FAO | | | | | |
| Activity 1.2 | Identifications et validations des listes des bénéficiaires | | | Partenaires techniques (DRRAH Centre Nord, Sahel et Est) et partenaires opérationnels (REACH Italia, SERACOM, CRUS dans la Région du Sahel; ATAD, AZND et ABN dans la Région du Centre Nord et ATT dansla Région de l'Est) | | | | |
| Activity 1.3 | Préparation et lancement des dossiers d l'achat d'aliment bétail | "appel d"offre pour | FAO | | | | | |
| Activity 1.4 | Achat d"aliment bétail | | FAO | | | | | |
| Activity 1.5 | Distribution d"aliment bétail | | | Partenaires opérationnels (REACH Italia, SERACON CRUS dans la Région du Sahel; ATAD, AZND et ABN dar la Région du Centre Nord et ATT dansla Région de l'Est) | | | | |
| Activity 1.6 | Formation, suivi et encadrement technique en collaboration avec les services techniques de l'Etat | | | Partenaires techniques (DRRAH Centre Nord, Sahel et Est) | | | | |
| Activity 1.7 | Suivi post-distribution et évaluation de l'intervention | | | FAO, Partenaires techniques (DRRAH Centre Nord, Sa et Est) et partenaires opérationnels (REACH It SERACOM, CRUS dans la Région du Sahel; ATAD, Az et ABN dans la Région du Centre Nord et ATT dan Région de l'Est) | | | | |

| Output 2 | 6,500 ménages vulnérables reçoivent une couverture sanitaire de leurs animaux |
|----------|---|
|----------|---|

| Indicators | Description | Target | | Achieved | | Source o | f verif | ication |
|---------------|---|---|-----------------|---|-----------|---------------|---------|---------------|
| Indicator 1.1 | Nombre d'animaux vaccinés et déparasités | Au moins 19,500 bovins 32,500 petits rumina ont été vaccinés déparasités | | 13617 bovins et Petits ruminants o vaccinés et dépara | ont été | opération | niques | et rapport |
| Explanation o | f output and indicators variance: | Il y a eu finalement m a permis de vacciner les personnes vulnéra | plus de ¡ | petits ruminants. Ce | la pourra | ient s'expliq | | |
| Activities | Description | | | lemented by | | | | |
| Activity 2.1 | Préparation et lancement des dossiers d'appe des actes sanitaires | I d"offre pour l'achat | FAO | | | | | |
| Activity 2.2 | Achat des actes sanitaires FAO | | FAO | | | | | |
| Activity 2.3 | Prophylaxies et déparasitage des animaux des bénéficiaires | | | aires techniques | (DRRAI | H Centre I | Nord, | Sahel et |
| Activity 2.4 | Suivi-évaluation de la santé des animaux | | | aires techniques | (DRRAI | H Centre I | Nord, | Sahel et |
| Activity 2.5 | Renforcement des capacités des pasteurs soins sanitaires et en hygiène des habitats | | Partena Est) | aires techniques | (DRRAI | H Centre I | Nord, | Sahel et |

6. Accountability to Affected People

A) Project design and planning phase:

Le Burkina Faso a connu au cours de la campagne 2017/2018 des poches de sécheresses en plus des attaques des chenilles légionnaires d'automne. Cela a entrainé une faible disponibilité alimentaire du bétail dans 15 provinces situées dans les régions du Sahel, du Centre-Nord, du Nord, de l'Est et du Centre-Ouest. Face à ce déficit fourrager le Ministère des Ressources Animales et Halieutiques dans son plan de réponse et de soutien aux éleveurs exposés au effets de la campagne agropastorale 2017-2018, estime à au moins 207 150 têtes de bovins et de 831 742 têtes de petits ruminants pourraient en mourir si aucun appui n'est apporté aux pasteurs et agropasteurs. Cette perte pourrait s'évaluer à 59 442 091 907 FCFA (111 896 262 USD). Les populations qui seront les plus touchées sont très pauvres et leur nombre avoisinerait à environ 954 315 personnes. Sur cette base, la FAO a obtenu auprès de CERF un appui financier à hauteur de 1 035 022 USD (579 612 320 FCFA) pour venir en aide aux pasteurs et agropasteurs victimes de la crise pastorale dans les Régions du Centre-Nord, du Sahel et de l'Est.

Cette phase a durée de février à Juin 2018.









Vue des élévages en période de crise pastorale

B) Project implementation phase :

L'identification des partenaires opérationnels s'est faite par la FAO avec le concours des partenaires techniques des zones d'intervention du projet. Après l'identification des partenaires de mise en œuvre du projet, des protocoles d'accord de mise en œuvre ont été établis avec ces partenaires. S'en sont suivis des séances d'informations, de sensibilisation sur les activités du projet avec ces partenaires techniques et opérationnels ainsi qu'aux autorités régionales, provinciales, départementales et communales.

Par la suite, l'identification des bénéficiaires a été faite suivant l'approche HEA (Household Economy Approach). Les critères supplémentaires suivants ont été utilisés : (i) Etre un ménage vulnérable dans une commune à risque d'insécurité alimentaire et nutritionnel et à déficit fourragers et reconnu comme tel par sa communauté ; (ii) Avoir un cheptel composé au maximum de 5 bovins et 10 petits ruminants (ovins/caprins) ; (iii) Priorité aux femmes chefs de ménages. Cette identification a été participative et connu les étapes suivantes : (i) la prise de contact ; (ii) le listing des ménages ; (iii) la tenue de l'assemblée villageoise ; (iv) la catégorisation des ménages et croisement des résultats des comités de ciblage ; (v) la validation communautaire définitive des listes et enregistrement des données ; (iv) Identification des bénéficiaires populations réfugiées par le HCR.

Un comité de plaintes a été mis en place dans chaque village bénéficiaire pour recueillir les doléances des doléances et leur apporter des solutions dans la mesure de leur possibilité.

La phase de mise en œuvre a duré de juin 2018 à mars 2019.

C) Project monitoring and evaluation:

Le suivi évaluation du projet a été assuré à plusieurs niveaux :

- Les partenaires techniques et opérationnels ont assuré le suivi quotidien dans la mise en œuvre des activités et à travers des missions de suivi des activités des bénéficiaires suite au différents appuis (aliments, vaccination déparasitage, formations). Dans les rapports finaux chaque partenaire a réaliser sa propre évaluation des effets du projet.
- L'équipe de projet à toute les étapes cruciales du projet (identification des bénéficiaires, planification des activité, période post distribution a réalisé des missions de suivi avec les sous bureaux de la FAO implantés dans les régions.

A la fin de la mise en oeuvre du projet, la FAO a organisé, en collaboration avec les partenaires techniques et opérationnels, des focus groups pour une évaluation participative des résultats du projet.

| 7. Cas | h-Based Interven | tions | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 7.a Did t | the project include | one or more Cash Based I | ntervention(| s) (CBI)? | | | | |
| Planned | | | Act | Actual | | | | |
| No | | | No | No | | | | |
| 7.b Please specify below the parameters of the CBI modality/ies used. If more than one modality was used in the project, please complete separate rows for each modality. Please indicate the estimated value of cash that was transferred to people assisted through each modality (best estimate of the value of cash and/or vouchers, not including associated delivery costs). Please refer to the guidance and examples above. | | | | | | | | |
| CBI moda | ality | Value of cash (US\$) | a. Obje | ctive | b. Conditionality | c. Restriction | | |
| No | | | | | | | | |
| Supplemen | ntary information (optio | nal) | | | | | | |

| 8. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? | |
|---|--------------------------|
| Les bénéficiaires du projet sont unanimes sur la pertinence de l'activité. L'alimentation est essentielle pour la survie des animaux en période de crise alimentaire du bétail. Le projet a été | EVALUATION CARRIED OUT 🖂 |
| très significatif car il a permis non seulement de sauver plusieurs animaux des bénéficiaires mais | EVALUATION PENDING |
| aussi de venir en aide aux non bénéficiaires. Le projet a permis de sécuriser le reste du troupeau en limitant les ventes d'un certain nombre pour s'approvisionner en aliment bétail. Cependant, la période de livraison des aliments bétail a été diversement appréciée car ils ont été livrés après la période de soudure pastorale. La mise en œuvre du projet a eu un impact positif sur le prix de l'aliment bétail au niveau du marché. L'apport en aliment a permis de mettre en embouche | NO EVALUATION PLANNED |

certains animaux, ce qui a contribué à augmenter leurs revenus; le lait produit a été autoconsommé et le surplus a été vendu.

Les actions qui seront prises pour une éventuelle crise: (i) déstockage des animaux, (ii) pratique de la culture fourragère, (iii) constitution de stock de fourrage naturel, de sous-produits agroindustriels et de résidus de récolte et (iv) amélioration du rationnement des animaux.



Séances d'évaluation du projet avec les bénéficiaires

8.2 Project Report 18-RR-CEF-060 - UNICEF

| 1. Project Information | | | | | | | |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|--|
| 1. Agency: | | UNICEF | 2. Country: | Burkina Faso | | | |
| 3. Cluste | r/Sector: | 4. Project Code (CERF): | 18-RR-CEF-060 | | | | |
| 5. Project | t Title: | for Children under five years old | | | | | |
| 6.a Origin | nal Start Date: | 07/06/2018 | 6.b Original End Date: | 06/12/2018 | | | |
| 6.c. No-c | ost Extension: | ☐ No ⊠ Yes | if yes, specify revised end date: | 02/16/2019 | | | |
| 6.d Were all activities concluded by the end date? (including NCE date) | | | | | | | |
| | a. Total requiren | US\$ 15,530,000 | | | | | |
| | b. Total funding | US\$ 3,813,247 | | | | | |
| | c. Amount receiv | US\$ 3,000,000 | | | | | |
| 7. Funding | d. Total CERF fu of which to: | US\$961,030.37 | | | | | |
| 7 | Governme | US\$ 618,315.62 | | | | | |
| | Internation | | | US\$ 342,714.75 | | | |
| | ■ National N | | | US\$ 0 | | | |
| | Red Cross | VCrescent | | US\$ 0 | | | |

2. Project Results Summary/Overall Performance

UNICEF has used the CERF funds through the provision of systematic treatment and Ready to Use Therapeutic Food, in Burkina Faso, management and distribution of nutrition supplies is led by the national CAMEG. In the meantime, efforts will be made to strengthen district-level warehousing and management systems, as well as improve traceability of supplies both at regional and district levels. In parallel, adequate SAM treatment will be supported via regular and proactive supervisions at different levels targeting heath agents and community health workers. To avoid RUTF and other essential medicines stock-outs, UNICEF will carry out field visits for supply planning and pipeline monitoring. UNICEF will also make sure that RUTF buffer-stock is available in all targeted regions. A joint mission (MoH, UNICEF and WFP) will be conducted in the three regions in order to follow up progresses of the nutritional response.

With regards to coordination, UNICEF will chair and coordinate the Nutrition cluster group as the national platform for knowledge sharing and coordination at national level and at decentralized level.

The beneficiaries include 36,500 children (20,736 boys and 15,914 girls) under 5 years old affected by severe acute malnutrition. More specifically 15,833 children under five years old are targeted in the Sahel region, 10,638 and 10,180 children will be reached in the Est and Centre-Nord respectively. These targeted children will benefit from SAM treatment at health center level. In Burkina Faso, the Integrated Management of Acute Malnutrition scaling-up plan (2011-2015) has been implemented nationwide. Children will also benefit from nutrition screening through mass campaigns activities alongside with community screening using "MUAC by mothers" approach. The concept behind this latter approach is to train mothers to regularly screen their children for acute malnutrition by measuring MUAC and checking for oedema. Involving mothers in nutrition screening activities recognizes the fact that they are best placed to identify early signs of malnutrition and empowers them to protect and promote their child"s health. WHZ and MUAC will be used as a selection criterion for admissions of children aged from 6 months to 5 years (W/H - W/L <-3 Z score (WHO standards) or MUAC < 115 mm or Presence of bilateral oedema).

3. Changes and Amendments

- Increased level of insecurity in some regions of Burkina Faso has led to temporary closure of some health facilities. As of this write up (February 2019), in Sahel Region where the security situation is worsening, out of 109 health facilities, 4 health facilities are closed, 10 had reduced activities and 20 are at considerable risk of closure considering their situation close to the border with Niger and Mali. This situation is reducing access to nutrition services to SAM children. A strategy of treatment of SAM children with community-based health workers has been experienced in the most insecure areas in Sahel region to reduce this gap.
- Nationally, the estimated caseload for SAM children for 2018 was 187,177 (based on SMART 2017), however 94,630 SAM children had been admitted and treated during year 2018, which represent 50.5% of the targeted number. In the three targeted regions, 35,883 SAM children were admitted out of 73,299 estimated caseload which represent 49%. Potential causes of the low coverage could be the fact that the effect of the nutrition crisis in Burkina Faso proved to be less than what was expected, or the effect of deteriorating security on access to quality nutrition interventions in Sahel, North and East regions. The other factors could be linked to the weak referral system of screened children to nutrition services and insufficient communication around the CMAM program to population leaving far from health facilities.
- Delay in procurement of RUTF due to the production capacity of the local supplier who had previously received a large amount of order from UNICEF with other donors (ECHO, etc.). This had led to a delay in treatment of SAM children with therapeutic products from this Grant, which started in October 2018 and will continue during the first quarter of 2019. Nevertheless, UNICEF had ensured 100% of expenditure of allocated CERF funds prior to the expiry date.

4. People Reached

4a. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by age group and sex

| | Female | | | Male | | | Total | | |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|--------|--------------------|----------------------|--------|
| | Girls (< 18) | Women (≥ 18) | Total | Boys (< 18) | Men (≥ 18) | Total | Children (< 18) | Adults (≥ 18) | Total |
| Planned | 15,914 | 0 | 15,914 | 20,736 | 0 | 20,736 | 36,650 | 0 | 36,650 |
| Reached | 18,692 | 0 | 18,692 | 17,958 | 0 | 17,958 | 36,650 | 0 | 36,650 |

4b. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by category

| Category | Number of people (Planned) | Number of people (Reached) |
|--|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Refugees | 0 | 0 |
| IDPs | 0 | 0 |
| Host population | 36,650 | 36,650 |
| Affected people (none of the above) | 0 | 0 |
| Total (same as in 4a) | 36,650 | 36,650 |
| In case of significant discrepancy between | | |

In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:

N/A

5. CERF Result Framework

Project objective

Contribute to the reduction of mortality and morbidity through life saving treatment for under 5 SAM children in the Sahel, East and Centre-Nord regions

| Output 1 | Assured availability and provisions of nutrition supply for quality SAM treatment (without complication) | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|--------|----------------|----------|------------------------|--|--|
| Indicators | Description | Target | | Achieved | Source of verification | | |
| Indicator 1.1 | Number of RUTF cartons locally procured and distributed | 34,000 | | 34,000 | Rapport d'activité | | |
| Indicator 1.2 | Number of Scale, electronic, mother/child, 150kgx100g procured and distributed | 200 | | 200 | Rapport d'activité | | |
| Indicator 1.3 | Number of Portable baby/child L-hgt mea.syst procured and distributed | 200 | | 200 | Rapport d'activité | | |
| Explanation o | f output and indicators variance: | N/A | | | | | |
| Activities | Description | | Implemented by | | | | |
| Activity 1.1 | Procurement of 34,000 RUTF cartons | | UNICEF | | | | |
| Activity 1.2 | Procurement of 200 electronic scales | | UNICE | F | | | |
| Activity 1.3 | Procurement of 200 portable baby.child L-hgt | | | UNICEF | | | |
| Activity 1.4 | Distribution of 34,000 RUTF cartons | | CAMEG | | | | |
| Activity 1.5 | Distribution of 200 electronic scales | | | UNICEF | | | |
| Activity 1.6 | Distribution of 200 portable baby.child L-hg | t | UNICE | F | | | |

| Output 2 | U5 SAM children are screened, assisted and referred to therapeutic feeding program | | | | | | | |
|---------------|--|-----------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicators | Description | Target | | Achieved | Source of verification | | | |
| Indicator 2.1 | Number of U5 children screened through mass and community screening | 1,868,244 | | 1,868,244 | Rapport d'activités du Ministère de la Santé | | | |
| Indicator 2.2 | Number of mothers trained on MUAC screening | 50,000 | | 50,000 | Rapports d'activités des ONGs partenaires | | | |
| Indicator 2.3 | Number of children admitted into therapeutic feeding program | 36,650 | | 36,650 | Rapports du système national d'information sanitaire (ENDOS) | | | |
| Explanation o | f output and indicators variance: | N/A | | | | | | |
| Activities | Description | | Implemented by | | | | | |
| Activity 2.1 | Support mass screening in the Est and Centre-Nord regions | | | Health Districts of Bogande, Diapaga, Fada, Gayeri, Manni and Pama in the Est region and Health Districts of Barsalogho, Boulsa, Boussouma, Kaya, Kongoussi, Tougouri in the Centre-Nord | | | | |
| Activity 2.2 | Support screening by mothers using MUAC through community platforms in the Est and Sahel regions | | | and GRET | | | | |

| Output 3 | Supervisions, monitoring & evaluation and coordination are ensured | | | | | |
|------------|---|--|----|------------------------------------|--|--|
| Indicators | Description Target Achieved Source of verification | | | | | |
| | Number of supervisions carried out by district teams in the Est, Sahel and Nord regions | | 32 | Rapports d'activités des districts | | |

| Indicator 3.2 | Number of supervisions carried out by health agents in the Est, Sahel and Nord regions | | | 48 | Rapports d'activités des districts sanitaires | |
|----------------|--|-----|---|---|---|--|
| Indicator 3.3 | Number of Nutrition Cluster Consultative Coordination meetings carried out in the Est, Sahel and Centre-Nord regions | | | 3 | Rapport d'activités des régions sanitaires | |
| Indicator 3.4 | One joint mission (MoH, UNICEF and WFP) is conducted | Yes | | Yes | Rapports de missions de supervision | |
| Indicator 3.5 | A national nutrition survey is conducted in the three target regions | Yes | | Yes | Rapport de l'enquête disponible | |
| Explanation of | of output and indicators variance: | N/A | | | | |
| Activities | Description | | Imple | Implemented by | | |
| Activity 3.1 | Carry out supervisions of health agents by district teams in the Est, Sahel and Nord regions | | | Health Districts of Bogande, Diapaga, Fada, Gayeri, Manni and Pama in the Est region. Health Districts of Barsalogho, Boulsa, Boussouma, Kaya, Kongoussi, Tougouri in the Centre-Nord. Health Disricts of Dori, Djibo, Gorom-Gorom and Sebba in the Sahel regions | | |
| Activity 3.2 | Carry out supervisions of community health workers by health agents in the Est, Sahel and Nord regions | | Health Districts of Bogande, Diapaga, Fada, Gayeri, Manni and Pama in the Est region. Health Districts of Barsalogho, Boulsa, Boussouma, Kaya, Kongoussi, Tougouri in the Centre-Nord. Health Disricts of Dori, Djibo, Gorom-Gorom and Sebba in the Sahel regions | | | |

6. Accountability to Affected People

Carry out Nutrition Cluster Consultative Coordination meetings

in the Est, Sahel and Centre-Nord regions

A) Project design and planning phase:

Activity 3.3

This project is aligned to and based on the National Nutrition Survey (SMART methodology) results and the Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO), a process aimed at identifying priority needs and programming response through the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP). These documents and strategies are based on the most recent available data and surveys carried out at community level. They also are the result of the work of the nutrition partners and properly reflect the national humanitarian needs and targets and describe the selected strategies of nutrition partners to meet identified needs. In addition, UNICEF has engaged discussions with its partners including the directorate of nutrition, GRET and HELP (two NGOs operating in the East and Sahel respectively) to design this project.

Est regions

Regional Health Directorates of the Sahel, Centre-Nord and

B) Project implementation phase:

With regards to accountability to affected populations, nutrition sensitization forums at the community level serve as an important platform to receive community member's feedback. For instance, within the mother-to-mother support groups, mothers are trained on malnutrition screening using MUAC and they also receive information on the health services available for their children. UNICEF also uses communication for development as a strategy in implementing projects to ensure adequate communication and feedback from the communities.

C) Project monitoring and evaluation:

UNICEF received funds from the Bill and Melinda Gates foundation to develop social accountability mechanisms (community group's feedback, U-report-youth opinion) to promote the use of civil society feedback to improve service delivery and strengthen the links between social accountability mechanisms and policy makers (to empower citizens to hold service providers accountable). Furthermore, as mentioned above, the mother-to-mother support groups implemented for nutrition and health counselling in some regions serve as a platform to receive feedback from mothers. In parallel to that, others community members including traditional leaders provide feedback and opinion through the community dialogues platforms.

| 7. Cash-Based Interventions | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------------------|--------|------------------------|--------|---------------------|-------------------------|--|
| 7.a Did the project include one or more Cash Based Intervention(s) (CBI)? | | | | | | | |
| Planned | | | Actual | | | | |
| No | | | No | | | | |
| 7.b Please specify below the complete separate rows for ea each modality (best estimate of and examples above. | ch modality. Please indicate the | ne est | imated value of cash | n that | was transferred to | people assisted through | |
| CBI modality | Value of cash (US\$) | a. | Objective | b. C | onditionality | c. Restriction | |
| No | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary information (option | nal) | | | | | | |
| 8. Evaluation: Has this p | project been evaluated or | is an | ı evaluation pendi | ng? | | | |
| | | | | | EVALUA ⁻ | TION CARRIED OUT | |
| regional and district levels to a | void nutrition supply stock-out | t. UNI | CEF will regularly car | rry | EVALUATION PENDING | | |
| warehousing and management systems, as well as improve traceability of supplies both at | | | | | | LUATION PLANNED ⊠ | |
| Furthermore, since 2008, a Na out annually by the governmer partners (contribution of CERF | nt with the technical and finan | | | | | | |

8.3 Project Report 18-RR-WFP-036 - WFP

| 1. Project Information | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 1. Agenc | y: | WFP | 2. Country: | Burkina Faso | | |
| 3. Cluste | r/Sector: | Food Security - Food Aid | 4. Project Code (CERF): | 18-RR-WFP-036 | | |
| 5. Projec | t Title: | Response and support to vulnerable | e populations for the 2018 lean sea | son | | |
| 6.a Origin | nal Start Date: | 21/05/2018 | 6.b Original End Date: | 20/11/2018 | | |
| 6.c. No-c | ost Extension: | ⊠ No ☐ Yes | if yes, specify revised end date: | | | |
| 6.d Were all activities concluded by the end date? (including NCE date) | | □ No ⊠ Yes | | | | |
| | a. Total requiren | nent for agency's sector response | to current emergency: | US\$ 8,700,000 | | |
| | b. Total funding | b. Total funding received for agency's sector response to current emergency: | | | | |
| | c. Amount receiv | ved from CERF: | | US\$ 2,999,616 | | |
| 7. Funding | d. Total CERF fu | inds forwarded to implementing pa | rtners | US\$ 695,290 | | |
| 7.1 | ■ Governme | US\$ 0 | | | | |
| | Internation | US\$ 170,342 | | | | |
| | National N | GOs | | US\$ 524,948 | | |
| | Red Cross | /Crescent | | US\$ 0 | | |

2. Project Results Summary/Overall Performance

Through this CERF grant, WFP and its partners assisted 82,600 vulnerable persons including 42,952 women and 39,648 men with assistance in three of the four priority areas (Centre north, East and Sahel regions). Due to low food availability on local markets and high food prices in these areas as evidenced by the market analysis, in-kind food assistance was provided to beneficiaries. The monthly ration consisted of 12 kg of cereals, 3 kg of pulses and 0.75 kg of oil, per person. A total of 2,562 mt of cereals, 735 mt of pulse and 248 mt of vegetable oil were distributed.

WFP ensured that the needs of women, men, girls and boys were met equally. Targeting was carried out by ensuring a female participation rate of 50 percent. During this period, 52 percent of beneficiaries who received targeted food assistance were women. A coordination framework gathering humanitarian actors was set up to ensure adequate assistance was provided to affected persons during the lean season. This helped to avoid duplication, address gaps and better harmonize targeting and data collection.

3. Changes and Amendments

WFP targeted all vulnerable people among host population as Internal displaced persons were assisted by the Red Cross. This was possible thanks to operational coordination meetings on food assistance which objective was to avoid duplication, address gaps and better harmonize targeting and data collection. As a member of National and Regional Committees for Food Security, WFP was also involved in coordination at the regional level through its sub offices including in the Sahel region. This collaboration allowed to deliver a comprehensive package of interventions addressing the needs of local populations the most vulnerable to severe food and nutritional insecurity.

4. People Reached

4a. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by age group and sex

| | Female | | Male | | | Total | | | |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|--------|
| | Girls (< 18) | Women (≥ 18) | Total | Boys (< 18) | Men (≥ 18) | Total | Children (< 18) | Adults (≥ 18) | Total |
| Planned | 20,779 | 7,301 | 28,080 | 19,181 | 6,739 | 25,920 | 39,960 | 14,040 | 54,000 |
| Reached | 32,356 | 10,596 | 42,952 | 30,267 | 9,381 | 39,648 | 62,623 | 19,977 | 82,600 |

4b. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by category

| Category | Number of people (Planned) | Number of people (Reached) |
|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Refugees | 0 | 0 |
| IDPs | 5,000 | 0 |
| Host population | 49,000 | 82,600 |
| Affected people (none of the above) | 0 | 0 |
| Total (same as in 4a) | 54,000 | 82,600 |

In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons: WFP was able to assist more beneficiaries (82,600) than planned because of the dollar fluctuation that allowed to buy more food commodities for general food distribution. All beneficiaries were targeted among host population as Internal displaced persons were assisted by the Red Cross. WFP planned to assist 5,000 internally displaced persons in the targeted regions. However, during the implementation phase, the coordination between WFP and other humanitarian actors revealed that all registered IDPs were assisted by other actors including Internal displaced persons assisted by the Red Cross in the Sahel region. To avoid duplication of assistance and for better use of available resources, WFP focused on assisting vulnerable people among host populations. In addition, due to the insecurity, it has been observed that not all IDPs wanted to be identified as being displaced through registration. Thus, WFP beneficiaries might include IDPs not registered.

5. CERF Result Framework

Project objective

Saving lives, reducing malnutrition and protecting livelihoods in order to promote stability and contribute to zero hunger during the lean season in areas affected by climate shock and seasonal stress in Burkina Faso

| Output 1 | Targeted beneficiaries are ensured access to food through General Food distribution | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|--|--|
| Indicators | Description | Target | Achieved | Source of verification | | |
| Indicator 1.1 | Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving General Food distribution | under 18; 19,181 male under 18; 7,301 female above 18; 6,739 male | under 18; 30,267 male under 18; 10,596 | reports | | |
| Indicator 1.2 | Quantity of foods provided | 3,387.2 mt | 3 544,5 mt | Supply chain and logistic reports | | |
| Explanation of | The total number of beneficiaries is above the planned thanks to total variation in the programming rate. All beneficiaries received the norm | | | | | |

| ration composed of 12 kg of cereals, 3 kg of pulses and 0.75 kg person. | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| Activities | Description | Implemented by | | |
| Activity 1.1 | Contracting with Cooperating Partners | WFP also signed agreements with local associations and NGOs. Cooperating partners (per region): - Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International - East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) - Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. | | |
| Activity 1.2 | Capacity strengthening of Cooperating Partners | Government (Ministry of Agriculture) and WFP | | |
| Activity 1.3 | Population's targeting | Cooperating partners (per region): - Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International - East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) - Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. | | |
| Activity 1.4 | Food supply and transportation | WFP supply chain/Logistic | | |
| Activity 1.5 | Food distribution | Cooperating partners (per region): - Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International - East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) - Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. | | |
| Activity 1.6 | Post-Distribution Monitoring | WFP (VAM /M&E team) & Cooperating partners (per region): Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. | | |
| Activity 1.7 | Draw Lessons learned | Government, Cooperating partners and WFP Lessons learned are reported in annexe 2 with success stories. | | |

6. Accountability to Affected People

A) Project design and planning phase:

Based on results of Cadre Harmonisé (October 2017), field visits were conducted to observe the situation and collect needs and concerns of the affected population. In line with WFP's general policies on gender and protection, WFP Burkina Faso worked with partners and communities to ensure that the specific needs of women, children, the disabled and the elderly are understood and addressed. For instance, targeting was carried out by ensuring a female participation rate of 50 percent. During this period, 52 percent of beneficiaries who received targeted food assistance were women. Through participatory community approaches for needs assessments, WFP and its partners targeted beneficiaries and organized information and awareness raising activities to ensure all beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were aware of the criteria for nutritional assistance.

B) Project implementation phase:

Communities were able to provide feedback through the beneficiary feedback mechanism, part of WFP's accountability to affected populations model. The feedback mechanism was used to monitor the performance of WFP's interventions and is used for all WFP activities. A toll-free line was made available to both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The number was displayed on all distribution sites and printed on ration cards. Beneficiaries were given the opportunity to express themselves anytime they felt their rights were not respected or noticed any irregularity in the implementation of activities. A dedicated WFP staff oversaw the reception of phone calls. The staff also proceeded with first processing and answered questions. For calls or complaints that required to be addressed more specifically, the staff reported them to the coordinator who addressed them.

C) Project monitoring and evaluation:

Food basket monitoring carried out by food aid monitors showed that all beneficiaries (100 percent) appreciated the quality of the Food they received (sorghum/millet, beans, vegetable oil). On average, beneficiaries consumed the food commodities for 16 days. WFP conducted post distribution monitoring (PDMs) surveys in four out of the ten regions targeted during the lean season where in-kind food was provided (Centre-North, East, North and Sahel). Result of the PDM revealed that 47 percent of beneficiaries did not know there was a functioning toll-free number they could use to refer any issue. Hence, WFP and its cooperating partners reinforced communication around the feedback mechanism tool. Between August and December 2018, WFP handled more than a hundred calls (compliments on the effectiveness of its interventions and warnings on the risks of diversions, etc.) that were all addressed when required.

| 7. Cash-Based Intervent | Cash-Based Interventions | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------|----------------|--|--|--|
| 7.a Did the project include | 7.a Did the project include one or more Cash Based Intervention(s) (CBI)? | | | | | | |
| Planned Actual | | | | | | | |
| No Choose an item. | | | | | | | |
| complete separate rows for ea | 7.b Please specify below the parameters of the CBI modality/ies used. If more than one modality was used in the project, please complete separate rows for each modality. Please indicate the estimated value of cash that was transferred to people assisted through each modality (best estimate of the value of cash and/or vouchers, not including associated delivery costs). Please refer to the guidance and examples above. | | | | | | |
| CBI modality | Value of cash (US\$) | a. Objective | b. Conditionality | c. Restriction | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Supplementary information (option | nal) | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

| 8. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? | |
|--|--------------------------|
| WFP provided in kind-food assistance in four identified priority regions (Centre-North, East, North and Sahel) as the availability of staple food in local markets was a challenge. Results | EVALUATION CARRIED OUT 🖂 |
| from Post Monitoring Distribution showed that most beneficiaries (64 percent) preferred the | EVALUATION PENDING |
| food modality. Only 12 percent of them preferred the cash modality, while 22 percent preferred the dual modality (in-kind food and cash). The remaining 2 percent surveyed had no preference on the assistance modality. Results also showed that 31 percent did not know that food assistance were provided by WFP leading WFP to recommend partners to insist on communication/awareness around food distribution. Food basket monitoring (FBM) carried out by food aid monitors showed a good level of distribution of the food. Beneficiaries made a very good appreciation of the quality of the commodities they received. | NO EVALUATION PLANNED [|

8.4 Project Report 18-RR-WFP-037 - WFP

| 1. Proj | 1. Project Information | | | | | |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Agenc | y: | WFP | 2. Country: | Burkina Faso | | |
| 3. Cluster/Sector: Nutrition - Nutrition 4. Project Code (CERF): | | | | 18-RR-WFP-037 | | |
| 5. Project | t Title: | ulnerable persons during the lean s | eason 2018 | | | |
| 6.a Origin | nal Start Date: | 11/05/2018 | 6.b Original End Date: | 10/11/2018 | | |
| 6.c. No-c | ost Extension: | ⊠ No ☐ Yes | if yes, specify revised end date: | | | |
| 6.d Were all activities concluded by the end date? (including NCE date) | | | | | | |
| a. Total requirement for agency's sector response to current emergency: | | | | US\$ 4,514,364 | | |
| b. Total funding received for agency's sector response to current emergency: | | | | US\$ 1,172,942 | | |
| c. Amount received from CERF: | | | | US\$ 1,980,392 | | |
| d. Total CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners of which to: | | | | US\$ 80,007 ¹ | | |
| ► Government Partners | | | | US\$ 80,007 | | |
| | Internation | US\$ 0 | | | | |
| | National N | GOs | US\$ 0 | | | |
| | Red Cross | /Crescent | | US\$ 0 | | |

2. Project Results Summary/Overall Performance

The project assisted a total of 50,706 people and allowed to maintain the malnutrition indicators within the SPHERE standards (95.63%) in the Centre North, East and Sahel regions. This was achieved during the lean season (June to September), a period during which people living in rural areas adopt various strategies to feed themselves and their families as they live on their food reserve until the next harvest.

3. Changes and Amendments

No change was made in the project from the original proposal

4. People Reached

4a. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by age group and sex

| | | Female | | | Male | | | Total | |
|---------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------------------|--------|
| | Girls (< 18) | Women (≥ 18) | Total | Boys (< 18) | Men (≥ 18) | Total | Children (< 18) | Adults (≥ 18) | Total |
| Planned | 11,186 | 9,427 | 20,613 | 12,900 | 0 | 12,900 | 24,086 | 9,427 | 33,513 |

¹ WFP signed Field level agreements (FLA) with implementing partners for multi donors contributions. As General food distibution (GFD) were coupled with blanket supplementary feeding (BSF), the FLA amounts transferred to NGOs and associations included both costs necessary for the distribution of in-kind food (GFD) and nutritional products (BSF).

| Reached | 18,498 | 12,723 | 31,221 | 19,485 | 0 | 19,485 | 37,983 | 12,723 | 50,706 |
|---|---|--|--------|--------|--------|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| 4b. Number of people directly assisted with CERF funding by category | | | | | | | | | |
| Category | Number | Number of people (Planned) | | | | Number of people (Reached) | | | |
| Refugees | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | |
| IDPs | | | 0 | | | | 0 | | |
| Host population | | 33,513 | | | 50,706 | | | | |
| Affected people (none | e of the above) | 0 | | | 0 | | | | |
| Total (same as in 4a |) | 33,513 5 | | | 50,706 | | | | |
| In case of significant of planned and reached the total numbers or to category distribution, reasons: | beneficiaries, either he age, sex or | WFP was able to assist more beneficiaries (50,706) than planned because of the dol fluctuation that allowed to purchase more nutritional products for blanket feeding. | | | | | | | |

| 5. CERF Result F | ramework |
|-------------------|--|
| Project objective | Saving lives, reducing malnutrition and protecting livelihoods in order to promote stability and contribute to zero hunger during the lean season in areas affected by climate shock and seasonal stress in Burkina Faso |

| Output 1 | Targeted children, pregnant and nursing mothers (and girls) receive specialized nutritious food in sufficient quantity and quality and in a timely manner to improve their nutrition status | | | | |
|----------------|---|----------|--|--|---|
| Indicators | Description | Target | | Achieved | Source of verification |
| Indicator 1.1 | Number children and pregnant and lactating women and girls receiving specialized nutritious food | 33,513 | | 50,706 | Cooperating partners reports |
| Indicator 1.2 | Quantity of fortified or special nutritious foods provided | 729.4 mt | | 801.63 mt | Supply chain and logistic reports |
| Explanation of | foutput and indicators variance: | | | products purchased was be people than planned. | higher than planned, which |
| Activities | Description | | Implen | nented by | |
| Activity 1.1 | Contracting with cooperating partners | | WFP contracted government partners including regional directorates for health (Directions Régionales la Santé, DRS) and its decentralised structures (provinc in the Centre-North, East and Sahel regions. WFP a signed agreements with local associations and NGOs. | | |
| Activity 1.2 | Provide emergency nutrition treatment to vulnerable children (6 to 59 months) and PLW/Gs | | - Di de Ea | | e la Santé (DRS) and province) – Centre-North, |
| Activity 1.3 | Provide preventive nutritious rations for children (aged 6-23 months) and PLW/Gs | | Coope | rating partners (per regio | n) : |

| | | Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. |
|--------------|---|--|
| Activity 1.4 | Sensitization about the utilization of the nutritional products, messaging on nutrition practices | Government partners: - Directions Régionales de la Santé (DRS) – Centre-North, East and Sahel regions, - Decentralised structures at DRS, - Local associations - WFP staff |
| Activity 1.5 | Screening for malnutrition in children under 5 and pregnant and nursing women | Cooperating partners (per region): Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. |
| Activity 1.6 | Purchase, transport and delivery of food and nutritional products in the targeted villages | WFP supply chain/ Logistic Cooperating partners (per region): Centre-North: Association ZoodNooma (AZND), Association pour la Promotion des Initiatives Locales (APIL), Plan International East: Association pour le Développement des Communautés Villageoises (ADCV), Association d'appui à la Promotion du Développement durable des Communautés défavorisées (APDC) Sahel: Service Rural d'Approvisionnement et de Commercialisation (SERACOM), AFRICARE. |
| Activity 1.7 | Monitoring and evaluation | Government, Cooperating partners and WFP. |
| Activity 1.8 | Capacity strengthening of cooperating partners | Gouvernement and WFP |
| Activity 1.9 | Ensure financial and narrative reporting | Government, Cooperating partners and WFP |

6. Accountability to Affected People

A) Project design and planning phase:

Based on results of Cadre Harmonisé (October 2017), field visits were conducted to observe the situation and collect needs and concerns of the affected population. In line with WFP's general policies on gender and protection, WFP Burkina Faso worked with partners and communities to ensure that the specific needs of women, children, the disabled and the elderly are understood and addressed. For instance, targeting was carried out by ensuring a female participation rate of 50 percent. During this period, 52 percent of beneficiaries who received targeted food assistance were women. Through participatory community approaches for needs assessments, WFP and its partners targeted beneficiaries and organized information and awareness raising activities to ensure all beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries were aware of the criteria for nutritional assistance.

B) Project implementation phase:

Communities were able to provide feedback through the beneficiary feedback mechanism, part of WFP's accountability to affected populations model. The feedback mechanism was used to monitor the performance of WFP's interventions and is used for all WFP activities. A toll-free line was made available to both beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. The number was displayed on all distribution sites and printed on ration cards. Beneficiaries were given the opportunity to express themselves anytime they felt their rights were not respected or noticed any irregularity in the implementation of activities. A dedicated WFP staff oversaw the reception of phone calls. The staff also proceeded with first processing and answered questions. For calls or complaints that required to be addressed more specifically, the staff reported them to the coordinator who addressed them.

C) Project monitoring and evaluation:

Food basket monitoring carried out by food aid monitors showed that all beneficiaries (100 percent) appreciated the quality of the nutritional products they received (vegetable oil, SuperCereal and SuperCereal Plus). On average, beneficiaries consumed the nutritional products for 16 days. WFP conducted post distribution monitoring (PDMs) surveys in four of the ten regions targeted during the lean season where in-kind food was provided (Centre-North, East, North and Sahel). Result of the PDM revealed that 47 percent of beneficiaries did not know there was a functioning toll-free number they could use to refer any issue. Hence, WFP and its cooperating partners reinforced communication around the feedback mechanism tool. Between August and December 2018, WFP handled more than a hundred calls (compliments on the effectiveness of its interventions and warnings on the risks of diversions, etc.) that were all addressed when required.

| 7. Cash-Based Interven | Cash-Based Interventions | | | | | |
|---|------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|--|--|
| 7.a Did the project include | one or more Cash Based Inter | vention(s) (CBI)? | | | | |
| Planned Actual | | | | | | |
| No | | No | | | | |
| 7.b Please specify below the parameters of the CBI modality/ies used. If more than one modality was used in the project. please complete separate rows for each modality. Please indicate the estimated value of cash that was transferred to people assisted through each modality (best estimate of the value of cash and/or vouchers, not including associated delivery costs). Please refer to the guidance and examples above. | | | | | | |
| CBI modality | Value of cash (US\$) | a. Objective | b. Conditionality | c. Restriction | | |
| No | | | | | | |
| Supplementary information (optional) | | | | | | |

| 8. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending? | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Some of the main findings of the PDMs are summarized below: | EVALUATION CARRIED OUT 🖂 |
| For 33 percent of surveyed households, their main source of income came from the sale of agricultural products; | EVALUATION PENDING |
| 100 percent of the beneficiaries who received nutrition appreciated the quality of the nutritionals products (vegetable oil, SuperCereal and SuperCereal Plus). 59 percent of beneficiaries (more than one in two persons) did not know the reason that led to their being selected to receive nutritional assistance. WFP took note of that result to further discuss the right approach to address the issue. Specific communication is to be carried out to minimise the risks of improper use of nutritional products (dilution, sharing the rations with non-beneficiary households or family members who do not require the use of nutritional products, etc.); | NO EVALUATION PLANNED □ |

- More than 61 percent of the beneficiaries (more than one in two persons) did not know the quantity of nutritional products (SuperCereal, SuperCereal Plus and oil) they were entitled to before they arrived at the distribution sites.
- WFP recommended that implementing partners strengthen communication with beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries on targeting, transfer modality choices, food quantities, timeline, use of assistance.

ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

| CERF Project Code | Cluster/Sector | Agency | Sub-grant made under pre- existing partnership agreement | Partner Type |
|-------------------|-----------------|--------|---|--------------|
| 18-RR-WFP-037 | Nutrition | WFP | Yes | GOV |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | INGO |
| 18-RR-WFP-036 | Food Assistance | WFP | Yes | INGO |
| 18-RR-CEF-060 | Nutrition | UNICEF | Yes | GOV |
| 18-RR-CEF-060 | Nutrition | UNICEF | Yes | INGO |
| 18-RR-CEF-060 | Nutrition | UNICEF | Yes | INGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | GOV |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | GOV |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | NNGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | INGO |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | GOV |
| 18-RR-FAO-015 | Food Assistance | FAO | yes | NNGO |

ANNEX 2: Success Stories (WFP)

1. "The harvest was not good ... the granaries were empty"





Rainatou and Ténin are two young mothers in their twenties. On their way to the distribution site in the village of Pelse (Centre-North region) where they were to receive their first food rations, they talked about the lean season. The harvest was not good and ensuring a daily meal for their families was a real challenge. In some areas, people had exhausted the stocks of millet and maize they kept in their granaries only a few months after the harvest and buying food on the markets was difficult for them. The two young mothers acknowledged that the food assistance they are receiving from WFP is bringing them relief. With their husbands they can focus more on field work and thanks to the rations they receive they have the peace of mind that their children will not get sick.

2. "I can see the smile on my children's faces"









BOURGOU Ninyama is one of the beneficiaries from the village of Pirgou in the commune of Nagbingou (Centre-North region). She is a mother of 9 children.

[&]quot; I used to make a paste with flour and boil green leaves from wild plants that grow next to my hut. I did not want my children to go to sleep on an empty stomach. Now with the food I just received from WFP, I will cook beans that we will eat with oil tonight. Now, we can eat twice a day. I am grateful because I can already see the smile on my children's faces and I will have more strength to carry out my activities".

ANNEX 3: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

| AAP | Accountability to Affected Populations |
|-----------|--|
| BSF | Blanket supplementary Feeding |
| CAMEG | La Centrale d'Achat des Médicaments Essentiels Génériques cret |
| CERF | Common Emergency Response Fund |
| CBPF | Country Based Pooled Funds |
| CBI | Cashed Based Interventions |
| CBHW | Community-Based Health Workers |
| CfW | Cash for Work |
| CHF | Common Humanitarian Fund |
| CICR | Comité International de la Croix Rouge |
| COOPI | Cooperazione Internazionale |
| CORDAID | Catholic Organisation for Relief and Development Aid |
| CR/CH | Coordonnateur Résident / Coordonnateur Humanitaire |
| DTM | Displacement Tracking Matrix |
| ECHO | European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations |
| EHDP | L'Equipe Humanitaire-Développement Pays (EHDP) |
| EHP | Equipe Humanitaire Pays |
| NHIS | National Health Information Systems |
| FAO | Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations |
| FLA | Field Level Agreement |
| GBV | Gender Based Violence |
| GCMF | Global Commodity Management Facility |
| HACT | Harmonized Approach to Cash Transfers |
| HRP | Humanitarian Response Plan |
| HCT /UNCT | Humanitarian country team / United Nations Country Team |
| HELP | NGO based in Burkina Faso |
| ICC | Inter Cluster Coordination |
| IDTR | Identification Documentation Tracing and Reunification |
| IEC | Information-Education-Communication |
| IMC | International Medical Corps |
| MAM | Moderate Acute Malnutrition |
| MUAC | mid-upper arm circumference measure (MUAC) - Nutrition screening |
| MSF | Médecin Sans Frontière |
| NGOs | Non-Gouvernemental organisations |
| NFI | Non Food Items |
| NHIS | National Health Information System |
| OCHA | Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs |
| OFDA | Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance |
| OMS | Organisation Mondiale de la Santé |
| ONG | Organisation Non Gouvernementale |

| PAM | Programme Alimentaire Mondial |
|----------|--|
| PDM | Post Distribution Monitoring |
| PEP | Post Exposure Preventive treatment |
| PRH | Plan de Réponse Humanitaire |
| SAM | Severe Acute Malnutrition |
| RUTF | Ready to Use Therapeutic Feeding |
| UFE / RR | Under Funded Emergency /Rapid Response |
| UNDSS | United Nations for the Department of security and Safety |
| UNFPA | United Nations Population Fund |
| UNHAS | United Nations Humanitarian Air service |
| UNICEF | United Nations Children's Fund |
| USD | United State Dollar |
| WFP | World Food Organization |