ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM 2014 RC/HC REPORTS ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS

PARTNERSHIPS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF 2014 CERF FUNDING
The introduction of a new CERF narrative reporting framework in 2013 has improved the overall quality of reporting by Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators on the use of CERF funds (RC/HC reports) and has allowed for a more systematic and timely analysis of the data and information provided in the reports. The CERF secretariat has analyzed key performance data from all RC/HC reports submitted for 2014 CERF grants (second year under the new reporting framework) and produced several briefing notes to present the findings of the analysis.

This briefing note summarizes information on partnerships in the implementation of CERF funding. All RC/HC reports used for the analysis that follows can be found on CERF’s website. Given up to nine month implementation time frame of CERF grants followed by a three-month reporting period, the complete reports on the implementation of all CERF-funded projects in 2014 were only available at the beginning of 2016 for consolidation.

GLOBAL REACH OF CERF PARTNERSHIPS

While anchored in the UN system, CERF is a mechanism that benefits the entire humanitarian community. A CERF-funded response is a collective effort by in-country humanitarian partners under the leadership of Humanitarian Coordinators. CERF requests are prioritized and planned by the Humanitarian Country Teams and cluster/sector structures, which include NGOs as active participants.

General Assembly Resolution 46/182 sets out that CERF can only directly fund UN Agencies. By limiting direct recipients of grants to UN organisations, CERF can disburse funding quickly and efficiently with streamlined processes, enabling it to meet its rapid response mandate.

However, CERF grants are implemented in close partnerships between UN agencies and local/international NGOs, host governments and Red Cross/Red Crescent societies. Once the inclusive planning process is completed, these organisations receive CERF funding from UN Agencies through sub-grants.

In 2014, CERF allocated US$ 471 million to 14 UN Agencies in response to humanitarian crises in 45 countries. Out of this amount, $106 million was sub-granted to over 550

---

1 www.unocha.org/cerf/partner-resources/grant-reports/grant-reports-2014
2 The terms “UN agencies”, “UN Organizations”, “UN agencies and IOM”, and “agencies” are used interchangeably
3 The sub-grant analysis is based on reports on all 2014 CERF applications despite that some of them also included projects approved in the last days of 2013 and in the first days of 2015. Hence, the overall 2014 allocation amount referenced in this note differs by $10 million from the official 2014 CERF allocation figure ($461 million).
Implementing Partners (IPs) through the far reaching partnership networks of UN agencies. This represents 23 per cent of the overall 2014 CERF funding and does not include the value of in-kind partnership arrangements.

The majority of organisations that received CERF funding in 2014 were local partners including 366 local NGOs, 37 government partners and 18 Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies. The remaining 133 partners were international NGOs.

This represents an unparalleled global reach that would be difficult to achieve for CERF or CERF’s donors through direct funding agreements. Since inception in 2006, CERF has funded humanitarian action in 96 countries.

The extensive partnerships under CERF grants between UN agencies and local organisations in crises across the world help localise humanitarian response and enhance the capacity of local actors, while at the same time fostering a coordinated and coherent response to needs.

More than half of CERF funding to Colombia and Eritrea was implemented through partners. In DRC, Haiti, Myanmar, Solomon Islands and Yemen between 40 and 50 per cent of CERF funding was implemented through non-UN actors. In contrast, in Cameroon, Djibouti, Guatemala, DPRK, Liberia, Nepal, Serbia, Sierra Leone and Zimbabwe below 10 per cent of CERF funding was implemented by partners. Nevertheless, in all 45 countries assisted by CERF in 2014, UN Agencies entered in partnerships with non-UN actors in implementing CERF funding.

Over half of sub-granted CERF funding in 2014 went to local partners including local NGOs, Government partners and Red Cross/Red Crescent societies. In Eritrea, Colombia, Yemen and DRC over 30 per cent of CERF funding was implemented through local partners. In Nigeria, Myanmar, Somalia, Pakistan and the Republic of Congo between 20 and 30 per cent

---

4 The sub-grant figures included in this note are based on self-reporting by each agency at the country level and there are no systems in place to verify this information at headquarters level. As such, these figures should be considered indicative only. However, the consistency in reported data year by year since 2011 indicates that the data are a good estimate of actual sub-grants.
of CERF funding went to local partners. Overall, UN agencies reported partnerships with local actors in implementation of CERF funding in 44 out of 45 countries, which received CERF support in 2014.

The world maps included in annexes represent partnerships in implementation of 2014 CERF funding globally. The first map illustrates the distribution of all partnerships under CERF grants whereas the second map focuses on the involvement of local partners.

**TRENDS IN SUB-GRANTS OF CERF FUNDING**

In 2014, agencies sub-granted to Implementing Partners (IPs) $106 million out of $471 million received from CERF (23 per cent). Twelve per cent of all 2014 CERF funding was sub-granted to local partners (local NGOs, government partners and Red Cross/Red Crescent); and eleven per cent was sub-granted to international NGOs. The proportion of 2014 sub-granted CERF funding as compared to the total amount allocated is presented in the following chart.

![2014 CERF Funding by Implementation Modality](image)

Apart from implementing sub-grants, IPs also played an important role in distributing to beneficiaries relief supplies procured by UN Agencies using funding from CERF. According to the budget breakdown of all 2014 projects, 45 per cent of CERF funding or $211 million was used by recipient agencies for procurement of relief supplies such as food, shelters or medicines.

Out of $106 million sub-granted in 2014 to IPs, $55 million or 52 per cent was sub-granted to local partners. This included $30 million (28 per cent) to local NGOs, $21 million (20 per cent) to government partners and $4.3 million (4.1 per cent) to Red Cross/Crescent societies. Another $51 million or 48 per cent was sub-granted to International NGOs.
The proportion of sub-granted funding varied between the two CERF windows. While the overall sub-granted funding was 23 per cent for all 2014 CERF funds, the percentage was 19 for Rapid Response (RR) funding and 29 for funding for underfunded emergencies (UFE).

2014 CERF Funding by Window and Implementation Modality

The proportion of sub-granted funding by partner type also differed between the two CERF windows. International NGOs were the largest recipients of rapid response funding, receiving $32 million or 56% per cent of sub-granted RR funding; while local partners were the largest recipients of funding for underfunded emergencies, receiving $30 million or 61 per cent of sub-granted UFE funding.

The total CERF sub-granted funding as reported by agencies has been on a steady increase in dollar terms over the past years with the total $84 million in 2011, $91 million in 2012, $97 million in 2013, and $106 million in 2014. As percentage of overall CERF funding, the sub-granted amount increased to the highest ever in 2014 to 23 from around 20 in the
period 2011 – 2014. The proportions of sub-granted funding by partner type were comparable across years, with a peak in funding to international NGOs and a corresponding drop for local partners in 2012.

The number of reported sub-grants in 2014 increased as compared to previous years. Out of 1,214 sub-grants reported in total for 2014, local NGOs accounted for the largest number with 465 sub-grants, followed by international NGOs with 452. Government partners received 247 and the Red Cross/Red Crescent Societies 50 sub-grants.
The average sub-grant size in 2014 for international NGOs ($112,526) was nearly twice bigger than for local NGOs ($64,229), hence although local NGOs received a higher number of sub-grants, international NGOs received more funding through sub-grants. The average sub-grant size for government partners and for Red Cross/Crescent was approximately $86,000.

**SUB-GRANTS OF CERF FUNDING BY SECTOR AND AGENCY**

All sectors receiving CERF funding in 2014, apart from Security, reported sub-grants. However, the proportion of sub-granted funding varied significantly between sectors. According to reported data, Health (the largest sector) sub-granted 20 per cent of CERF funding received and Food (the second largest sector) sub-granted 7 per cent.

### 2014 CERF Funding by Sector and Implementation Modality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Procurement of Relief Supplies</th>
<th>Other Implementation Costs</th>
<th>Sub-grants</th>
<th>Total (in millions)</th>
<th>Sub-granted Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>No. of Sub-grants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$123</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$111</td>
<td>$7.4</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>$56</td>
<td>$21</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection/Human Rights/Rule of Law</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$8.1</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and non-food items</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-sector</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>$31</td>
<td>$13</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Management</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>$24</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination and Support Services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$0.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>$7.0</td>
<td>$3.6</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Action</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>$3.2</td>
<td>$2.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.9</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Recovery and Infrastructure</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>$1.3</td>
<td>$0.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Protection, Education, Mine Action, and Economic Recovery and Development sectors sub-granted over half of CERF funding received; while Shelter and Non-food items, Camp Management and Coordination sectors sub-granted less than 20 per cent of CERF funding received.

All CERF recipient agencies, except UN Habitat and UNWRA, reported sub-grants in 2014. According to reported data, UNICEF, the second largest recipient of CERF funds in 2014, implemented the largest total amount through partners ($48.4 million through 517 sub-grants). This amount accounted for 41 per cent of all CERF funding received by UNICEF in 2014. In comparison WFP, the largest CERF recipient reported $8.8 million, or 6 per cent of received CERF funds as implemented through partners (in-kind arrangements, such as the value of relief items distributed to beneficiaries, are not included in these figures).
According to reported data there were significant differences in the partner type profile of agencies’ implementation of CERF grants in 2014. Forty-five per cent of funding sub-granted by UNICEF (the biggest provider of sub-grants) went to international NGOs, while 55 per cent went to local actors of which half was for government counterparts. UNHCR (second biggest provider of sub-grants) contracted 58 per cent of its sub-granted funding to international NGOs, 41 percent went to local partners of which the majority was to local NGOs and only 4 per cent to government partners.

WFP and FAO worked mostly with local NGOs providing to them nearly half of their sub-granted funding. UNDP’s major implementing partners were government partners, which received 72 per cent of total UNDP’s sub-granted funding.
ANNEX 1 - PARTNERS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF CERF FUNDING

TOTAL 2014* CERF FUNDING $471 M
SUB-GRANTED TO PARTNERS $106 M
23% OVERALL PERCENTAGE SUB-GRANTED

# OF PARTNERS:
133 INGO**
366 NNGO***
37 GOVERNMENTS
18 RED CROSS/CRESCEINT

% of CERF funding implemented by partners
<10 20 30 40 >40%

Country | #of partners | Sub-granted amount (in US$ M)
--- | --- | ---
Guatemala | 6 | $0.5 M
Haiti | 12 | $3.7 M
Honduras | 10 | $0.5 M
Colombia | 24 | $2.5 M
Bolivia | 7 | $0.5 M
Paraguay | 5 | $1.1 M
CAR - Central African Republic
DRC - Democratic Republic of the Congo
oPt - occupied Palestinian territory

*2014 is the latest full year for which complete sub-grant data is currently available
**INGO - International Non-governmental Organisations
***NNGO - National Non-governmental Organisations

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. Final boundary between the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan has not yet been determined. Final status of the Abyei area is not yet determined.

Creation date: 16 May 2016
Sources: UNCS, CERF
Feedback: cerf@un.org
www.unocha.org/cerf
www.reliefweb.int
ANNEX 2 - LOCAL PARTNERS IN IMPLEMENTATION OF CERF FUNDING

TOTAL 2014* CERF FUNDING  
$471 M

SUB-GRAINED TO NATIONAL PARTNERS
$55 M

12% OVERALL PERCENTAGE SUB-GRAINED

# OF PARTNERS:
366 NGO**
37 GOVERNMENTS
18 RED CROSS/CRESCEINT

% of CERF funding implemented by national partners

<10  20  30  40  >40%

Country  #of partners | Sub-granted amount (in US$ M)

- Guatemala 3 | $0.3 M
- Haiti 2 | $0.9 M
- Honduras 3 | $0.1 M
- Colombia 17 | $1.7 M
- Bolivia 4 | $0.1 M
- Paraguay 2 | $0.2 M
- Mauritania 11 | $0.7 M
- Senegal 3 | $0.5 M
- Gambia 1 | $0.4 M
- Senegal 12 | $1.1 M
- Sierra Leone 8 | $0.3 M
- Liberia 1 | $0.4 M
- Mauritania 6 | $0.1 M
- Libya 6 | $0.1 M
- Niger 18 | $1.1 M
- Mali 11 | $1.1 M
- Chad 20 | $4.3 M
- Sudan 14 | $2.7 M
- Libya 4 | $0.4 M
- CAR 1 | $1.6 M
- CAR 5 | $0.8 M
- DRC 6 | $2.2 M
- Congo 32 | $0.7 M
- Djibouti 4 | $0.1 M
- Somalia 65 | $5.1 M
- Uganda 7 | $1 M
- Kenya 7 | $3.2 M
- South Sudan 9 | $1.4 M
- Eritrea 1 | $1.7 M
- Yemen 10 | $5 M
- Pakistan 29 | $2.9 M
- Afghanistan 5 | $0.2 M
- Nepal 2 | $0.05 M
- Democratic People’s Republic of Korea 1 | $0.02 M

CAR - Central African Republic
DRC - Democratic Republic of the Congo
oPt - occupied Palestinian territory

*2014 is the latest full year for which complete sub-grant data is currently available
**NGO - National Non-governmental Organisations

The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. Final boundary between the Republic of Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan has not yet been determined. Final status of the Abyei area is not yet determined.
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