

FIJI
RAPID RESPONSE
CYCLONE YASA
2021

21-RR-FJI-46848

Sanaka Samarasingha

Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator

PART I – ALLOCATION OVERVIEW

Reporting Process and Consultation Summary:

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

15 Dec 2021

AAR participants: RC a.i. (RC currently on home leave); FAO (grant-receiving agency); Implementing Partners (Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Fisheries, ADRA); OCHA OoP; RCO MCO Fiji.

Please confirm that the report on the use of CERF funds was discussed with the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team (HCT/UNCT).

Yes No

Please confirm that the final version of this report was 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

1. STRATEGIC PRIORITIZATION

Statement by the Resident/Humanitarian Coordinator:

The CERF response to TC Yasa targeted the most vulnerable and strongly affected people in the hardest hit areas of Fiji with live-saving assistance. Farmers and fishers received agriculture and fishery support to quickly restore their occupational activities and ensure food security. The planning process and subsequent relief operation brought together humanitarian actors from the UN, NGO and government-side to ensure an effective, principled, targeted and needs-based humanitarian response which helped to kickstart and to complement other relief activities from the government, local and international humanitarian partners. However, due to a renewed spike in the pandemic in Fiji and a subsequent lockdown (also in cyclone-affected areas) just as the project started, caused some delays on accessing these communities and delayed distributions. Furthermore, as some procurement had to be made internationally, the disruption of international supply chains caused additional delays. For this reason, the project took longer than anticipated and ultimately had to be cut short (as a second NCE was not granted by the CERF Secretariat). However, by that time, most objectives had been achieved (in some cases more beneficiaries were even reached than initially planned); and FAO - as the grant-receiving agency - was also able to tap on alternative funding sources to ensure that all of the project activities will be implemented; albeit a part of it outside the CERF envelope due to reasons mentioned above.

CERF's Added Value:

Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to people in need?

Yes Partially No

International procurement has been a major issue for FAO. To date, three out of four procurements batches (fisheries inputs, inputs for People with Disabilities (PWD), and seeds) have been received in Fiji. Unexpected – mostly pandemic-related - events, supply chain disruptions, and global shipping delays led to a protracted delivery process.

Did CERF funds help respond to time-critical needs?

Yes Partially No

Fishery inputs met time-critical needs, along with fast delivery of assistance (with exception of COVID-related delays). As for the agriculture inputs, what was delivered within the project's timeframe also met time-critical needs. However, distributions of part of these inputs are yet to be finalized.

Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?

Yes Partially No

The quality and frequency of coordination particularly between humanitarian actors and government entities leading the humanitarian response improved at the federal as well as district level. Information and data exchange became more frequent and more efficient as priority activities were identified and planned. At the PHT-level, various ad hoc meetings were organized on top of the regular meeting schedule, ensuring an adequate consultation process of concerned agencies as well as all other humanitarian stake holders responding outside this particular CERF envelope.

Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources?

Yes Partially No

Considerations of the ERC's Underfunded Priority Areas¹:

As regards the ERC's underfunded humanitarian priority areas, this CERF allocation focused on a) support for women and girls, and b) targeting disabled people. Education in protracted crisis did not apply as this tropical cyclone was a fast-onset emergency. FAO and implementing partners reached out to the *Fiji Council for Disabled Persons* to receive an accurate list of disabled people and thus were able to tailor an efficient humanitarian response. In addition, consultations were held on the most appropriate tools to be procured for them. In the agricultural component, 58% of beneficiaries were women, youth and persons living with a disability. The total number of disabled persons reached 417 for Output 1 which exceeded the target (250) by 66%. In addition, 83 elderly (over 70 years of age) were also reached.

Table 1: Allocation Overview (US\$).

Total amount required for the humanitarian response	4,726,000
CERF	500,000
Country-Based Pooled Fund (if applicable)	0
Other (bilateral/multilateral)	0
Total funding received for the humanitarian response (by source above)	500,000

Table 2: CERF Emergency Funding by Project and Sector/Cluster (US\$)

Agency	Project Code	Sector/Cluster	Amount
FAO	21-RR-FAO-002	Food Security - Agriculture	500,000
Total			500,000

Table 3: Breakdown of CERF Funds by Type of Implementation Modality (US\$)

Total funds implemented directly by UN agencies including procurement of relief goods	476,264
Funds sub-granted to government partners*	0
Funds sub-granted to international NGO partners*	0
Funds sub-granted to national NGO partners*	23,736
<i>Funds sub-granted to Red Cross/Red Crescent partners*</i>	<i>0</i>
Total funds transferred to implementing partners (IP)*	23,736
Total	500,000

* Figures reported in table 3 are based on the project reports (part II, sections 1) and should be consistent with the sub-grants overview in the annex.

2. OPERATIONAL PRIORITIZATION:

Overview of the Humanitarian Situation:

¹ In January 2019, the Emergency Relief Coordinator identified four priority areas as often underfunded and lacking appropriate consideration and visibility when funding is allocated to humanitarian action. The ERC therefore recommended an increased focus on these four areas to ensure that they be given due consideration by RC/HCs and HCTs/UNCTs when prioritizing life-saving needs for inclusion in CERF requests. These areas are: (1) support for women and girls, including tackling gender-based violence, reproductive health and empowerment; (2) programmes targeting disabled people; (3) education in protracted crises; and (4) other aspects of protection. While CERF remains needs based, the ERC will be looking for country teams to prioritize projects and mainstreamed activities that systematically and effectively address to these four historically underfunded areas. Please see the questions and answers on the ERC four priority areas [here](#).

On 17 December 2020, Category 5 Cyclone Yasa made landfall in Fiji, with winds over 250 km/h impacting mainly in the Northern Division as well as parts of Eastern and Western Divisions, and affecting 194,360 people (38,872 households), 22 percent of Fiji's population. The National Disaster Management Office of Fiji (NDMO) confirmed that 24,413 people sought shelter in evacuation centers across the four divisions. A total of 6,385 houses were partially damaged and 1,859 destroyed in the Northern Division alone. Furthermore, the cyclone damaged some 101 schools and 24 health facilities. The total loss to the agriculture sector from Cyclone Yasa is estimated at US\$54.4 million.

Operational Use of the CERF Allocation and Results:

In response to the crisis, CERF allocated \$0.5 million from its Rapid Response window for the immediate commencement of life-saving activities. This funding will enable FAO and partners to provide life-saving assistance to 17,900 people, including 5,300 women, 6,100 men, 6,500 children, and 500 people with disabilities in the food security sector. The CERF allocation will serve as a critical injection of early funds for the emergency response.

People Directly Reached

FAO reached their intended target. The numbers were calculated based on NDMO, Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Fisheries data of the most affected areas within the Northern and Eastern Divisions.

However, the targeted reach for the category of People with Disabilities (PwD) were not reached as the 417 PwD is only based on Output 1. For Output 2, inputs were handed over to MoF, and provided to either male or female beneficiaries (depending on the items). MoF did not collect figures regarding the household (hh) members. It is assumed that some of the hh were PwD but this was, unfortunately, not captured. Data collection was challenging due to delays and not always clear criteria. Data gathering is still ongoing due to COVID-related delays.

People Indirectly Reached:

FAO and its implementing partners have indicated that households were covered and reached through the project of Output 1 agriculture inputs and Output 2 fisheries inputs. It is not expected that any other people were reached indirectly with this support for both Outputs. [to note that Food Security is assisting households rather than individuals.

Table 4: Number of People Directly Assisted with CERF Funding by Sector/Cluster*

Sector/Cluster	WOMEN	MEN	GIRLS	BOYS	TOTAL
Food Security – Agriculture (Planned)	5,373	6,089	3,045	3,403	17,910
Food Security – Agriculture (Reached)	3,817	2,492	6,388	6,388	19,085

Table 5: Total Number of People Directly Assisted with CERF Funding by Category*

Category	Planned	Reached
Refugees	0	0
Returnees	0	0
Internally displaced people	0	0
Host communities	17,910	19,085
Other affected people	0	0
Total	17,910	19,085

Table 6: Total Number of People Directly Assisted with CERF Funding*

Sex & Age			Number of people with disabilities (PwD) out of the total	
	Planned	Reached	Planned	Reached
Women	5,373	3,817	249	222
Men	6,089	2,492	233	195
Girls	3,045	6,388	3	0
Boys	3,403	6,388	5	0
Total	17,910	19,085	490	417

PART II – PROJECT OVERVIEW

3. PROJECT REPORTS

3.1 Project Report 21-RR-FAO-002

1. Project Information			
Agency:	FAO	Country:	Fiji
Sector/cluster:	Food Security – Agriculture	CERF project code:	21-RR-FAO-002
Project title:	Emergency support to re-establish agriculture and fisheries livelihoods of households affected by Tropical Cyclone Yasa		
Start date:	01/02/2021	End date:	31/10/2021
Project revisions:	No-cost extension <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Redeployment of funds <input type="checkbox"/>	Reprogramming <input type="checkbox"/>
Funding	Total requirement for agency's sector response to current emergency:		US\$ 3,000,000
	Total funding received for agency's sector response to current emergency:		US\$ 140,000
	Amount received from CERF:		US\$ 500,000
	Total CERF funds sub-granted to implementing partners:		US\$ 23,736
	Government Partners		US\$ 0
	International NGOs		US\$ 0
National NGOs		US\$ 23,736	
Red Cross/Crescent Organisation		US\$ 0	

2. Project Results Summary/Overall Performance

A total of 3,817 households (19,085 people) were reached through this CERF funded FAO project in Fiji, which sought to re-establish the agriculture- and fisheries-based livelihoods of households affected by Tropical Cyclone Yasa, which struck this Pacific island nation in December 2020. Out of the 3,817 households who benefited, some 2,941 households (14,705 individuals) received agricultural inputs such as seed packages (and for some, also hand tools), while 876 households (4,380 people) were provided with fisheries assistance. A breakdown of the number of households and people reached per division and province is as follows:

- Northern Division - Bua – 1,477 households (1,194 households received agricultural inputs, 283 received fisheries inputs)
- Northern Division – Cakudrove – 786 households (776 received agricultural inputs, 10 received fisheries inputs)
- Northern Division – Macuata – 1,225 households (971 received agricultural inputs, 254 received fisheries inputs)
- Eastern Division – Lau – 329 households (all who received fisheries inputs)

Examining the inputs which households received under Outputs 1, a total of 2,941 households received seed packages, which were comprised of seeds of French beans (one 30g pack), cowpea (one 50g pack), tomato (one 10g pack), yard long beans (one 30g pack) and Chinese cabbage (one to two 10g packs). In total, 450 kg of seed was procured, which included 90kg of yard long beans, 30 kg of tomato, 150 kg of cowpeas, 90kg of Chinese cabbage and 90kg of French beans.

From these 2,941 households, 417 households included a family member living with a disability and received specially selected tools to complement the seed packages. These included watering cans (with nozzle and sprayer) and hosepipe. In addition, 83 hosepipes were provided to households, which included elderly (over 70 years of age) family members.

Under Output 2, three different types of fisheries inputs were provided. Fishing gear packages, comprising one torch (with batteries), two boxes of fishing hooks (size #1 and size #3), monofilament lines (7lbs, 12 lbs, 20 lbs, 60 lbs), one 20cm knife, two packs of green lures (5 lures per pack) and 1kg of lead sheets, were supplied to fishermen from 426 households. Post-harvest kits, which included two 20cm knives, two 20 litre buckets, two 40 cm basins, one scrubbing brush and a fish scale remover were delivered to fisherwomen from 429 households. Some 20 bags of two different types of aquaculture feed (aqua focus 870 3 mm 32% protein floating tilapia feed and aqua focus 871 4mm 30% protein floating tilapia feed) was provided to each of the 21 households who engage in this livelihood activity.

3. Changes and Amendments

In June 2021, a No-Cost-Extension (NCE) of three months was requested by FAO due to the late arrival of inputs (fertilizer, hand tools and shade net), which was approved by the CERF Secretariat and resulted in an updated NTE of 31 October 2021 (as reflected above). This allowed a significant portion of the procured items to be distributed to the beneficiary households across the affected areas by the project end date. In September 2021, FAO alerted the RC and OCHA to the fact that some additional delays in the transportation of some inputs (shade net, sowing trays, fertilizer, and several types of hand tools) had been experienced, owing to the worldwide supply chain disruptions and global shipping delays. FAO took all measures possible to urge and support the vendor to ship the items to Fiji as swiftly as possible. FAO already identified funding and commenced arrangements for these items to be distributed, together with some remaining seed packages, as soon as possible after arrival in-country. For the fisheries inputs for the Eastern Division, due to COVID-related travel restrictions, these were handed over to the Ministry of Fisheries who are in the process of conducting these distributions in-line with domestic travel advice.

The items which will be distributed upon arrival in Fiji include the following: cane knife (3,000 pieces), digging fork (3,000 pieces), 20 litre jerry cans (3,000 pieces), shade net (450 rolls of 50 metre length), sowing trays (3,000 pieces) and urea fertilizer (3,000 packets of 5kg). These items will be provided to the 2,941 households who were reached with the seed distribution, with each household receiving one cane knife, digging fork, jerry can, sowing tray and packet of fertilizer, along with 7.5 metres of shade net. Any remaining items will be distributed to households in surrounding communities, and will be decided upon through consultation between FAO, the Ministry of Agriculture and the service provider.

4. Number of People Directly Assisted with CERF Funding*

Sector/cluster	Food Security – Agriculture									
Category	Planned					Reached				
	Women	Men	Girls	Boys	Total	Women	Men	Girls	Boys	Total
Refugees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Returnees	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internally displaced people	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Host communities	5,373	6,089	3,045	3,403	17,910	3,817	2,492	6,388	6,388	19,085
Other affected people	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	5,373	6,089	3,045	3,403	17,910	3,817	2,492	6,388	6,388	19,085
People with disabilities (PwD) out of the total										
	249	233	3	5	490	222	195	0	0	417

* Figures represent best estimates of people directly supported through CERF funding. Disaggregation by sex and age represents women and men ≥18, girls and boys <18.

5. People Indirectly Targeted by the Project

As Output 1 (farming support) covered all households in the targeted communities, it is not expected that any people were reached indirectly with this support. Similarly, for Output 2 (fisheries assistance), it is not anticipated that there any indirect beneficiaries either. [to note that Food Security is assisting households rather than individuals.]

6. CERF Results Framework

Project objective	Cyclone-affected agricultural households have restored food security and livelihoods.			
Output 1	2,200 households (+/- 11,000 people) farming capacity restored and strengthened			
Was the planned output changed through a reprogramming after the application stage? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				
Sector/cluster	Food Security – Agriculture			
Indicators	Description	Target	Achieved	Source of verification
Indicator 1.1	Number of kits of planting material and tool kits distributed	2,200	2,941	Procurement documentation, implementing partner reports
Indicator 1.2	% of women, children, youth and persons from vulnerable groups benefiting directly from the output	65%	58%	Implementing partner reports
Indicator 1.3	Number of households harvesting and consuming crops	2,200	2,941	Monitoring data and reports
Indicator 1.4	Number of households with a family member who is a People with Disabilities supported through tailored and increased investment agricultural packages	250	417	Implementing partner reports
Explanation of output and indicators variance:		For indicators 1.1, 1.3 and 1.4, a slightly higher number of beneficiaries was reached, owing to the amount of inputs which could be procured utilising the funds budgeted. Furthermore, indicators 1.1 and 1.3 rose as during the initial phase of distribution, strong requests were voiced by community members whose names were not on the original list of beneficiaries. Therefore, it was decided to distribute seed to all households in the targeted communities so as to avoid any feelings of discrimination. This was possible due to the amount of seed which was procured. The indicator was slightly lower than planned, owing most likely to the fact that households (rather than individuals) are targeted. The planned number of persons living with disabilities (Indicator 1.4) was greatly exceeded with 167 additional people receiving this support.		
Activities	Description	Implemented by		
Activity 1.1	Select the target communities and settlements and finalize the lists of beneficiary households	FAO Fiji and Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA)		
Activity 1.2	Procure agricultural inputs (seeds, tools and/or other local planting materials)	FAO Fiji and FAO Sub-regional Office for the Pacific Islands (SAP)		
Activity 1.3	Distribute agricultural inputs (seeds, tools and/or other local planting materials) and technical guidance material/communication	FAO Fiji and ADRA		

Activity 1.4	Conduct monitoring exercise of beneficiary household sample	ADRA
Output 2	1 132 households and 5 communities fishing capacity restored and made more resilient	
Was the planned output changed through a reprogramming after the application stage? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>		
Sector/cluster	Food Security – Agriculture	
Indicators	Description	Target
Indicator 2.1	Number of cooking kits and fishing gear packages distributed	1,110
Indicator 2.2	Number of small-scale aquaculture/mariculture households with production restored	22
Indicator 2.3	Number of communities with restored or improved access to nearshore FAD	5
Explanation of output and indicators variance:		Both indicators 2.1 and 2.2 were almost completely achieved (in excess of 79%) with fishing households across the Northern and Eastern Divisions benefiting from this support. For indicator 2.3, this activity was removed during the initial stages of the project owing to budget constraints, prioritisation of the fishing gear packages, post-harvest kits, and aquaculture feed. Furthermore, FADs are being covered by another ongoing FAO project in this country.
Activities	Description	Implemented by
Activity 2.1	Confirm the target communities and settlements and finalize the lists of beneficiary households	FAO and MoF
Activity 2.2	Procure and distribute fishing gears, fish cooking sets and post-harvest materials for small-scale fishing households (2 sets of fishing gears kit /HH)	FAO and MoF
Activity 2.3	Repair and restore small-scale aquaculture and mariculture operations for 22 households	FAO and MoF
Activity 2.4	Conduct deployment of new and repair damaged Fishing Aggregating Devices for 250 households (5 FADs)	N/A
Activity 2.5	Conduct monitoring exercise of beneficiary household sample	This will take place after the end of the project. It was not possible during the course of the project as the distribution of inputs was delayed, owing to the COVID-19 outbreak in Fiji and associated lockdowns and travel restrictions.

7. Effective Programming

a. Accountability to Affected People (AAP)²:

During the initial planning stage, FAO ensured planned activities were in line with needs as outlined in the post-disaster assessments, both those led by the Government of Fiji and those undertaken by other agencies and organizations. For the fisheries component, an in-

² AAP and PSEA are part and parcel of IASC commitments, and therefore mandatory for compliance for all UN agencies and partners. Agencies do not necessarily need to establish new AAP and PSEA mechanisms for CERF projects if functioning ones are already in place. For more information please refer to the [IASC AAP commitments](#).

depth assessment of damages to fishing activities of artisanal fishers, small-scale fishers who go beyond the reef, and those involved in the preparation, marketing, and sale of fish (post-harvest), including household assets such as fishing gear and post-harvest materials, was conducted in collaboration with the Ministry of Fisheries to develop and focus recovery activities and programming for the fisheries sector. Following the detailed assessment, a list of supplies and assistance was finalized, and the beneficiaries and communities who were to be aided, were identified. For the agricultural support output, FAO, through its implementing partner, liaised with local authorities and planned beneficiaries to share pertinent information about the project, to facilitate storage of inputs and to ensure that the output responded effectively to the needs as identified to respond to the impact of TC Yasa.

b. AAP Feedback and Complaint Mechanisms:

For Output 1, inputs which were distributed to beneficiaries (such as seed packages and agricultural tools) had stickers adhered to them which provided contact details of FAO and the service provider, ADRA. Beneficiaries were encouraged to contact responsible officers in this manner should they have any feedback to share. A total of 23 pieces of feedback were received, of which 16 were acknowledgements and appreciation for the assistance and seven were complaints. These complaints were largely questioning why some community members were eligible for assistance and others were not. These were resolved when additional distributions were made to ensure all community members were reached.

For Output 2, as the fisheries inputs were distributed to beneficiaries, phone contact details were shared with them by the service provider, the Ministry of Fisheries. Beneficiaries were encouraged to contact the responsible officer if they had any feedback to share. Five calls were received from beneficiaries who received aquaculture feed to follow-up on obtaining the remaining aquaculture feed, as aquaculture feed was stored with the service provider to maintain its quality owing to beneficiaries' inadequate storage facility. The Ministry of Fisheries then supplied the feed at the farmers' request. These beneficiaries were also encouraged to visit Ministry of Fisheries office if they had any queries.

c. Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (PSEA):

The feedback and complaint mechanism described above included this aspect. No reports of incidences were received.

d. Focus on women, girls and sexual and gender minorities, including gender-based violence:

As both components of the project targeted households (rather than individual beneficiaries), it was relatively simple to ensure that men, women, boys and girls benefited equally from all project activities. FAO and its partners captured sex-disaggregated data for the head of household/person receiving the input packages, as well as data on elderly and persons living with disabilities. From analysing the reported figures, FAO was pleased to note that men, women, boys and girls were all supported equally by project activities. Furthermore, it is assumed that, as CERF support would reduce the likelihood of negative coping mechanisms being utilised and the resulting tensions within households, the risk of gender-based violence would be reduced. For the fisheries component, post-harvest processing kits were provided to female beneficiaries as they are generally the household members who conduct this aspect of the food production.

e. People with disabilities (PwD):

Output 1 of this project was designed to particularly target a significant proportion of PwD, with just over 14% of total beneficiaries under this component falling into this category. The selection of PLWD was conducted in consultation with the *Fiji National Council for Disabled Persons* who provided FAO with a list of persons in the affected areas who they recommended receive enhanced support. These individuals (and their households) therefore received not only seed packages but also hand tools specially selected for use by PwD. In addition, the details of this component were discussed with the Pacific Protection Cluster, who indicated their agreement with the planned approach.

f. Protection:

As this project targeted households, it was relatively straightforward for all members of the communities under Output 1 to be benefited by these interventions. For Output 2, selection was based on the livelihood practised by the households, with as many households in the

affected area to be reached as possible. Therefore, all members of the targeted communities – including women, men, girls and boys, including the elderly and PwD – were reached in an inclusive fashion.

g. Education:

Not applicable for this project.

8. Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA)

Use of Cash and Voucher Assistance (CVA)?

Planned	Achieved	Total number of people receiving cash assistance:
No	No	0

If **no**, please describe why CVA was not considered. Where feasible, CVA should be considered as a default response option, and multi-purpose cash (MPC) should be utilised wherever possible.

If **yes**, briefly note how CVA is being used, highlighting the use of MPC, and if any linkages to existing social protection systems have been explored.

The intervention was designed in coordination with the national ministries and their response and recovery plan to ensure maximum synergy and complementarity of the activities with the national authorities. In this context, CVA was not a selected modality of intervention for this assistance. It is to be noted that a conditional CVA to specifically address food security vulnerabilities would not have been efficient to implement in the context of the intervention as the inputs were not available in the affected project areas for the farmers and fishers to access.

9. Visibility of CERF-funded Activities

Title	Weblink
Impact of Tropical Cyclone Yasa on fisheries in Fiji assessed	https://www.fao.org/in-action/sustainable-nearshore-fisheries-improves-livelihoods-pacific/news/details/en/c/1419168/
FAO Projects benefits fishing communities	https://www.pressreader.com/fiji/fiji-sun/20211030/281818582047592

ANNEX: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

CERF Project Code	Cluster/Sector	Agency	Implementing Partner Name		Sub-grant made under pre-existing partnership agreement	Partner Type	Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner US\$	Date of First Payment to Implementing Partner	Start Date of CERF Funded Activities By Implementing Partner*	Comments/Remarks
			Extended Name	Acronym						
21-RR-FAO-002	Agriculture	FAO	ADVENTIST DEVELOPMENT AND RELIEF AGENCY	ADRA	No	NNGO	\$23,736	21-Sep-21	24-Aug-21	Activities by IP start with the signature of the Letter of Agreement with FAO and the first installment is paid according the settled payment schedule