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THE UNITED NATIONS CENTRAL EMERGENCY RESPONSE FUND
provides fast, life-saving support for people affected by humanitarian crises.
A child in an Ethiopian district severely affected by drought.

The UN General Assembly created CERF in 2005 with one mission: TO SAVE LIVES.

On average, each year, CERF grants help humanitarian partners to deliver:

- **Critical Health Care** to 20 million people
- **Food Assistance** to 10 million people
- **Water and Sanitation** to 8 million people
- **Livelihood Support** to 5 million people
- **Protection** to 4 million people
- **Shelter** to 1 million people

As well as support services for refugees and migrants, nutrition programmes, mine action, emergency education and camp management, for millions of people in need.
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Under-Secretary-General and Emergency Relief Coordinator
© MINUSCA/Nektarios Markogiannis
When the United Nations General Assembly created the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) 10 years ago, it charged the Fund with two critical missions: to provide immediate and timely assistance to save the lives of people in crises, and to boost support to underfunded emergencies. Established as “a fund for all, by all”, CERF has enabled the international community to assist the world’s most vulnerable people wherever and whenever crises occur. Over the past decade, it has built a formidable record for the speed, scale and impact of its responses.

The need for CERF reached a historical high in 2015, with unprecedented levels of humanitarian suffering and the highest level of global displacement since the Second World War. CERF remained a critical enabler of effective, timely and life-saving humanitarian action throughout the year, helping front line partners on the ground kick-start or reinforce emergency activities in 45 countries. Below are just a few examples of CERF’s support:

- Within 48 hours of the Nepal earthquake, I made available US$15 million from CERF for partners to jump-start and accelerate life-saving response to hundreds of thousands of people.
- In Yemen, where a staggering 82 per cent of the population required humanitarian assistance, CERF provided $44 million to ensure critical services reached people most in need.
- As millions of people struggled with the devastating impact of droughts and floods driven by a strong El Niño weather cycle, CERF was at the forefront, providing quick and early funding to the tune of $59 million to countries in Eastern and Southern Africa, Central America and the Caribbean in 2015. By mid-2016, this amount had reached $119 million.

CERF raised $403 million for 2015. This would not have been possible without the generous support of the 59 Member States and observers, some of whom increased their contributions in 2015, as well as private donors and individuals. The scale and intensity of emergencies in 2015 pointed to the need for a larger, more robust CERF commensurate with the scale of response required to address global humanitarian needs. To that end, the UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon articulated a new vision for CERF for the World Humanitarian Summit, calling to increase CERF’s annual funding target to $1 billion by 2018 to invest in this highly successful, proven instrument by backing what works.

As CERF enters its second decade, it has earned the trust and commitment of its donors and partners, and it is now valued as an essential part of the world’s humanitarian response. Many of the humanitarian challenges we faced in 2015 are continuing into 2016. We count on the continued trust and support of our partners to enhance CERF’s capacity and ensure it remains agile and fit to respond quickly, effectively and at the appropriate scale to people in need.

Stephen O’Brien
UN Under-Secretary-General for
Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator
CERF is one of the fastest and most effective ways to ensure life-saving assistance to people in need. It pools voluntary contributions from donors around the world into a single fund with a US$450 million annual target. These donors are mainly Governments, but also the private sector and individuals. The money can be released immediately, anywhere in the world, at the onset of emergencies, in rapidly deteriorating situations and in protracted crises that fail to attract sufficient resources.

During emergencies, humanitarian organizations on the ground jointly prioritize needs and apply for funding. In each country that applies for a CERF allocation, the Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) leads a process by the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) to develop submissions that prioritize essential life-saving activities in a strategic, focused and coherent manner. The CERF secretariat provides support to decision makers to ensure an effective and efficient prioritization process.

CERF funds an average of 500 projects a year. Applications are reviewed against CERF’s criteria, i.e., needs are urgent and proposed activities will save lives. The Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), who is the Fund manager, approves the allocations.

Only UN organizations and the International Organization for Migration (IOM) are directly eligible to receive CERF funding. However, CERF grants are implemented in partnerships with local and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), host Governments and Red Cross/Red Crescent societies. CERF leverages the global network of partnerships that the UN agencies and IOM have established over decades to reach people quickly wherever and whenever the need is greatest.

CERF is guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence. All countries are vulnerable to circumstances that can create humanitarian need. CERF is a fund “by all, for all”, and one third of the countries that have donated to CERF have themselves been recipients of emergency funding.
FUNDING FOR HUMANITARIAN ACTION

CERF allocates funds for life-saving work at the most critical phases of an emergency:

- In the beginning, when resources can jump-start a humanitarian response.
- When an ongoing crisis deteriorates.
- When a crisis fails to attract enough resources for an effective response.

The Fund issues grants for these phases through two windows:

- The Rapid Response Window provides assistance to new emergencies, to existing emergencies that have deteriorated significantly, or in response to time-critical needs.
- The Underfunded Emergencies Window delivers support for critical needs in underfunded and often protracted crises. Grants are allocated in two rounds: at the beginning and in the middle of each year.

The Rapid Response Window

*Kick-starts humanitarian assistance in a crisis*

In emergencies, time lost leads to lives lost. Funds for critical life-saving assistance can be made available within hours of a disaster. The Fund makes grants year-round for rapid action in emergencies as needs arise. This allows UN agencies, IOM, and their partners to start humanitarian assistance immediately, while moving forward with other fundraising efforts to ensure longer-term support.

A minimum of two thirds of the Fund are used for rapid response purposes.

The Underfunded Emergencies Window

*Bolsters emergency response when funds are scarce*

CERF is a lifeline for some of the world’s most neglected, underfunded and often protracted crises. It makes grants through this window twice a year, responding to emergencies where resources are low and the humanitarian situation is dire or at risk of deteriorating further. Most grants are allocated early in the year to allow partners to begin projects without delay. Through such allocations, the ERC raises awareness of crises that might otherwise be overlooked.

Up to one third of the Fund are used in chronically underfunded emergencies.

Loan Facility

*Covers cash-flow gaps in critical emergency response*

CERF has a $30 million loan facility. UN organizations and IOM can access flexible CERF loans based on indications that they have secured other donor funding and will be in a position to repay the loans. This allows them to start relief operations immediately.
CERF marked its tenth anniversary in 2015. The world was in turmoil, faced with an increasing number of large, complex and protracted emergencies dominated by violent armed conflicts. Millions of people were caught up in four “mega-crises” caused by the conflicts in Iraq, South Sudan, Syria and Yemen. The number of internally displaced persons (IDPs), refugees and asylum seekers exceeded 60 million, the largest number since the Second World War. In addition, many countries faced natural disasters, as the worst El Niño phenomenon in 50 years had devastating impact across the globe. Together, these events created a perfect storm and a level of need unprecedented in CERF’s history.

In January 2015, the UN and its partners appealed for $16.4 billion to provide urgent humanitarian assistance to 57 million people in 22 countries. By the end of 2015, the humanitarian situation worldwide had worsened, and it was estimated that 87 million people required urgent humanitarian assistance at an estimated cost of $20 billion.

CERF used its reserve from previous years ($67 million) to supplement contributions received for 2015 ($403 million). It allocated nearly $470 million in 45 countries, supporting the life-saving work of humanitarian partners by funding 463 projects through 72 grants.

**2015 Highlights**

- **Four L3 crises under way:** Iraq, South Sudan, Syria and Yemen.*
- **$77M for the Syria regional response**—the largest single allocation for an emergency to date.
- **CERF allocated $59M for response to El Niño-related climate events.**
- **$470M total allocations**

Top 10 recipients:
- Yemen
- Syria AR
- Ethiopia
- Somalia
- Sudan
- Nepal
- Lebanon
- Malawi
- Chad
- Myanmar

*The IASC deactivated the L3 in the Central African Republic in May 2015.
CERF kick-started operations with rapid-response grants totalling nearly $301 million.

For example, within 48 hours of the devastating earthquake in Nepal in April, CERF had announced $15 million for aid. In Yemen, where armed conflict exacerbated an already dire situation, humanitarian partners received more than $44 million through four allocations for projects ranging from food aid to emergency telecommunications. This was the highest amount provided to humanitarian operations in a single country in 2015. And when floods in Myanmar displaced over 160,000 people from their homes, more than $10 million in CERF funding helped to provide food, shelter and more.

Wherever funds were required rapidly, CERF enabled humanitarian action with timely support.

CERF disbursed $169 million through its Underfunded Emergencies Window.

CERF focused its first underfunded-emergencies allocation on the Syria regional emergency, giving more than $77 million to six of the affected countries. The second allocation brought relief to people in large displacement crises, including more than $21 million for refugees in Chad and IDPs in Sudan due to the protracted crisis in Darfur.
More than half of CERF’s total 2015 funding was allocated for food, health services, and water and sanitation. Emergencies in Africa received the largest amount of funding by region, accounting for approximately 52 per cent of CERF’s total allocations. The Fund made its third- and fourth-highest allocations of the year to Ethiopia and Somalia. These countries were already confronting emergencies when El Niño brought extreme drought conditions to the region, intensifying humanitarian needs and threatening to reverse years of development.

CERF used its Rapid Response and Underfunded Emergencies Windows to address humanitarian needs linked to El Niño. It took decisive early action by allocating $59 million for timely life-saving responses in eight countries: El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, Malawi, Somalia and Zimbabwe.
In 2015, CERF disbursed funds to 10 United Nations agencies, funds and programmes and to IOM.

Each year on average, UN agencies and IOM channel more than 20 per cent of the funds they receive from CERF to their implementing partners, much of which is then provided to national and local partners. National and international NGOs work hand in hand with CERF’s partner agencies to deliver humanitarian relief. In addition to their implementing capacity, NGOs provide local knowledge of needs in an emergency. As part of the humanitarian coordination structures they can play a key role in deciding how CERF funds will be used.

In 2015, UN agencies used more than $240 million of CERF funding to procure relief supplies to affected people. Many of these supplies were then delivered by NGOs and other partners.

By linking allocations directly to the most urgent needs, as identified and prioritized by RC/HCs, CERF enables a timely, focused and coherent response to humanitarian emergencies.

**ALLOCATIONS BY AGENCY**

in US$ million

- **WFP**: $159.9M
- **UNICEF**: 113.9
- **UNHCR**: 69.4
- **WHO**: 39.4
- **IOM**: 29.9
- **FAO**: 27.4
- **UNFPA**: 16.1
- **UNRWA**: 6.1
- **UNDP**: 5.1
- **UNOPS**: 2.2
- **UN Women**: 0.3

**Total**: $469.7M

**SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT GOALS**

Humanitarian action and the Agenda for Sustainable Development

**CERF** is keeping pace through its close links with the newly adopted 2030 agenda for Sustainable Development, which aims to improve the lives of everyone, everywhere. Achieving the 17 Sustainable Development Goals will depend in no small part on reaching the millions of vulnerable children, women and men suffering the devastating impacts of humanitarian crises. This is CERF’s raison d’être, and the Fund has an important contribution to make in realizing the 2030 Agenda's overarching objective of leaving no one behind.

-Ban Ki-moon, UN Secretary-General
CERF 2015 ALLOCATIONS
in US$ million, as of 31 December 2015

ALLOCATIONS BY COUNTRY

- **YEMEN**: $44.3M
- **SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC**: $29.9M
- **ETHIOPIA**: $27M
- **SOMALIA**: $25.3M
- **SUDAN**: $24.2M
- **NEPAL**: $19.1M
- **LEBANON**: $18M
- **MALAWI**: $16.9M
- **CHAD**: $16.5M
- **MYANMAR**: $15.8M
- **DRC***: $14.8M
- **CAMEROON**: $14.1M
- **AFGHANISTAN**: $13.8M
- **NIGER**: $13.7M
- **SOUTH SUDAN**: $13.4M
- **IRAQ**: $12.5M
- **CAR***: $11.6M
- **PAKISTAN**: $11M
- **RWANDA**: $10.5M
- **NIGERIA**: $9.9M
- **HAITI**: $9.2M
- **TANZANIA***: $9.2M
- **JORDAN**: $9M
- **TURKEY**: $9M
- **DPRK***: $8.3M
- **ZIMBABWE**: $8.1M
- **ALGERIA**: $5.1M
- **VANUATU**: $5M
- **UKRAINE**: $4.9M
- **MOZAMBIQUE**: $4M
- **EGYPT**: $3.5M
- **UGANDA**: $3.2M
- **DJIBOUTI**: $3M
- **COLOMBIA**: $3M
- **ERITREA**: $3M
- **BANGLADESH**: $3M
- **EL SALVADOR**: $2.7M
- **MAURITANIA**: $2.5M
- **BURUNDI**: $2.5M
- **MADAGASCAR**: $2.3M
- **HONDURAS**: $2.2M
- **PHILIPPINES**: $1.5M
- **LIBYA**: $1.5M
- **PERU**: $0.9M
- **CHILE**: $0.8M

*CAR - CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
DPRK - DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF KOREA
DRC - DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
TANZANIA - UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA
STRATEGIC USE OF CERF FUNDS

Greater impact through targeted allocations
CERF works closely with field partners to strategically select and support projects that target immediate life-saving needs. This approach adds to the value of every dollar that CERF allocates; it places HCs at the centre of decision-making and promotes a coherent and effective response to urgent needs. The following examples demonstrate how CERF funds were used strategically in 2015.

SUPPORTING LEVEL-THREE EMERGENCIES

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) is a collective of 18 organizations chaired by the ERC. The ERC declares level-three (L3) emergencies based on a review of the scale, urgency, capacity needed and risk of deterioration of an emergency. The L3 designation activates a focused system-wide humanitarian emergency response. In 2015, CERF supported the scale up of humanitarian operations at a critical juncture in the four L3 emergencies: Iraq, South Sudan, Syria and Yemen. For each of these crises, 2015 brought an escalation of need that required funding through CERF’s Rapid Response and Underfunded Emergencies Windows. The following examples illustrate how CERF supported the HCTs in L3 emergencies.

“CERF has, over the years, proven to be an efficient mechanism for providing a combination of urgent, life-saving aid and long-term support in protracted crises. CERF is a role model for how to reach more people in need by providing effective humanitarian aid in a flexible manner. As such, it is very much aligned with Sweden’s core humanitarian principles, and I am proud that Sweden is the second biggest donor to CERF since the start.”

—H E Ms Isabella Lövin, Sweden’s Minister for International Development Cooperation

“I want to be a teacher. I want to help others like me,” said 10-year-old Memdiglielembaye Croyance, a returnee from CAR at the Djako primary school in Moundou, Chad. She is one of the 1.3 million children uprooted by conflict in Nigeria and the Lake Chad region.

© UNICEF/McMahon
Mitigating the impact of a conflict and embargo

In 2015, 82 per cent of Yemen’s 26 million people required humanitarian assistance due to the conflict intensification. That year, CERF disbursed more funding to Yemen than to any other country, with over $44 million in four rapid-response allocations.

In May 2015, CERF allocated $1.4 million to help humanitarian partners sustain food-aid operations in Yemen. A $25 million CERF allocation followed in June and August to provide fuel, medicine, emergency supplies, clean water and sanitation services and nutrition. It also increased humanitarian air services and improved port facilities, enabling humanitarian access for aid agencies, and expanding the volume and reach of life-saving assistance.

In July 2015, CERF provided $2.6 million to set up security and telecommunications support structures required for international staff to operate in five area hubs. This followed the L3 activation and the IASC’s decision to scale up UN and INGO presence across the country.

Massive displacement amid continued fighting created new needs. In October, CERF disbursed $15 million for aid operations targeting 2.6 million IDPs, refugees and migrants. The funds supported demining, the removal of unexploded ordnance and the provision of basic household supplies to people who had fled their homes.

2015 RESPONSE TO YEMEN
in US$ million

2015 CERF FUNDING
$44 M

ALLOCATIONS BY SECTOR

Health
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
UNHAS
Coordination and support services
Logistics
Shelter and NFI
Nutrition
Protection
Early recovery
Food
Multi-cluster
Emergency telecommunications

$10.8M

4.9
4
3.3
3
2
1.5
1.4
1
0.7

ALLOCATIONS BY AGENCY

UNICEF
WFP
WHO
UNHCR
IOM
UNDP
UNFPA

$11.9M
9.4
9.0
6.4
3.9
2.7
1.1

2015 IN REVIEW
Record contribution to World Health Organization boosts essential health care in Yemen

The impact of Yemen’s humanitarian emergency, already profound, intensified in 2015 due to a strict embargo against the import of many essential goods. Among them were medical supplies, including medicines to treat chronic and dangerous diseases. The shortage occurred at a time when Yemen’s entire health system was under great strain.

CERF allocated more than $8 million to the World Health Organization—the Fund’s largest-ever contribution to the agency—to support the delivery of life-saving medicines for non-communicable diseases.

Medical mobile teams provide primary health-care services for internally displaced people. © WHO

RESPONSE TIMELINE
in US$ million

- Escalation of hostilities
  - Apr 2015
  - $1.4M

- Food assistance for 133,000 conflict-affected people
  - May
  - $11

- CERF funding enabled humanitarian partners to deliver time-sensitive, life-saving assistance to IDPs and host communities
  - Jun
  - $14.3

- Coordination and support services to set up humanitarian area hubs
  - Jul
  - $2.6

- CERF funds allocated for emergency relief supplies including water, health care, dignity kits, sleeping mats, blankets and other household supplies
  - Aug
  - $15

  - Sep
  - $3

  - Oct

2015 IN REVIEW
Addressing new emergency needs

SOUTH SUDAN

Armed conflict

Rapid-response allocations

In 2015, more than 6 million people were in need of protection and humanitarian assistance, both in South Sudan and in surrounding countries that accommodated South Sudanese refugees fleeing conflict. South Sudan also accommodated Sudanese refugees. During the year fighting in South Sudan intensified displacing hundreds of thousands of people, leading the Humanitarian Country Team to request CERF assistance. From June to August, the Fund provided $20.4 million to address the new humanitarian needs related to conflict and disease outbreaks. Three allocations totalling $13.4 million were provided to humanitarian organizations working in South Sudan and one allocation of $7 million to support South Sudanese refugees in Sudan.

Renewed conflict in the Greater Upper Nile region in Unity and Upper Nile States beginning in April resulted in further displacement, destruction of homes and livelihoods for an estimated 750,000 people. In response CERF allocated $5.2 million for South Sudan in July to provide life-saving survival kits to people in hard to reach locations, where humanitarian access was severely limited.

By the end of May, Sudan’s White Nile State experienced an influx of approximately 30,000 South Sudanese refugees due to the conflict in South Sudan. CERF’s $7 million allocation enabled the provision of life-saving supplies and services at reception sites such as protection, primary health care and nutrition.

In June, CERF provided $5.6 million to UNHCR, UNOPS, WFP and UNICEF in South Sudan to support the increased needs of the 10,000 refugees in Ajuong Thok camp, both new arrivals from Sudan as well as those relocating from Yida.

In July, a cholera outbreak in Juba and Bor counties of Central Equatoria and Jonglei States compounded the country’s already dire humanitarian situation. A sudden 50-200% increase in the cost of safe drinking water led to poor hygiene and sanitation practices and made already vulnerable communities more susceptible to the disease. To reduce the morbidity and mortality associated with cholera and prevent any further spread, CERF supported UNICEF and WHO with $2.6 million to deploy qualified health professionals, deliver life-saving medicines and provide clean drinking water and sanitation services.

The flexibility of the CERF’s rapid-response window enables humanitarians to strategically address needs as they arise, providing responders with critical funding whenever and wherever needed.

RESPONSE TO SOUTH SUDAN CRISIS

as of 31 December 2015

2015 CERF FUNDING

$20M


Allocation for South Sudan response

Allocation for South Sudanese refugees in Sudan

- Fighting flares
- Expand capacity of refugee camp
- Survival kits distribution
- Cholera outbreak

15

2015 IN REVIEW
Survival kits for stranded people

Fighting in the country’s Greater Upper Nile region displaced hundreds of thousands of people in remote and swampy areas. Cut off from their homes, they lost their livelihoods and missed the growing season. Some 750,000 people lacked access to humanitarian support and were in dire need of food, shelter, clean water, health care and protection.

The HCT approached CERF with a proposal to help these people with life-saving supplies through the provision of customized survival kits. With a $5.2 million grant from CERF’s Rapid Response Window, humanitarians assembled and distributed 30,000 survival kits containing emergency shelter, health and nutrition supplies, and material for fishing or growing vegetables. The kits were airdropped in areas that could not be accessed by road. They offered families a way to cultivate nutritious food quickly, or to catch fish to eat, trade, sell or preserve.

Top and bottom left: On 29 August 2015, humanitarian partners distribute survival kits in Nyilwak, an isolated community on the Nile River, Upper Nile. The survival kits—containing critical household items—are delivered by helicopter to hard-to-reach locations. © IOM/Bannon

Bottom right: On 25 September 2015, a woman unpacks a survival kit provided by humanitarian partners in Bauw. © WFP/George Fominyen
The 2015 El Niño phenomenon was the most severe El Niño of the last 50 years by many accounts, and it is a classic example of how climate conditions create humanitarian crises. The phenomenon, which recurs every two to seven years, warms the tropical waters of the Pacific Ocean, producing weather patterns that cause severe drought and flooding. This has devastating consequences, such as crop failure, food insecurity, malnutrition, lack of potable water and forced displacement.

Based on forecasts and reports from partners on the ground, the UN Secretary-General and the ERC advised that El Niño called for early action, and they mobilized CERF to address humanitarian needs early on.

Between July and December 2015, CERF made multiple allocations from its Rapid Response and Underfunded Emergencies Windows, providing nearly $59 million in grants for 36 El Niño-related relief projects in eight countries: El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, Malawi, Somalia and Zimbabwe. The funds helped aid agencies respond to displacement, drought, floods and food insecurity. As the year ended, additional funds were in the pipeline to support humanitarian action in other countries severely affected.

CERF’s early provision of El Niño-related funds illustrates its role in enabling early action to emergencies, including slow-onset crises. When CERF allocates funds to an emergency, it indicates that the severity of a crisis has moved beyond the local donor response and merits international attention.
The current El Niño is resulting in life-threatening weather extremes around the globe.

— Stephen O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

In Ethiopia’s Somali region, supplies from WFP reach people affected by drought. CERF support helped the agency to deliver food and nutrition services. © WFP/Melese Awoke
CERF supports WFP response to El Niño

CERF funds bring aid to Ethiopians during El Niño

The 2015 El Niño affected Ethiopia more than any other country. It caused erratic rainfall, leading to the country’s worst drought in five decades. By late 2015, over 10 million people in Ethiopia needed humanitarian assistance.

In Gazgibla, one of 186 districts experiencing a nutrition crisis, 48-year-old Teshome Kalelew visited a health centre in the town of Bella to collect food rations for himself and his wife, who had just given birth to twins. Teshome said the lack of rain in 2015 was the most serious he had seen in decades.

“In normal years, we get about five days of rain at the end of June, then it rains regularly in July and August, and again for up to five days in September,” he said. “This time, it rained only six days in three months.”

CERF is among the contributors helping WFP to provide food and nutrition services at health centres. With help from WFP and the Government of Ethiopia, Teshome received cereal, beans and oil for his family. His wife received special high-nutrient food for pregnant women, nursing mothers and malnourished children.

Finding the trigger for early funding in slow-onset disasters

The Fund’s size is limited, but global needs are rising. For these reasons, the CERF secretariat has set new parameters to prioritize the countries that are most affected and most in need of funding.

Challenges arise when country teams apply for rapid response funding for drought, given the difficulties identifying a trigger. The eligibility requirement for rapid response funding is clear in sudden-onset emergencies, such as conflict, earthquakes or floods, as such emergencies create new and unplanned needs beyond the country team’s response capacity. However, in slow-onset crises, it is more difficult to identify new needs as distinct from chronic needs.

To facilitate decision-making in slow-onset crises, the CERF secretariat developed a drought-guidance note explaining how to determine eligibility for rapid response funding. The trigger is determined by reviewing available data including food insecurity levels, rainfall, crop production and malnutrition prevalence, then comparing it to the same period the previous year and the average of the last five years. This analysis enables CERF to determine whether a trigger is present. Once this is determined, country teams can apply for time-critical support from CERF.
Cash assistance: A lifeline for Zimbabweans during drought

Dumazile Moyo, a mother of four, is one of the more than 1.5 million people in Zimbabwe who faced hunger in 2015.

“We didn’t have a good harvest because the rains came late,” she said. “By then, the crops were wilting. I harvested only three bags of maize and two bags of millet—not enough to feed my family.”

To help people like Dumazile, WFP launched an operation to provide food, or, where market conditions allowed, cash assistance for the most vulnerable people. CERF funding helped to make the programme possible.

Cash has benefits for people, communities and humanitarians. It lets people choose their own food, it injects money into the local economy and it costs less to transport.

As El Niño began to build in late 2015, Zimbabweans who depend on their crops, and who had already suffered a blow from erratic weather, needed all the help they could get.

CERF provided WFP with $4.25 million in rapid-response funding for Zimbabwe, of which $2.3 million was distributed as cash vouchers to purchase food.

At one cash-distribution point at a church in the central Zimbabwe town of Sasula, Frank Zivengwa said: “Life is tough now.”

He has a wife and six children at home. “I can survive only by working in other people’s fields,” he said. “Sometimes I make bricks to sell.”

One woman said: “We’re hoping for a better harvest next season so we won’t be stressed again about not being able to feed our families.”

For people dependent on the weather, cash vouchers provide security against the unpredictable.

A distribution operation takes place in a municipal office, where the money is handed out by guards from a local security firm.

© WFP/David Orr
TAKING A REGIONAL APPROACH TO INCREASE IMPACT

In 2015, CERF provided regional allocations to respond to the needs of people affected by complex crises spreading beyond national borders in and around Burundi, Darfur, Myanmar, Nigeria, Syria and Yemen. Through this approach, CERF aims to have a wider regional impact on reducing humanitarian problems that are interlinked and may exacerbate one another.

For example, in response to the Lake Chad Basin crisis, the ERC released more than $58 million from CERF for life-saving assistance to people affected by the Boko Haram violence, including displaced people, host communities and people who stayed behind. Some $27.2 million was allocated in March to assist more than 1.6 million people from Cameroon, Chad, Niger and Nigeria, and an additional $31 million was provided in late 2015/early 2016 for more than 700,000 people affected by the deteriorating situation.

For the first underfunded round of 2015, two regions were highlighted in CERF allocations: the Syria crisis ($77.5 million to Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Turkey) and the Great Lakes ($14 million to Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) and Rwanda).
Nigerian refugees and Chadian displaced children attend school

For children displaced from their homes by a humanitarian emergency, going to school is a quick way to regain some stability in a disrupted life. It can also provide physical and psychosocial protection to children. In the Lake Chad region, where at least 65,000 displaced people have taken refuge from conflict, UNICEF helped to provide education in 56 schools for more than 11,000 children.

The refugee influx in Chad had strained an already fragile education system. Therefore, UNICEF used CERF funding for emergency repairs of classrooms, and to provide teacher training and learning materials.

“I never had the chance to go to school,” said 15-year-old Aisha Mahamat, a Nigerian refugee who lives in Dar es Salam refugee camp. She was married at age 13 but has since divorced and now has a child. With support from CERF, UNICEF made it possible for Aisha to realize her dream of attending school.

“Now I have the opportunity to study,” she said with a smile. “My son, Aboukar, stays with my mother when I am in class.”

Ten-year-old Bello Ali is also from Nigeria. He was born in a village beside Lake Chad. “My father is a herder,” he said. “I was not going to school as I was always with our cattle.”

Like Aisha, Bello’s stay in the camp was a gateway to school. “Today, it is the first time I study,” he said. “I love it.”

Two girls playing jump rope during school recreation in Dar es Salam refugee camp in Chad. Ninety per cent of the camp’s children had never attended school before arriving in the camp. A total of 1.3 million children have been uprooted by conflict in Nigeria and the Lake Chad region.

© UNICEF/Bahaji
CERF
RAPID RESPONSE

2015 IN REVIEW
NEPAL
Earthquake
Rapid-response allocations

Two major earthquakes struck Nepal in April and May 2015, affecting more than 5.4 million people and causing severe damage to infrastructure and livelihoods. More than 8,000 people lost their lives, over 600,000 houses were destroyed and another 290,000 damaged, rendering many people homeless. The UN and its partners appealed for $422 million to help 2.8 million people for five months. The heavy monsoon rains, landslides and Nepal’s mountainous terrain created a difficult operating environment for UN agencies, IOM, and national and international NGO partners. They worked with local authorities and local partners to ensure that millions of people were reached with essential assistance in the 14 worst-affected districts.

CERF was one of the first contributors to support response efforts. Within 48 hours of the first earthquake, the Fund announced $15 million from the Rapid Response Window to jump-start urgent relief. CERF funding allowed humanitarian responders to provide food to more than 728,000 people, safe drinking water and sanitation facilities to 235,000 people and access to essential health services to an estimated 1.46 million people.

Later in the year, CERF allocated an additional $4.2 million to overcome logistical challenges due to mudslides limited access to vulnerable communities. It used a variety of approaches to bring aid to survivors, from donkeys to helicopters from the UN Humanitarian Air Service.

Ireland greatly values the CERF’s ability to mobilize funds quickly, and to channel that funding to where it is most needed. For example, the outbreak of conflict in Yemen led to humanitarian needs on an unprecedented scale, and CERF’s quick action allowed the UN to support the supply of critical needs such as fuel, medicine and water, helping prevent even greater suffering. We were also glad to see CERF responding quickly to the earthquake which struck Nepal, and to underfunded crises across the globe. I am proud of Ireland’s continued and consistent support to CERF.

—Seán Sherlock, Ireland’s Minister of State for Overseas Development Assistance, Trade Promotion and North South Co-operation

Search-and-rescue teams in the ancient city of Bhaktapur, Nepal, after the 7.8-magnitude earthquake. © OCHA/Orla Fagan
FIRST RESPONDERS FOR NEPAL EARTHQUAKE

in US$ million

FIRST CERF ALLOCATION

$15M

**ALLOCATION BY SECTOR**

- WASH: $3.5M
- Shelter and NFI: 3.5
- Food: 2.9
- Health: 2.5
- Logistics: 2.5
- Protection: 0.5

**ALLOCATION BY AGENCY**

- WFP: $4.9M
- UNICEF: 4.8
- IOM: 3.5
- WHO: 1.0
- UNFPA: 0.8

**TOTAL HUMANITARIAN CONTRIBUTIONS TO NEPAL FLASH APPEAL**

$15M CERF

$29.5M

Other contributions included in Flash Appeal

1Financial Tracking Service as of 6 May 2016

---

**IOM uses CERF funds to shelter Nepalis**

Kancchi Gole remembers exactly what she was doing when an earthquake destroyed her home. “I was cooking that day,” said the 57-year-old Nepali wife and mother, who supports her unemployed husband, an elderly brother-in-law and two blind children.

“Suddenly, the earth shook heavily, causing the cooking utensils to fall to the ground. I immediately ran outside, shouted everyone’s name and shouted to my husband to take the kids outside.”

Nepal’s 7.8-magnitude earthquake in April, and a second quake in May measuring magnitude 7.3, destroyed or damaged hundreds of thousands of homes. Kancchi’s house was among them.

“Our roof collapsed,” she said. “Most of the walls cracked. There is no way that we could live in that house anymore.”

IOM used CERF funding to provide emergency shelter materials, kitchen supplies, hygiene kits and blankets to more than 400,000 people whose homes were damaged or destroyed. For Kancchi and her family, who were sheltering under tarpaulins in an open space near their home, the supplies arrived just in time.

She explained: “Just as we thought that we wouldn’t be able to go back to our old house until we received reconstruction funding from the Government, IOM came with corrugated iron sheets. This allowed us to build a temporary shelter next to our ruined house.”

Her next step was clear: “My main priority is to get the house situation sorted out as soon as possible so that I can start working and feed my family.”

---

Nepal’s earthquakes left many children homeless and without access to care.
© OCHA/Orla Fagan
**RESPONSE TIMELINE**

### Within 48 hours

ERC announces **CERF allocation** enabling humanitarian country teams to kick-start relief efforts

7.8-magnitude **earthquake** strikes

**UNDAC** assessment initiated

Flash appeal launched ($415M)

CERF is the **top contributor** to the Flash Appeal

---

**25 Apr**  
**UNDAC** team deployed

**26**

**27**

**28**

**29**

**30**

**1 May**

**2**

**3**

**4**

**5**

**6**

---

**2015 IN REVIEW**
Political tensions in Burundi in April of 2015 led to violence in the country, forcing 150,000 people to flee to DRC, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda. By the end of 2015, the number of refugees in the four countries had reached more than 230,000. In May 2015, UNHCR and humanitarian partners appealed for $207 million to provide assistance. About 60 per cent of people fleeing Burundi were children; humanitarian organizations reported high levels of malnutrition and expressed concern for child protection.

In May and June, CERF allocated $15 million through its Rapid Response Window to support the humanitarian response in Tanzania and Rwanda. Nearly $8 million was allocated to scale up the relief operation in Rwanda, supporting refugees at two reception centres and in one camp. CERF funding helped to provide food, water and health services to 30,000 Burundian refugees as well as protection and nutrition to more than 7,000 children. CERF’s allocations enabled humanitarian partners to meet the refugees’ critical needs while improving health and reducing vulnerability.

The contribution from CERF has come at a critical time for UNHCR’s initial response in supporting the Government of Rwanda in ensuring basic assistance and protection for refugees fleeing from Burundi.

— Saber Azam, UNHCR Representative, co-led the response with the Government of Rwanda
UNHCR helps Burundians seeking refuge in Rwanda

When violence sent a wave of refugees from Burundi into Rwanda in April 2015, tens of thousands of people found a temporary home at Mahama camp. Less than a month after it opened, the camp housed more than 20,000 people—a number that would eventually reach 50,000.

UNHCR responded to the emergency from the start. CERF was ready to help, approving a contribution of nearly $6 million to UNHCR for immediate, life-saving assistance and protection to the refugees, including those who would come to stay at Mahama.

First, UNHCR set up reception sites near the border, assisting all of the Burundian refugees in registering for essential services on arrival. This cleared the way for them to receive aid immediately and helped UNHCR and its partners in establishing what types of assistance would be needed. The agency provided shelter materials, water and sanitation at the reception areas.

A short time later, the Government of Rwanda allocated a site for the Burundian refugees inside its borders. UNHCR used bus-and-truck convoys to transport the refugees to their temporary home. CERF funds helped to provide clean water and cooking supplies for the camp’s residents.

“UNHCR is tremendously grateful to CERF for this timely contribution to the Burundi refugee crisis in Rwanda, and to the essential work of our sister UN agencies,” said the agency’s representative, Saber Azam, who worked with the Government of Rwanda to lead the humanitarian response.

CERF also contributed almost $2 million to other UN agencies working to meet the critical needs of Burundian refugees.

Securing livelihoods

MOZAMBIQUE

- Extreme weather
- Floods
- Rapid-response allocation

In January 2015, heavy rains and flooding affected 160,000 people in Mozambique’s central Zambezia Province, forcing 50,000 people to flee their homes. CERF approved an initial $3.2 million rapid-response grant to kick-start the humanitarian response and offer a vital bridge to recovery.

CERF funds supported UN agencies and partners to provide food, clean water and shelter, as well as agricultural materials to support livelihoods and limit dependence on food aid. Humanitarian partners delivered emergency food assistance to more than 50,000 people, shelter and family kits to over 76,000 people and safe water to approximately 48,000 people in resettlement centres.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) used CERF funds to provide maize, seeds and tools to nearly 28,000 people. This enabled them to rebound from the crisis quickly, taking advantage of moisture remaining in the fields by planting crops and thus creating a food source that would generate income.

The situation is critical for many families that have lost everything, including their homes and crops for the year.

– Camila Rivero Maldonado, IOM Project Manager.
IOM used CERF funding to shelter 40,000 displaced people in Zambezia Province
In just two weeks during July and August 2015, heavy floods and monsoon rains affected more than 9 million people in Myanmar. The waters temporarily displaced up to 1.7 million people.

CERF disbursed $9 million in August to help the HCT kick-start relief assistance for some 160,000 people across several of the country’s regions. It supported food, shelter, water and sanitation as well as protection and reproductive health. With CERF funding, UNFPA provided a multi-sectoral prevention and response to gender-based violence targeting 12,000 women. Specific activities included establishing Women Friendly Spaces, delivering mobile services for counselling and psychosocial support, providing case management, raising community awareness, and training relevant government authorities and service providers. UNFPA also improved access to reproductive health services for thousands of people displaced by the floods.

By October, food security had significantly deteriorated in some areas, prompting CERF to release a second allocation of $1.5 million for livelihoods.

Rebuilding livelihoods with FAO support

Sixty-year-old Daw Nye Mya lives beside Myanmar’s Chindwin River in the Sagaing region. She had never seen flooding as treacherous as the waters that surged over the riverbank and into her village in July and August 2015.

When the flooding began, Daw Nye Mya and her three daughters scrambled to reach safety. The first flood completely engulfed their village. Villagers used small boats to evacuate children and the elderly first. A second wave of flooding followed a month later.

Three months passed before they could return home and begin to restore their livelihoods, which depend on agriculture. Villagers found their fields covered in dense mud, baked hard and cracking. Those with land on higher ground, such as Daw Nye Mya, also suffered losses.

She explained: “When the floods came, the torrential rains washed away the upper layer of soil. The soil fertility decreased, and my yield of groundnuts and pigeon peas was only half the yield of the previous year.”

Before the floods, the crops had generated income that helped to pay for one daughter’s university education. The damaged fields jeopardized the family’s future.

FAO was there to help, providing crucial support for nearly 80 families in Daw Nye Mya’s village. The agency gave them agricultural kits and piglets before the next rainy season arrived. This was all part of a larger, CERF-funded project that assisted more than 50,000 flood-affected people in the Sagaing region.

Daw Nye Mya was grateful for the assistance. “We are very hopeful that the fertilizer and seeds from FAO will help in the upcoming crop season to increase the yield and improve quality,” she said.
When Tropical Cyclone Pam struck the island nation of Vanuatu in March 2015, CERF approved rapid-response funds in 24 hours to kick-start humanitarian relief operations. The Fund allocated more than $5 million for food, shelter, water and sanitation, and logistical support.

The storm affected over 166,000 people, more than half of Vanuatu’s population. These people were dispersed across an 80-island archipelago, meaning the obstacles to providing aid, especially logistics, were immense.

CERF’s allocation helped support a coordinated emergency response, enabling the Logistics Cluster—a team of specialists from several organizations—to set up a shared facility for humanitarian cargo at the country’s primary airport in Port Vila. The cluster installed two additional mobile cargo storage units enabling them to receive more relief supplies.

Through CERF’s support, some 45,000 people received water supplies, close to 25,000 children were vaccinated and almost 50,000 people received agricultural materials. UNICEF used CERF funding to bring clean water for drinking, cooking and bathing to over 6,800 households in Vanuatu, surpassing an initial target of 6,500 households.

When Tropical Cyclone Pam struck Vanuatu in March 2015, 30-year-old Katelina Ialoo was sheltering in Fresh Wota School, a temporary evacuation centre established in the capital, Port Vila. IOM used CERF funding to set up the centre for people who had lost their homes.

As the storm raged outside, Katelina went into labour. Twelve hours later, she had given birth to her firstborn child, a girl. The new mother had a name in mind for her baby: Pamela.

During the storm, Katelina’s husband was far out to sea, working on a fishing boat. But she later received word that he was safe. Of the centre’s 200 occupants, she was one of two women who gave birth that night. Sixteen others were between five and seven months pregnant.

Asked what she wanted for her baby, Katelina thought for a long time before answering: “I want her to work for the church because God helped us through the storm.”
SUPPORTING UNDERFUNDED EMERGENCIES

In front of a tent shelter, a woman carries a girl on a bitterly cold winter’s day in Dikmen Valley, a host community in the Turkish capital, Ankara. © UNICEF/Yurtsever
Sudden and massive new emergencies generate media coverage that generally trigger donations. However, small, slow-onset and ongoing crises rarely attract the funding needed. CERF’s Underfunded Emergencies Window aims to offset the imbalance in humanitarian aid flows by bolstering support for neglected crises and highlighting funding gaps to trigger additional contributions. In 2015, the Fund disbursed approximately $169 million through its Underfunded Emergencies Window in 20 countries.

**FIRST ALLOCATION ROUND**

In January, the ERC allocated $98.5 million from CERF to boost life-saving relief in 12 countries where humanitarian needs were high and financial support low. Some $77.5 million was allocated to six countries affected by the crisis in Syria. Another $13 million went to support aid operations in three countries in Africa’s Great Lakes Region, where the long-running conflict in DRC continued to have disastrous effects. The remaining $8 million went to sustain long-standing but critically underfunded humanitarian operations in Colombia, the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea and Djibouti.

CERF is a key partner for the Netherlands. In a year of immense humanitarian needs, CERF provided timely and life-saving aid, both in sudden emergencies and neglected crises. Its flexible nature allows CERF to provide humanitarian assistance to those people who need it most.

— Lilianne Ploumen, Minister for Foreign Trade and Development Cooperation of the Netherlands
The Syria crisis entered its fifth year in 2015, with the region’s already massive humanitarian needs growing at an overwhelming rate. At the beginning of the year more than 12 million people were in need of humanitarian assistance. By October this number had increased to 13.5 million. Millions of people had also left the country, crossing into or through Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey or further. The UN and its partners appealed for $8.4 billion to assist 18 million people in and around Syria in 2015.

Based on the vulnerability and funding analysis and consultations with key partners, the ERC focused the year’s first underfunded-emergencies allocation on Syria and countries in the region, disbursing over $77 million among them. The largest amount, $30 million, went to Syria for life-saving aid and assistance programmes.

CERF specifically supported projects with direct, life-saving value for more than 7 million people in the region. It helped humanitarian organizations to sustain assistance to IDPs and refugees, provide protection to the most vulnerable people, relieve food insecurity and malnutrition, and support health care.

For example, in the Kurdistan region, CERF funds helped humanitarian partners to meet the high-priority needs of approximately 100,000 Syrian refugees in camps who needed food, water and sanitation services, and psychosocial care.
The conflict in Syria has propelled one of the largest refugee crises since the Second World War... As an international community, it is our responsibility to support the neighbouring countries who shoulder most of the burden.

— Stephen O’Brien, Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator

Om Rad is married and has four children. They live in Homs, a Syrian city that has seen fierce fighting during the country’s civil war. When Om Rad delivered her fourth child, she suffered health problems and required medical attention. She needed help but was unsure where to find it, as many of the local medical facilities had been destroyed.

Then she found an answer. “I heard from my neighbour about this clinic managed by the Syrian Family Planning Association that would be able to assist me at no cost,” she said. In 2015, about 187,000 women in Homs were estimated to be of reproductive age. On average, the clinic receives 20 to 30 patients each day.

Om Rad received care at the clinic, which relied on CERF funding disbursed through UNFPA to provide life-saving medical services to women and children.

“I’m so touched that I was able to get services at this clinic in these challenging times,” she said. “At least I can receive health-care services now whenever I need. I wish this brutal war would come to an end.”

CERF funds enable UNFPA to offer life-saving reproductive health services for women in the besieged Syrian city of Homs. © UNFPA
CERF has shown that moving funding quickly when it’s urgent to act does make a difference and saves lives. It provides vital funds for UN agencies to get the assistance needed in sometimes very difficult conditions. This is why Canada has been and will remain a strong supporter and advocate for the CERF.

— Marie-Claude Bibeau, Minister of International Development and La Francophonie, Government of Canada
The crisis in Darfur entered its thirteenth year in 2015, with over 4.4 million people in need of humanitarian assistance, over 2.5 million internally displaced and some 380,000 others living in neighbouring Chad as refugees. The crisis was protracted and neglected, with a funding gap of over 40 per cent for the fourth consecutive year. CERF allocated more than $8 million from the Underfunded Emergencies Window for displaced people in Bangladesh and Myanmar. At the time of the allocation, 130,000 people had been displaced in Myanmar by intercommunal violence in Rakhine state, and 541,000 people across the country required humanitarian assistance. In Bangladesh, over 33,000 registered refugees were living in two camps in the Cox’s Bazar region. This was in addition to between 300,000 and 500,000 undocumented nationals of Myanmar requiring assistance. The CERF allocations offered a lifeline to many people displaced from their homes.

In Myanmar’s Kachin/Shan and Rakhine States, children affected by armed conflict need strong support for better access to education. © OCHA
We must help children, women and men in times of need. Switzerland is willing to provide assistance wherever it’s urgent. We support CERF as an instrument operating quickly and efficiently in response to the needs of people who are suffering. Everywhere and in an impartial way.

—Didier Burkhalte, Head of the Department of Foreign Affairs of the Swiss Confederation
People displaced from their homes by armed conflict, natural disasters or harsh economic conditions figured prominently in CERF’s allocations between 2011 and 2015.

CERF’s new Index for Risk and Vulnerability

With a funding gap growing year after year, it is vital to prioritize which crises need funds from the Underfunded Emergencies Window.

In late 2015, the CERF secretariat developed an evidence-based tool to inform decision-making: the CERF Index for Risk and Vulnerability (CIRV). Lessons learned from previous underfunded-emergencies allocation rounds guided its development. CIRV was applied for the first time in late 2015 to decide the first round of allocations of 2016.

The index enables CERF to harmonize the gathering and analysis of data from UN agencies, NGOs and OCHA, while also including an assessment of risk and vulnerability for people affected by an underfunded crisis. CIRV is designed to identify emergencies with the most profound humanitarian needs and the highest risk that the situation will deteriorate. It builds on the Index for Risk Management and additional factors including conflict, food insecurity and protection concerns.

INFORM

CIRV CERF Index for Risk and Vulnerability

Risk of humanitarian needs
Food security
War prevalence
Conflict dynamics
Risk of rights violations
Human rights
CERF works continuously to improve its operation, document its added value and demonstrate results achieved through the humanitarian programmes it has funded. To this end, the narrative reports by RC/HCs on the use of CERF funds are a key management tool. They help ensure accountability, and they provide important information and data to demonstrate the Fund’s results and performance. They are also a key resource for identifying good practices and lessons learned.

The CERF reporting framework, introduced in 2013, has improved the overall quality and timeliness of narrative reports and allowed for a more timely and systematic analysis of information. CERF has embarked on additional initiatives to improve its performance and accountability.

Recipients of CERF grants have specific time periods to implement approved projects: six months for rapid-response and nine months for underfunded-emergencies allocations. They then have up to three months to report on their results.

A complete set of reports on the implementation of all 2015 CERF grants will be available towards the end of 2016. This section presents key information reported by RC/HCs on the use of 2014 grants. All reports have been submitted and posted on the CERF website [cerf.un.org]. Specifically, the section presents information on the number of people reached with the help of CERF funds, the strategic added value of CERF funding on country-level humanitarian response, and the involvement of NGOs and other partners in the delivery of CERF-funded humanitarian action. A more detailed analysis of 2014 reports is available on the CERF website.

### BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR

As of 31 December 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Children (under age 5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>48.1% 51.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.7M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>48.3% 51.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water and sanitation</td>
<td>48.5% 51.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>46.1% 53.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>40.0% 60.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>49.9% 50.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisector</td>
<td>46.2% 53.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp management</td>
<td>48.4% 51.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter and NFI</td>
<td>41.9% 57.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine action</td>
<td>54.1% 45.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>53.8% 46.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following are consolidated estimates of people reached through 2014 CERF funding, as per RC/HCs’ reports on the use of CERF funds.

- An estimated **19.8 million people**, including **4.7 million children** under age 5, benefited from CERF-funded health support in 2014 through **142 priority health projects** in **38 countries**. This included 10.3 million women and girls (51.8 per cent) and 9.5 million men and boys. Another estimated 32.7 million people were reached through public health campaigns in response to the Ebola outbreak in Guinea, Liberia, Nigeria and Sierra Leone.

- CERF provided funding to four UN agencies in 2014 to implement **67 life-saving projects** in the **food sector** benefiting a reported 7 million people (51.7 per cent women and girls) in 35 countries.

- CERF funded **75 projects** that provided critical **water and sanitation assistance** to **6.6 million people** in **32 countries**. They included 3.4 million women and girls (51.7 per cent) and 1.1 million children.

- An estimated **4.1 million people**, including 400,000 children, benefited from **83 CERF-funded protection projects** in **23 countries**. Over 2.2 million of these people were women and girls and 1.9 million were men and boys.

- Over **4.1 million people** in **28 countries** benefited from critical CERF-funded assistance in the **nutrition sector**. They included 2.5 million women and girls (60 per cent) and 1.6 million men and boys. Nearly half of the assisted people were children.

- An estimated **3 million people** in **21 countries** benefited from 35 CERF-funded life-saving projects in the **agriculture sector**.

- More than **1 million people** in Burundi, the Central African Republic, Chad, Serbia and South Sudan benefited from eight CERF-funded **camp management projects** in 2014. Of these people, 51.6 per cent were women and girls.

- An estimated **820,000 people** in **18 countries** benefited from 35 CERF-funded projects to provide **life-saving shelter and non-food items**. They included nearly 500,000 women and girls (57.8 per cent).

- CERF provided funding to **two UN agencies** in 2014 for **mine-action programmes** in Afghanistan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Libya and Yemen, benefiting an estimated 500,000 people.

- In 2014, CERF funded emergency interventions in the **education sector** reaching an estimated **180,000 people** in **13 countries**.
BENEFICIARIES BY COUNTRY

This world map illustrates CERF’s global reach and provides estimates of beneficiary figures by country. Information in the map is based on beneficiary estimates provided by RC/HCs in CERF reports. It indicates direct beneficiaries of CERF-funded projects, as well as people reached through public-health campaigns in response to the Ebola outbreak in West Africa.

*CAR - CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC
DRC - DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO
OPT - OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN TERRITORY

*These figures do not include 32.7 million people reached through public-health campaigns funded by CERF in response to Ebola outbreak.

CERF’S ADDED VALUE TO THE HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE

CERF made important strategic contributions to the functioning of the humanitarian system. CERF pools contributions from several donors and makes them available for immediate humanitarian action. When emergencies strike, humanitarian organizations can receive assurance of CERF funding within hours, which facilitates the immediate phase of the life-saving response. In 2014, 87 per cent of RC/HCs reported that CERF rapid-response funding led to a fast delivery of assistance to people in need. The remaining 13 per cent of reports stated that CERF allocations partly led to a fast delivery of assistance.

Unlike the majority of bilateral funding that focuses on agencies’ individual outputs, CERF funding is designed to enable joint response by the humanitarian community towards achieving collective outcomes. As such, CERF funding is prioritized, planned and implemented jointly by country-level humanitarian actors. This enables a common response and enhances coordination and leadership of humanitarian action. In 2014, 92 per cent of RC/HCs reported that CERF allocations had in some way improved coordination among the humanitarian community. The remaining 8 per cent of reports stated that CERF allocations partly improved coordination.

Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries (Rapid Response Window)?

- 87% agree
- 13% partly agree

Did CERF improve coordination among the humanitarian community?

- 92% agree
- 8% partly agree

Source: RC/HCs Report

MEASURING RESULTS OF CERF FUNDING
CERF PARTNERSHIPS TOWARDS LOCALIZED HUMANITARIAN ACTION

CERF is anchored in the UN system, but it benefits the entire humanitarian community. It provides funding directly to UN agencies and IOM, but CERF grants are implemented in close partnerships with local and international NGOs, host Governments and Red Cross/Red Crescent societies.

These organizations receive close to one quarter of all CERF funding through subgrants. In 2014, over 550 partners in 45 countries received $106 million in CERF funding through partnerships with UN agencies. More than half of subgranted CERF funds are provided to local partners. This helps to localise humanitarian response, build the capacity of national actors in crisis-affected countries, and foster a coordinated and coherent response.

Apart from implementing subgranted CERF funding, international NGOs and local partners also play an important role in distributing relief supplies procured by UN agencies with CERF funds.

Through the far-reaching and long-term partnership networks of UN agencies in crisis-affected countries, hundreds of implementing partners receive CERF funds to deliver life-saving humanitarian assistance each year. In 2014, CERF funds reached more than 420 local partners and over 130 international NGOs in support of humanitarian action in 45 countries. This represents an unparalleled global reach that would be difficult to achieve for CERF’s donors through direct funding agreements. Since its inception in 2006, CERF has funded humanitarian action in 96 different countries.

The portion of CERF funding transferred by recipient UN agencies to partners has steadily increased. In the four-year period since CERF started tracking and recording subgrant data, close to $380 million has been reported as subgranted to NGOs and other partners, of which $195 million has been for local partners.

The CERF secretariat and the CERF Advisory Group work closely with CERF recipient agencies and other IASC partners to make partnerships under CERF grants as effective and efficient as possible.

**SUBGRANT FUNDING IN 2014**
in US$ million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National NGO</th>
<th>Governments</th>
<th>Red Cross/Red Crescent</th>
<th>International NGO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$30M</td>
<td>$21M</td>
<td>$4M</td>
<td>$51M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**STEADY INCREASE IN FUNDING TO UN AGENCIES AND IOM PARTNERS**
in US$ million

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2011: $3M; 2012: $4M; 2013: $3M; 2014: $4M

**PARTNERS OF RECIPIENT AGENCIES IN 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partners</th>
<th>National NGOs</th>
<th>International NGOs</th>
<th>Governments</th>
<th>Red Cross/Red Crescent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>554</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MEASURING RESULTS OF CERF FUNDING 42
DELIVERING HUMANITARIAN ACTION
in US$ million, as of 31 December 2014

$471 M
TOTAL 2014* CERF FUNDING

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS

% of CERF funding implemented by partners

Country # of partners | Subgrant amount (in US$ M)

$106 M
SUBGRANTED TO PARTNERS

23% OVERALL
PERCENTAGE
SUBGRANT

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

NATIONAL PARTNERS

% of CERF funding implemented by national partners

Country # of partners | Subgrant amount (in US$ M)

$55 M
SUBGRANTED TO
NATIONAL PARTNERS

12% OVERALL
PERCENTAGE
SUBGRANT

# OF PARTNERS:
366 NNGO***

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

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

SUBGRANTED TO PARTNERS
NATIONAL PARTNERS
$106 M
$55 M

INTERNATIONAL PARTNERS

23% OVERALL
PERCENTAGE
SUBGRANT

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

NATIONAL PARTNERS

12% OVERALL
PERCENTAGE
SUBGRANT

# OF PARTNERS:
366 NNGO***
SUPPORT FOR CERF

Donors contributed generously to CERF in 2015. Despite financial and economic challenges, many donors maintained or increased their contributions.

By December 2014, CERF had received pledges equivalent to $418.6 million based on exchange rates at the time. This was the second-highest level in the Fund’s history. CERF donors were responding to projected humanitarian needs for 2015.

In 2015, the Fund received $403 million, meeting 90 per cent of its annual $450 million target. The shortfall of $48 million was largely due to a combination of factors including currency-exchange fluctuations linked to the strong US dollar (96 per cent of contributions were provided in non-US-dollar currency), and reduced contributions from some donors. In addition, some of CERF’s core supporters were unable to provide additional contributions at the end of the year.

Andorra, Germany, Ireland, Netherlands, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Switzerland and United Arab Emirates increased their contributions in 2015 compared with 2014. Colombia, Cyprus, Lithuania, Malaysia, Philippines and Serbia returned as donors. However, there was little progress in significantly increasing contributions from donors outside the top 10 contributors.

Major donors including Germany, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland provided a combined $29 million at the year’s close in addition to their earlier contributions for 2015. These contributions were vital in helping to reduce the funding gap, and they demonstrate the significant impact of year-end contributions on CERF’s income. Over the 2013-2015 period, year-end contributions that had not been formally pledged accounted for approximately 8 per cent of the Fund’s income. These top-up contributions have become a means for CERF to help reach its funding target, but they are unpredictable. Reliance on year-end contributions that are typically only announced in the last quarter of the year affects the Fund’s ability to plan and manage allocations throughout the year. This may affect its capacity to respond to needs as they arise.

In 2015, CERF began exploring opportunities for new funding sources. It commissioned the Innovative Finance Foundation to explore options such as debt swaps, insurance schemes and micro-levies. Combined with traditional sources, these opportunities could help expand the Fund and provide enhanced funding security through a diversification of income streams.

TOP 10 DONORS IN 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>$83.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>$59.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>$52.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>$49.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>$43.3M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>$24.4M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>$14.6M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>$12.2M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>$11.0M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>$10.4M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Celebrating 10 years of collective success

In 2015, CERF entered its tenth year of existence. The beginning of the anniversary was marked at the annual High-Level Conference held in December 2015. The Fund’s stakeholders highlighted past successes and reaffirmed their support. Donors pledged contributions equivalent to over $251 million for 2016, and they called to attention the importance of the Fund reaching its funding target.

Between CERF’s inception in 2005 and the end of 2015, CERF had received more than $4.2 billion from 125 Member States and observers, regional and local governments, international organizations, private donors and individuals.
Stephen O’Brien manages CERF on behalf of the UN Secretary-General. He is supported by a secretariat hosted by OCHA and based at UN Headquarters in New York.

Transparency
CERF is at the forefront of promoting transparency in aid delivery. It publishes all grants decisions in real time on its website and on the OCHA-managed Financial Tracking System. In 2015, the Fund augmented its transparency further by publishing data under the International Aid Transparency Initiative standards. It also makes narrative reports publicly available for each CERF allocation to demonstrate the results achieved and CERF’s added value.

In addition, CERF tracks and publishes the second layer of CERF grant implementation, reflecting funding from recipient UN agencies to their implementing partners, thereby providing full transparency of CERF funding from allocation decisions to front line delivery.

In 2015, CERF began using the new United Nations Enterprise Resource Planning system (Umoja). The system is expected to increase transparency and enable more efficient and timely business processes, including faster disbursement of grants. CERF will also expand the availability of detailed real-time data through a dedicated public business intelligence interface allowing more CERF data to be accessed online.

Monitoring
In 2015, the CERF secretariat introduced a number of improvements to ensure that RC/HCs receive all essential information regarding the implementation of CERF grants. CERF developed and piloted new guidance on the roles and responsibilities in monitoring grant implementation at the field level. It is scheduled to be rolled out in 2016.

Performance and Accountability Framework
Through the Performance and Accountability Framework, there have been 24 independent reviews of CERF’s work in 24 countries since 2010. In 2015, this review base was expanded to include reviews of the Fund’s work in two large-scale regional crises centered on the Syrian Arab Republic (Syria plus Iraq, Jordan and Lebanon) and South Sudan (South Sudan plus Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda). A third review was undertaken of CERF’s impact on work in Iraq beyond the scope of programmes related specifically to Syrian refugees in that country.

The reviews can be downloaded from the CERF website.

Review of CERF’s support to the South Sudan crisis
In 2015, OCHA commissioned an independent review of CERF support to South Sudan crisis response, in line with the Fund’s Performance and Accountability Framework. The review found that CERF was an important contributor to the response, with a strategic role in kick-starting operations to save lives in all five countries assessed. In countries hosting South Sudanese who had fled their country, while CERF contribution was small compared to the total humanitarian expenditure, it triggered life-saving action and helped improve the living conditions of refugees.
Accountability to affected people and gender inclusion

It is critical that accountability to affected people (AAP) is advanced through programmes and through a collective response at the country level. To this effect, CERF promotes AAP throughout its programme cycle. AAP has been fully integrated into CERF’s application format at strategic and project levels and forms part of the proposal review. To close the information loop, since 2015, recipient agencies have been asked to explain in their narrative reports how affected people were involved during project design, implementation and monitoring.

A new and improved application template was implemented in January 2015 following a comprehensive development-and-testing process. The new template requires more detailed information on issues related to gender and gender-based violence. The application specifically asks for sex- and age-disaggregated data. Gender is also mainstreamed throughout the document. For example, a gender analysis is requested in the section on humanitarian context and response. Applicants are requested to describe how gender was taken into account during the prioritization process and to reflect gender issues in the log frame of individual projects. In addition, as a follow-up to the ‘Keep Her Safe’ commitments, the template now has a dedicated self-assessment question on how gender-based violence has been considered in project design.

Reducing programme support costs

In 2015, CERF began to explore the possible reduction of its programme support cost from 3 per cent to 2 per cent. The reduction is not expected to have any adverse impact on management of CERF, and it is estimated to annually channel approximately an additional $4 million into the Fund’s humanitarian programming budget. This estimate is based on the funding level of $450 million per year.

Managing CERF: Engaging decision makers

In 2015, the CERF secretariat rolled out a revamped learning programme piloted during 2014. The programme’s interactive workshops target key participants in the CERF process: RC/HCs, HCTs, humanitarian cluster and sector leads, and relevant OCHA staff. They engage field and headquarters personnel in deploying funds strategically and prioritizing the most urgent humanitarian needs.

CERF delivered five field-based workshops and two webinars to field staff in 2015. Three workshops were also held with crucial stakeholders who support the CERF process at headquarters. Together, the workshops led to more focused and better-prioritized CERF submissions from HCTs. In 2016, CERF will continue to deliver workshops and webinars targeting new country teams and headquarters-based audiences.
The CERF Advisory Group provides the Secretary-General with policy guidance on the use and impact of the Fund. In 2015, the group’s 18 members met in May and October to discuss CERF’s impact in the field and the challenges faced by the global humanitarian community.

In May, the group received a report on the progress of the High-Level Panel on Humanitarian Funding and began to look ahead at the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS). The group also had an in-depth discussion on CERF allocations to L3 emergencies. In October, the group further discussed the WHS and assessed the results from two scoping studies on the future of CERF and whether or not it should raise its funding target.

A full summary of the meetings’ discussions as well as observations, recommendations and conclusions of the CERF Advisory Group meetings in 2015 are available on the CERF website.

The Secretary-General appointed seven new members of the Advisory Group in September 2015.

DR. ELTJE ADERHOLD
Head of Division, Task Force for Humanitarian Aid, Federal Foreign Office GERMANY

MS. NAJLA ALKAABI
Under-Secretary Assistant for International Cooperation, Ministry of International Cooperation and Development THE UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

DR. AHMED AL-MERAIKHI
Director of the Department of International Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and Director-General of the Qatar Development Fund QATAR

MR. JOZEF H.L. M. ANDRIESSEN
Programme Director Policy and Implementation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs THE NETHERLANDS

AMBASSADOR MANUEL BESSLER
Head of the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation, Federal Department of Foreign Affairs SWITZERLAND

MS. CHRISTINA BUCHAN
Director of the Humanitarian Organizations and Food Assistance, Global Affairs CANADA

MS. NANCY BUTIJER
Head, Division for Economic Multilateral Relations, Economic and Social Issues, Ministry of Foreign and European Affairs CROATIA

MS. JUDY CHENG-HOPKINS
Adjunct Professor at Columbia University MALAYSIA

AMBASSADOR SEOKYOUNG CHOI
Permanent Representative of the Republic of Korea to the World Trade Organisation REPUBLIC OF KOREA

MR. JESUS R.S. DOMINGO
Assistant Secretary, Office of the United Nations and International Organizations, Department of Foreign Affairs PHILIPPINES

MS. MARÍA ANDREA ALBÁN DURÁN
Director of the Department of International Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs COLOMBIA

MS. SUSAN ECKEY
Minister Councellor, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations in New York NORWAY

MR. NESTOR KOKO
Counsellor at the Permanent Mission of Côte d’Ivoire to the United Nations in New York CÔTE D’IVOIRE

AMBASSADOR NOZIPHO JOYCE MXAKATO-DISEKÖ
Deputy Director-General, Multilateral Branch, Department of International Relations and Cooperation SOUTH AFRICA

MS. JETTE MICHELMAN
Chief Adviser, Department for Humanitarian Action, Civil Society and Personnel Assistance DENMARK
AMBASSADOR PER ÖRNEUS
Deputy Director-General for Multilateral Development Cooperation, Ministry of Foreign Affairs
SWEDEN

MS. YUKIE OSA
President, Association for Aid and Relief, Japan, Professor in the Department of Sociology, Rikkyo University
JAPAN

DR. ASHRAF SHIKHALIYEV
Director of the International Development Agency
AZERBAIJAN

MS. RACHEL TURNER
Senior Director for East and Central Africa Department, Department for International Development
UNITED KINGDOM

MR. MATHEWOS HUNDE TULU
Disaster Risk Reduction/Management Advisor for the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD)
ETHIOPIA

MAJOR GENERAL DR. JULIUS OKETTA
Director, National Emergency Operations and Coordination Centre, Office of the Prime Minister, Department of Relief, Disaster Preparedness and Management
UGANDA

MS. CATHERINE WALKER
Retired. Former First Assistant Director-General, Humanitarian and Stabilisation Division and Humanitarian Coordination
AUSTRALIA

MR. SAMSON PALIA WANGUSI
Deputy-Secretary, Emergency Humanitarian Response and Head of the Kenyan Relief and Rehabilitation Department
KENYA

MR. WENLIANG YAO
Commercial Counsellor, Department of International Trade and Economic Affairs, Ministry of Commerce
CHINA

Advisory Group Members 2015 - 2016
(New York meeting, 27-28 October 2015).

From left to right
Top row: Mr. Antoine Gerard, Ms. Jette Michelsen, Mr. Nestor Koko, Dr. Ahmed Al-Meraikhi, Mr. Samson Palia Wangusi, Mr. Stephen O’Brien, Ms. Rachel Turner, Mr. Ashraf Shikhaliyev, and Mr. Jozef H.L. Andriessen.

Bottom row: Mr. Seokyoung Choi, Ms. Najla Alkaabi, Ms. Christina Buchan, Ms. Maria Andrea Alban Duran, Ms. Nozipho Mxakato-Diseko, Mr. Jesus Domingo and Mr. Manuel Bessler.

© CERF

*Newly appointed member in 2015
*Term ended in May 2015
Today’s humanitarian needs far outweigh the resources made available to address them. Emergencies are increasingly large, complex and long lasting. More than twice as many people now rely on humanitarian organizations for help than in CERF’s first year of operation. Expressed in dollars, the need for humanitarian assistance skyrocketed from $5.2 billion in 2006 to $19.3 billion in 2015.

However, CERF’s annual fundraising target has remained unchanged since 2006 at $450 million. Its current capacity falls short of the world’s requirements. The amount of funding channelled through CERF on an annual basis has increased in absolute terms since 2006, but the proportion of funding through CERF compared with overall global funding needs, as reflected in appeals, has decreased significantly from 7 per cent in 2007 to 2.3 per cent in 2015.

Responding to the high level of global needs in 2015, CERF allocated $470 million to humanitarian programmes in 45 countries, thereby exceeding the contributions received during the year ($403 million) and significantly drawing on its reserves.

The timely, effective and professional response provided through the CERF is essential in humanitarian crisis as this means saving lives of those most in need. I am proud of Germany’s strong partnership with the Central Emergency Response Fund.

—Dr. Frank-Walter Steinmeier, Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany

Two studies explore options

In 2015, OCHA commissioned two independent studies analysing the potential benefits and drawbacks of increasing the Fund’s annual fundraising target, as well as the potential for securing funding for CERF through UN-assessed contributions. The studies were not designed to make specific recommendations about the Fund’s future, but they did cite the need for CERF to maintain its life-saving focus. They also noted the growing need for humanitarian support, the Fund’s increased reliance on a small number of donors, and the importance of the Secretary-General’s leadership in any initiative to strengthen CERF for the future.
ENVISIONING AN EXPANDED CERF

CERF has clearly established itself as indispensable to fast, reliable humanitarian action. But to continue serving in that role, it must adapt to a changing world that now relies more heavily on humanitarian support.

In late 2015, the Secretary-General’s High-level Panel on Humanitarian Financing called for accelerating efficiency in humanitarian response by, among other measures, committing donors to less earmarking of humanitarian funding. Unearmarked support for CERF was cited as a welcome example for donors of providing fast, predictable and flexible funding to UN agencies.

Reflecting on the panel’s report and the WHS consultations leading up to the Summit, the Secretary-General, in his 2016 report for the WHS, called for CERF’s annual funding target to be increased to $1 billion by 2018. This would be part of a minimum financial support package to narrow the current gap between urgent life-saving requirements and funding provided.

A larger CERF would offer undeniable benefits to the global response capacity against sudden crises and provide stronger support for underfunded emergencies. It would increase its ability to provide fast, flexible and needs-based funding at scale. A funding pool of $1 billion per year would retain a grant-making focus on meeting the most urgent life-saving needs and also have the capacity to fund early action work within the current General Assembly mandate.

Any significant changes in the mission, scope or eligibility criteria of CERF would require deliberations with Member States and possibly a new General Assembly resolution.
ANNEXES

Annex I: Total grants allocated by country
Annex II: Rapid-response grants allocated by country
Annex III: Underfunded-emergency grants allocated by country
Annex IV: Breakdown of allocations
Annex V: Contributions pledged

The humanitarian response to the Myanmar emergency included food aid and nutritional support for displaced people. © OCHA/Hkun Lat
## TOTAL GRANTS ALLOCATED BY COUNTRY

(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Rapid Response</th>
<th>Underfunded Emergency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>44,250,104</td>
<td>44,250,104</td>
<td>44,250,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>29,926,021</td>
<td>29,926,021</td>
<td>29,926,021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>17,003,929</td>
<td>10,015,968</td>
<td>27,019,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5,300,084</td>
<td>19,989,234</td>
<td>25,289,318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>9,079,147</td>
<td>15,116,739</td>
<td>24,195,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>19,113,716</td>
<td>19,113,716</td>
<td>38,227,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>18,004,139</td>
<td>18,004,139</td>
<td>36,008,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>16,925,025</td>
<td>16,925,025</td>
<td>33,850,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>10,515,475</td>
<td>16,514,042</td>
<td>27,029,517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>10,405,409</td>
<td>15,773,060</td>
<td>26,178,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>6,792,923</td>
<td>14,840,593</td>
<td>21,633,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>14,071,268</td>
<td>14,071,268</td>
<td>28,142,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>5,802,858</td>
<td>13,786,504</td>
<td>19,589,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>13,741,648</td>
<td>13,446,494</td>
<td>27,188,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>13,446,494</td>
<td>13,446,494</td>
<td>26,893,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4,490,040</td>
<td>7,988,999</td>
<td>12,478,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>11,556,590</td>
<td>11,556,590</td>
<td>23,113,180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>11,000,547</td>
<td>11,000,547</td>
<td>22,001,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>7,984,746</td>
<td>10,482,966</td>
<td>18,467,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>9,889,075</td>
<td>9,889,075</td>
<td>19,778,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>9,157,785</td>
<td>9,157,785</td>
<td>18,315,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>9,156,319</td>
<td>9,156,319</td>
<td>18,312,638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>9,000,346</td>
<td>9,000,346</td>
<td>18,000,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8,999,844</td>
<td>8,999,844</td>
<td>17,999,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>6,276,701</td>
<td>2,000,285</td>
<td>8,276,986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>8,110,712</td>
<td>8,110,712</td>
<td>16,221,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>5,051,640</td>
<td>5,051,640</td>
<td>10,103,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>5,038,408</td>
<td>5,038,408</td>
<td>10,076,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>4,920,172</td>
<td>4,920,172</td>
<td>9,840,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3,996,365</td>
<td>3,996,365</td>
<td>7,992,730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3,500,065</td>
<td>3,500,065</td>
<td>7,000,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>3,238,788</td>
<td>3,238,788</td>
<td>6,477,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>3,000,059</td>
<td>3,000,059</td>
<td>6,000,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2,994,382</td>
<td>2,994,382</td>
<td>5,988,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>2,993,896</td>
<td>2,993,896</td>
<td>5,987,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2,992,959</td>
<td>2,992,959</td>
<td>5,985,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
<td>5,420,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>2,532,163</td>
<td>2,532,163</td>
<td>5,064,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2,495,246</td>
<td>2,495,246</td>
<td>5,020,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2,294,798</td>
<td>2,294,798</td>
<td>4,589,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2,187,908</td>
<td>2,187,908</td>
<td>4,375,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,512,074</td>
<td>1,512,074</td>
<td>3,024,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1,491,012</td>
<td>1,491,012</td>
<td>2,982,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>914,395</td>
<td>914,395</td>
<td>1,828,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>777,854</td>
<td>777,854</td>
<td>1,555,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,736,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,913,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>469,650,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## RAPID-RESPONSE GRANTS ALLOCATED BY COUNTRY
(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Sum of Amount Approved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>5,802,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td>5,051,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>14,071,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>11,556,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>10,515,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>777,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>6,276,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>6,792,923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>2,710,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>17,003,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>9,157,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>2,187,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>4,490,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1,491,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>2,294,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>16,925,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>2,532,163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>3,996,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>10,405,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>19,113,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>13,741,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>9,889,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>11,000,547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>914,395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>1,512,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>7,984,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>5,300,084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>13,446,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>9,079,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>3,238,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>4,920,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>9,156,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanuatu</td>
<td>5,038,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>44,250,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>8,110,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,736,172</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX III

**UNDERFUNDED-EMERGENCIES GRANTS ALLOCATED BY COUNTRY**

(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Round I</th>
<th>Round II</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>7,983,646</td>
<td>7,983,646</td>
<td>15,967,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>2,992,959</td>
<td>2,992,959</td>
<td>5,985,918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>2,495,246</td>
<td>2,495,246</td>
<td>4,990,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>5,998,567</td>
<td>5,998,567</td>
<td>11,997,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>2,994,382</td>
<td>2,994,382</td>
<td>5,988,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic People’s Republic of Korea</td>
<td>2,000,285</td>
<td>2,000,285</td>
<td>4,000,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td>8,047,670</td>
<td>8,047,670</td>
<td>16,095,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>3,000,059</td>
<td>3,000,059</td>
<td>6,000,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>3,500,065</td>
<td>3,500,065</td>
<td>7,000,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>2,993,896</td>
<td>2,993,896</td>
<td>5,987,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>10,015,968</td>
<td>10,015,968</td>
<td>20,031,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>7,988,899</td>
<td>7,988,899</td>
<td>15,977,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>9,000,346</td>
<td>9,000,346</td>
<td>18,000,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>18,004,139</td>
<td>18,004,139</td>
<td>36,008,278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>5,367,651</td>
<td>5,367,651</td>
<td>10,735,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>2,498,220</td>
<td>2,498,220</td>
<td>4,996,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>19,989,234</td>
<td>19,989,234</td>
<td>39,978,468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>15,116,739</td>
<td>15,116,739</td>
<td>30,233,478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>29,926,021</td>
<td>29,926,021</td>
<td>59,852,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>8,999,844</td>
<td>8,999,844</td>
<td>17,999,688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98,455,176</strong></td>
<td><strong>70,458,660</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,913,836</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ANNEX IV

**A | BREAKDOWN OF ALLOCATIONS BY AGENCY**

(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Rapid Response</th>
<th>Underfunded Emergency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>110,509,712</td>
<td>49,419,236</td>
<td>159,928,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>69,202,040</td>
<td>44,707,215</td>
<td>113,909,255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>41,334,820</td>
<td>28,074,856</td>
<td>69,409,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>28,877,151</td>
<td>10,500,496</td>
<td>39,377,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>20,999,668</td>
<td>8,893,295</td>
<td>29,892,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>15,526,712</td>
<td>11,875,443</td>
<td>27,402,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>8,692,667</td>
<td>7,394,322</td>
<td>16,086,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRWA</td>
<td>6,050,035</td>
<td>6,050,035</td>
<td>12,100,070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>3,566,744</td>
<td>1,498,767</td>
<td>5,065,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNOPS</td>
<td>1,826,619</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>2,226,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWOMEN</td>
<td>200,039</td>
<td>100,171</td>
<td>300,210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,736,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,913,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>469,650,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### B | BREAKDOWN OF ALLOCATIONS BY SECTOR

(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Rapid Response</th>
<th>Underfunded Emergency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>19,110,859</td>
<td>2,340,260</td>
<td>21,451,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camp Coordination and Camp Management</td>
<td>6,580,426</td>
<td>200,030</td>
<td>6,780,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Protection</td>
<td>5,109,062</td>
<td>5,542,593</td>
<td>10,651,655</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Humanitarian Air Services</td>
<td>7,540,062</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>8,540,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Logistics</td>
<td>15,264,134</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,264,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Safety and Security</td>
<td>366,971</td>
<td></td>
<td>366,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Telecommunications</td>
<td>828,302</td>
<td></td>
<td>828,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Recovery</td>
<td>1,676,374</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,676,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2,216,905</td>
<td>4,676,053</td>
<td>6,892,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Aid</td>
<td>73,663,993</td>
<td>43,935,978</td>
<td>117,599,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Nutrition</td>
<td>66,698,074</td>
<td>45,192,254</td>
<td>111,890,328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Rights</td>
<td>1,989,892</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,989,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisector refugee assistance</td>
<td>20,273,503</td>
<td>14,200,479</td>
<td>34,473,982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Food Items</td>
<td>13,251,635</td>
<td>9,879,731</td>
<td>23,131,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection</td>
<td>11,336,899</td>
<td>4,198,395</td>
<td>15,535,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and Security of Staff and Operations</td>
<td>730,810</td>
<td></td>
<td>730,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence</td>
<td>3,538,922</td>
<td>4,468,947</td>
<td>8,007,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>9,957,995</td>
<td>1,895,957</td>
<td>11,853,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
<td>40,601,354</td>
<td>23,313,235</td>
<td>63,914,589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Action</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multisector</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,736,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,913,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>469,650,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C | BREAKDOWN OF ALLOCATIONS BY EMERGENCY TYPE

(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emergency Type</th>
<th>Rapid Response</th>
<th>Underfunded Emergency</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cholera</td>
<td>13,521,390</td>
<td></td>
<td>13,521,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deterioration of protection and human rights environment</td>
<td>2,994,382</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,994,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>161,148,886</td>
<td>116,943,407</td>
<td>278,092,293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement/Migration</td>
<td>1,986,864</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,986,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disruption of basic services</td>
<td>14,959,260</td>
<td></td>
<td>14,959,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drought</td>
<td>54,105,606</td>
<td>35,999,157</td>
<td>90,104,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>17,913,716</td>
<td></td>
<td>17,913,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme temperature (cold and heat waves)</td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flood</td>
<td>27,358,203</td>
<td></td>
<td>27,358,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measles</td>
<td>1,991,765</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,991,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>2,000,285</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,000,285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual humanitarian needs post-conflict</td>
<td>10,976,605</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,976,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm (hurricane, cyclone, etc.)</td>
<td>6,550,482</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,550,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300,736,172</strong></td>
<td><strong>168,913,836</strong></td>
<td><strong>469,650,008</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX V**

**A | CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED BY MEMBER STATES AND OBSERVERS**

(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Pledges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andorra</td>
<td>44,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armenia</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>9,201,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10,893,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>28,627,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>235,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d’Ivoire</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>14,223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>14,212,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Djibouti</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>113,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>7,583,965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>43,777,556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>2,179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>12,195,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>1,133,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>1,402,809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea, Republic of</td>
<td>4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>271,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>22,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>4,535,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contributor**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pledges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monaco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Marino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sovereign Military Order of Malta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal**

408,962,726
## B | CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED BY REGIONAL AND LOCAL AUTHORITIES
(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Pledges  a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government of Flanders (Belgium)</td>
<td>340,136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal** 340,136

## C | CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED BY OTHERS
(1 JAN - 31 DEC 2015) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Pledges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private donations outside the United Nations Foundation (under $50,000)</td>
<td>38,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private donations through the United Nations Foundation (under $50,000)</td>
<td>99,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigna Foundation through the United Nations Foundation</td>
<td>50,000   b</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal, Others** 187,934

**GRAND TOTAL** 409,490,796 c

## D | CORRIGENDUM OF CONTRIBUTIONS PLEDGED FOR 2014
(IN ANNEX V OF THE 2014 CERF ANNUAL REPORT) IN US$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributor</th>
<th>Pledges  d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>70,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>(50,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 1,230,500

---

* Contributions are based on the pledged year of the donors and differ from the amount reported as revenue under IPSAS. Actual received contributions may differ from the originally recorded pledges, due to fluctuations in exchange rates.
* Contribution of $50,000 was collected through the United Nations Foundation in 2014, but received by CERF in 2015.
* As of 9 June 2016, the amount of contributions received for 2015 is $402,716,351 (rounded up at $403 million in the text of the report).
* Includes the amounts not previously reported in annex V of the 2014 annual report of CERF.
DONATE TO CERF

UN MEMBER STATES AND OBSERVER MISSIONS, PLEASE CONTACT:
CERF secretariat at www.unocha.org/cerf/contact-us
Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA)
United Nations
Fax: 1 212 963 1312
E-mail: cerf@un.org

PRIVATE DONORS AND INDIVIDUALS:

1 ONLINE DONATIONS
To donate online, visit www.unocha.org/cerf/donate.
Your online donations will be channeled through the United Nations Foundation, a US 501(c)(3) public charity. Donations through the United Nations Foundation portal are tax deductible for US taxpayers.

2 BANK TRANSFER TO CERF
Please visit www.unocha.org/cerf/donate and contact the CERF secretariat for details.

3 TEXT TO DONATE (US ONLY)
To donate $5 to CERF using your cell phone, text CERF to 90999.

4 PAYMENT BY CHEQUE
Please make cheques payable to the United Nations Foundation. The memo line of the cheque should read "Donation to CERF". Cheques should be mailed to:
United Nations Foundation
Central Emergency Response Fund
P.O. Box 96721
Washington, D.C., 20090-6721
USA
Please include your name and contact information to recognize your contributions accordingly.

Note: US tax-deductible donations can also be made via money order or wire transfer. Please contact the United Nations Foundation for more information at www.unfoundation.org/contact-us.html.
CERF was born out of necessity and it continues through generosity. Donors enable CERF to support emergency life-saving humanitarian activities throughout the world. As crises persist, so does our resolve. With your help, we respond.

Member States and observer missions
cerf@un.org

Private sector and individuals
www.unfoundation.org/cerf