



**ANNUAL REPORT OF
THE HUMANITARIAN / RESIDENT COORDINATOR
ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS**

Country	Rwanda
Humanitarian / Resident Coordinator	Dr. Joseph Foubmi / UNICEF
Reporting Period	September 2007

I. Executive Summary

Rwanda remains highly vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition. Eighty-eight percent of the population is engaged in agriculture, which is affected by recurrent droughts and erratic rainfall (especially in the Western and Eastern provinces), plant and animal diseases, inappropriate farming practices, and inadequate inputs. Agriculture contributes 47 percent to Gross Domestic Product (GDP), which is very low, i.e. \$195/per capita. Poverty is widespread and it is estimated that 52 percent of the Rwandan population live with under \$1/day, and 84 percent live under \$2/day. Rwanda is ranked 161st among 177 nations in the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Human Development Index Report of 2007/2008. Any disruption to agricultural activities and/or loss of household assets creates an immediate need and a difficult long-term recovery for vulnerable households living in chronically food insecure areas.

In September 2007, heavy rains in Nyabihu, Rubavu, and Musanze districts in the Western province occasioned the loss of lives and a total destruction of property, homes and cultivated fields (estimated at 2,500 ha). There was also a displacement of population living in the areas mentioned. Immediate field assessments undertaken by the World Food Programme (WFP), the Government of Rwanda Disaster Management Unit (DMU) and the United Nations Rwanda Disaster Management Task Force (DMTF) confirmed 20 deaths and the displacement of an estimated 4,000 people. A further estimated 8,000 people in this flood area were still at risk if the rains had continued. The flooded valley is a part of the protected Gishwati Forest reserve but since late 1994 when the Government resettled people here, the surrounding mountain slopes have progressively lost most of their vegetative cover due to human exploitation. The Gishwati Forest ecosystem is environmentally fragile due to marginal soils and steep slopes, unsuitable for cultivation, but highly conducive to landslides. During the heavy floods in September 2007, large amounts of soil and sediments clogged up the river and the cultivated fields. The main road to Rubavu town has not been structured to drain very high volumes of rainwater and failing its ability to do so, a total of 706 houses built close to the road were destroyed.

The Government of Rwanda through its DMU and the technical support of the UN DMTF estimate that up to 12,000 people had been affected directly or indirectly by the flooding, either as a result of being made homeless or having lost their crops, animals or source of income (in some cases, all the situations apply).

The assistance provided to the flood affected districts of Nyabihu, Rubavu and Musanze, part of the ecosystem of Gishwati forest and the Virunga Mountains, was done in partnership by WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF, FAO and the Rwanda Red Cross. The Disaster Management Unit (DMU), pledged to provide assistance mainly for shelter construction. UN Agency assistance was complimentary, for example, WFP providing food assistance for immediate consumption and FAO seeds for longer term food security.

Total amount of humanitarian funding required (per reporting year)	WFP: \$ 93,011 UNICEF/WES: \$123,600 UNICEF/EDU: \$ 50,000 UNHCR: \$166,385 FAO: \$165,985
Total amount of CERF funding received by funding window	WFP: \$ 93,011 UNICEF: \$0 UNHCR: \$ 166,385 FAO: \$ 156,929 TOTAL: \$416,325
Total amount of CERF funding for direct UN agency/IOM implementation and total amount forwarded to implementing partners Note: This total must equal the total CERF funding allocated	
Total number of beneficiaries targeted and reached with CERF funding (disaggregated by sex / age)	4,000 directly affected beneficiaries (50 percent women)
Geographic areas of implementation	Nyabihu, Rubavu, Rusizi districts, Western Province and Musanze district in Northern Province, Rwanda.

II. Coordination and Partnership-building

- (a) **Explain the decision-making process and/or criteria used to identify priority area/sectors for the CERF grant request package. Describe the roles of the humanitarian country team and the cluster/sector leads. Please also provide specific reference as to how NGOs were included in the process.**

This disaster occurred in a region already struggling with chronic food insecurity problems and high child malnutrition rates. As a short term response, the Government of Rwanda Disaster Management Unit (DMU) and local authorities moved the displaced population into temporary camps where they have been receiving food (from Government and NGOs) and other non-food assistance. The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the Rwanda Red Cross (RRC) have distributed essential items (water tank/bladders and plastic sheeting) for the 4,000 displaced in order to reduce risks associated with water contamination. UNICEF also mobilized emergency school kits to engage the affected children in education and recreation activities in the aftermath of the disaster. The World Health Organization (WHO) and MINISANTE jointly supplied drugs for two months to the Health Centre identified for treating victims of the flood at the field level.

The identification of the priority area for the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) grant was done after several joint field visits involving members of the DMTF i.e. relevant UN agencies, NGOs and different governmental departments. Based on the assessment report, which reflected the level of damages occasioned, the limited local capacity to sustain the assistance, and the foreseen life threatening consequences in the absence of a quick response, the RC invited four UN Agencies: the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), WFP, UNICEF and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) to form a task force and put together a proposal for CERF funding.

A draft proposal was submitted to the United Nations Country Team (UNCT) for review and once it was established and agreed upon, the RC submitted the proposal to the CERF Directorate in New York. An immediate response was received from New York with suggestions for adjustments to be made to the document. Accordingly, the UN Task Force revised the proposal and resubmitted it through the RC. This

was approved by CERF/New York at a later stage. UNICEF decided to use their personal funds but still remained within the CERF project.

The main criteria used to identify the CERF beneficiaries was made based on people at risk in 'life threatening' situations, in terms of food, shelter, water, sanitation, and in need of immediate tools and seeds to recommence activities to recover their livelihoods.

NGOs such as the Red Cross (a DMTF member) have always been part of all discussions related to emergency assistance and field assessment missions. The Organization played a role in providing first aid services to the flood-affected population. To date, assorted other NGOs are still providing assistance in different sectors based on their financial capacity and directives of their mandates.

The following sectors were selected as the most vital for life-saving activities, to benefit from the CERF funding received by the three UN Agencies for the immediate and medium term needs:

- Food to be provided by WFP
- Transport/logistics and storage of non-food Items for the affected population to be provided by the Government
- Seeds and tools by FAO to facilitate immediate planting activities

WFP pledged to provide food assistance to an estimated 4,000 people in the camps, for a period of three months. A 'Food for Work' project as well as a land rehabilitation program to cater for immediate and mid-term recommencement of agricultural activities.

FAO initiated a 'rapid vegetable growth' project for 1,593 families. Under the project, fast growing vegetables that could be harvested within two months were planted.

In parallel, **UNICEF** monitored the quality water and sensitized the affected population about appropriate preventive health and hygiene measures to reduce the risks of waterborne diseases. UNICEF also provided tarpaulins to 2,000 families whose houses were destroyed by the floods.

UNHCR provided non-food items and transport of the items to the affected areas. The relocation of the affected population, initially planned in the project was not implemented due to constraints faced by the lack of available land. Hence UNHCR was informed by the government that this activity was no longer necessary required.

The extent and size of the operation did not necessarily require a sectoral / cluster approach. UN in Rwanda is already effectively operational under the one leadership of the RC achieved through the One UN 'delivering as one' pilot process.

When the needs assessment identified the areas of assistance required, the RC invited specialized UN agencies in different fields for the operation i.e. UNHCR, WFP, UNICEF and FAO. The proposal for CERF funding was therefore not undertaken in a cluster approach but by the specific requirements jointly agreed by concerned UN agencies that each agency would deliver in a specific sector as per its mandate and this was done in a coordinated manner.

(b) Describe the challenges faced when assessing the needs of the affected populations. Describe how funding levels were utilized in the prioritization process within the humanitarian response plan (i.e. CAP or country strategy in non-CAP countries).

The challenges included the multiple needs that had to be addressed, despite the limited resources available. The affected population had lost all their basic belongings including houses, crops in the fields and household tools. Faced with the need for shelter, food items for daily survival and other basic needs, the priority action was to provide food for a period of three months during which time the affected population could have grown their own crops with seeds received from FAO.

II. Implementation

(a) Describe key partnerships and inter-agency collaboration (e.g. NGOs, UN agencies, regional partners, IOs, and the national government) and the effect of these partnerships on the implementation of the projects funded by CERF.

The collaboration between the UN Agencies, the coordination bodies, the DMU, and the local authorities in the field resulted in a quick and timely delivery of the assistance required by the beneficiaries.

The Government, through the DMU in the Prime Minister's Office, played a prominent role in the coordination of the implementation of the various components of the project. The DMU has a coordination system at the district level that ensured that all the facilities and mechanisms required to facilitate the reception and distribution of the assistance provided were in place. This included amongst others, the provision of appropriate storage and organized distribution systems. While the agencies ensured the supply and transport of food and non-food items, the District Mayors assumed the reception of the assistance, its storage and the eventual distribution. GTZ TOR offered storage facilities in Kigali before part of the non-food items were transferred to the different locations for distribution.

As a result of the coordination mechanism, synergy was created amongst implementing agencies, and the best use of the resources was ensured. For example, the consumption of seeds for food was avoided, due to the distribution of WFP food and the FAO seeds being well organized.

(b) Explain what was the added value of the partnerships and/or inter-agency collaboration on the implementation of the projects, including strengths or weakness of such arrangements on (i) the achievement of project results and (ii) the mandate of the Fund in relation to the under-funded and rapid response windows.

The inter-agency collaboration was instrumental and effective for the success of the operation. For instance, WFP's free food distribution for short-term nutritional needs complemented FAO's seed provision and ended up assisting the population to better recover and gain some degree of improved food security.

UNICEF, WFP and FAO intervened jointly in the most affected regions and targeted the most vulnerable families. The funds made available through the CERF increased the effectiveness of the UNCT response in a coordinated and comprehensive manner, and ensured better self reliance of the resettled households.

The integrated and comprehensive manner of the distribution of the assistance was essential to achieve the objectives.

In addition, the good collaboration between the local (community/sector) and District level authorities and the UN was pertinent for prompt, appropriate and well targeted assistance.

The major challenge was the lack of access of the affected population to adequate land for agricultural activities. The population was given a plot for shelter construction and kitchen garden. No land for crop production as such was made available. Additionally, funds for shelter construction, including materials (cement, sand, etc.) pledged by DMU are yet to be provided by the Government to complete the works done by WFP with its own resources. Hence other competing needs have emerged such as the earthquake damages caused in February 2008. When people do not have proper shelter under adverse weather conditions, it is difficult for them to engage fully in any productive and livelihoods activities.

(c) List all implementing partners that benefited from CERF funding. Indicate whether partners were NGOs, government counterparts, or private contractors. Please also list their primary activities and the amount of CERF funding forwarded to each implementing partner. [Note: this information may be presented in tabular form as an annex to the report.]

WFP used private transporters to move the food from the WFP central warehouse in Kigali to distribution sites in Nyabihu, Rubavu and Musanze. The total cost occurred by each transporter was as follows:

- Murenzi Supply Company: \$ 634
- Niyibizi Gaston Company: \$ 516
- SDV TRANSAMI Rwanda: \$ 3,933
- = Total: \$ 5,083

UNICEF, in partnership with the Rwanda Red Cross (supporting the local government), assisted flood victims by:

- Providing collapsible tanks, jerry cans, water purification tablets, soap, and other items to the relocated populations.
- Providing water and sanitation expertise and equipment to analyze and monitor water quality in wells and other water sources.
- Training volunteers and community leaders on hygiene and health risk associated with waterborne diseases and on appropriate measures to be taken.
- Providing plastic sheeting to families whose houses have been lost or damaged.

UNHCR used the warehousing structure in Kigali managed by GTZ/TOR as a temporary storage facility while the non-food items were on transit at Kigali.

III. Results

(a) List the major activities carried out and the results achieved by sector/cluster as part of the overall response to which the CERF contributed. Please use specific measurable indicators to measure progress, where possible disaggregated data by sex/age.

The assistance provided to the flood affected districts of Nyabihu, Rubavu and Musanze, part of the ecosystem of Gishwati forest and the Virunga Mountains, was done in partnership by WFP, UNHCR, UNICEF, FAO and the Rwanda Red Cross. The Disaster Management Unit (DMU), pledged to provide assistance mainly for shelter construction. UN Agency assistance was complimentary, for example, WFP providing food assistance for immediate consumption and FAO seeds for longer term food security.

Local authorities in the districts were instrumental in collaborating with the DMTF members and providing storage facilities for relief food and non-food items. They were fully involved in the distribution process, organizing and managing the implementation of the assistance.

The following results were achieved per sector:

FOOD

Agency: WFP
 CERF project number: 07-WFP-070
 Budget: \$93,011

WFP provided food assistance to 4,715 people. Details on quantities per commodity are as follows:

District	# of beneficiaries	# of days	Ration							Total (MT)
			400			100	15	40	5	
			Cereals							
			Maize grain (60 days)	MML (30 days)	Total cereals	Pulses	Oil	CSB	Salt	
Nyabihu	2,462	90	59.088	29.54	88.63	22.16	3.32	8.86	1.11	124.08
Musanze	1,616	90	38.784	19.39	58.18	14.54	2.18	5.82	0.73	81.45
Rubavu	637	90	15.288	7.64	22.93	5.73	0.86	2.29	0.29	32.10
Total	4,715	90	113.16	56.58	169.74	42.44	6.37	16.97	2.12	237.64

NON-FOOD ITEMS

Agency: UNHCR
CERF project number: 07-HCR-031
Budget: \$166,385

UNHCR supplied and transported the following items to the distribution centres in the three districts:

A. DOMESTIC NEEDS					
N / S	ITEMS	Beneficiaries	N. of families	Quantity per household	Total quantity
1	Kitchen set	4,000	800	Two	1,600
2	Jerry cans (20L)	2,000	400	Two	800
3	Blanket	4,000	800	Five	4,000
5	Plastic mat	4,000	800	Five	4,000
6	Plastic sheeting	2,000	400	One	10 rolls
7	Pick-axes, hand tools, wheel barrows	2,000	400		400
8	Hygienic Pads	2,000 women	400	2,000	6,000
	SUB TOTAL				
B. Logistics and transport					
2	Rental of trucks for transport of non-food items and agricultural material	Trucks were rented by UNHCR to transport the non-food items from Ngara, Tanzania where the UNHCR items are stocked to Kigali and onward to the three districts for distribution. UNHCR also paid the transport related fees for the transport of seeds and pesticides supplied by FAO.			

Parts of the non-food items including Jerry cans, plastic sheeting, were to be supplied by UNICEF.

Water/sanitation:

The expected results at the end of the CERF grant period were:

- 4,000 persons directly affected by the flood are provided with essential hygiene information/education
- 4,000 persons (above mentioned) are provided with "safe water"/purification items
- 4 000 persons (above mentioned) have access to safe drinking water
- 4,000 persons whose houses were destroyed can be appropriately resettled.

UNICEF procured from Nairobi, family health and storage container items. However, following the December 27th political crisis in Kenya, the shipment was delayed.

The following items within the CERF proposal were made available by UNICEF:

Procurement	Quantity	Status/Observation
Plastic tanks of 5,000 litres	2	Available in warehouse (procured from N'bi)
Water bladders (10,000 litres)	10	Available in warehouse (procured from N'bi)
Jerry cans of 20 litres	800	Available in warehouse (locally procured)
Toilet soap	5,000	Available in warehouse (locally procured)
Water purification tablets & Sur eau		Available in warehouse
Calcium Hypochlorite, Aluminium sulphate		Available in warehouse
Plastic sheeting	20 rolls (equivalent to 240 pieces of sheeting of 4X5 meters)	Available in warehouse
Pick-axis, hand tools, wheel barrows		Wheel barrows no longer necessary but pick-axes and forked hoes are in the process of local procurement
Blocs of latrines	10	See 'note' below***
Training of trainers		Dates and methodology TBD with local government

***Note: At time of writing, District authorities were considering the possibility of constructing communal toilets since the houses are in block arrangements. A final decision on this is awaited.

FOOD SECURITY / AGRICULTURE

Agency: FAO
 CERF project number: 07-FAO-055
 Budget: \$156,929

Seeds and tools

At the end of December 2007, FAO had distributed 120 kg of different seeds (onion, carrot and cabbage), 1,600 hoes and 800 shovels. The Rwandan Red Cross and the local authorities assisted FAO in the distribution.

Due to the procedures of tenders, the following seeds and other agriculture inputs will be distributed to the beneficiaries during the month of February 2008: 10 kg of cabbage, 10 kg of carrots, 10 kg of onion, 92 tons of potatoes, 8 tons of peas, 800 kg of Dithane (fungicide), 30 tons of mineral fertilizer (NPK17-17-17) and 175 sprayers.

The expected outputs of FAO assistance are:

- 4,000 people (800 households) will be able to recover part of their crops during February and March 2008 (for vegetables) and plant for the new 2008 B season (March – June)
- They will be able to harvest per household, at least 1 ton of potatoes, 200 kg of peas and 500 kg of other vegetables by June 2008.

(b) For rapid response grants, describe whether CERF funding enabled prompt/early action to respond to life-saving needs and time critical requirements. For under-funded grants, describe whether CERF funding enabled the continuation of poorly funded, essential core elements of the overall response. Please be specific.

This rapid response grant enabled a prompt action and saved lives of the severely affected population. With the funding received from CERF, WFP could provide a three month free food ration. The Government had initially provided food assistance to the population. At the end of the three-month period, the beneficiary population is expected to harvest their own food assuming that other commitments for help from the Government materialize. UNHCR and UNICEF catered for the immediate domestic needs while FAO facilitated the provision of seeds and tools to assist the affected population to improve its food security.

(c) Describe how project monitoring and evaluation took place and who was involved in it.

The monitoring and evaluation was conducted jointly by the different agencies indicated above. The DMU officials and local authorities participated in the monitoring and evaluation missions. Beneficiaries were also given opportunities on different occasions to express their views on the assistance received.

As per the food component, WFP has an established monitoring and evaluation (M&E) mechanism for its operations in Rwanda. This M&E mechanism was used for monitoring the pre- distribution situation, the main distribution and the post food distribution.

(d) Highlight the overall impact of CERF funding on the cluster/sector level of the humanitarian response and the resource mobilization/advocacy efforts. In particular, describe whether resources or media attention were stimulated by CERF funding

Local and international media have been reporting widely on the flood emergency since the very first day of its occurrence. The assistance received from the government, UN agencies and NGOs has always been covered by the media. The funds received from CERF have also enjoyed widespread media coverage and continues to do so.

IV. Lessons Learned

This was the first CERF funding proposal that the UN agencies in Rwanda prepared and accessed. The learning process has been intensive and valued by all the stakeholders. The operation of providing assistance to victims of the flood in Nyabihu, Rubavu and Musanze Districts was carried out in a joint manner among the UN agencies, some NGOs, DMU and local authorities at both the district and sector levels. Some of the lessons drawn are as follows:

- Joint delivery by the different UN agencies proved to be very efficient and effective.
- The local authorities are very important in facilitating the provision of assistance, especially with regards to the provision of storage facilities and facilitating field missions.
- Involvement of NGOs like the Red Cross is crucial due to their knowledge of the field, operational capacities, and their ability to mobilize beneficiaries.
- Enhanced strategies e.g. WFP part of CERF funds, as per procedure, were received at WFP HQ and processed for food procurement. Meanwhile, WFP Rwanda utilized food from its in-country stocks to deliver assistance to the identified people as planned.

Constraints included:

- The number of affected people increased after the CERF funding was already approved. Alternative ways to support an additional 1,000 persons were explored among the partners.

- Even though the process of releasing funds was relatively quick, the limitation of activities that could be carried out using these funds prohibited some urgently needed assistance such as the construction of shelter.
- During the assessment, some needs expressed by the beneficiaries but considered other than strictly life saving activities could not be included in the submission to the CERF.
- Due to land constraints, the relocation of the affected population which was planned initially to be undertaken in other districts distant from the affected areas did not take place. As a result, the transport component (buses to be rented) initially budgeted by UNHCR was not implemented as the relocation sites were identified in the same vicinity of the affected areas.

List of Acronyms

CERF- Central Emergency Response Fund

DMU- Decision Management Unit

DMTF -Disaster Management Task Force

FAO- Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

GDP- Gross Domestic Product

NGO- Non-governmental organization

RC- Resident Coordinator

RRC- Regional Coordinating Councils

UNCT- United Nations Country Team

UNDP -United Nations Development Programme

UNICEF- United Nations Children's Fund

WFP -World Food Programme

WHO- World Health Organization