

ANALYSIS OF DATA FROM 2013 RC/HC REPORTS ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS

ADDED VALUE OF CERF IN 2013 AS ASSESSED BY RC/HCS



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

This briefing note summarizes information on the strategic value added by CERF to the overall humanitarian action in recipient countries as reported in 2013 RC/HC reports on the use of CERF funds.

In 2013, CERF allocated US\$ 482 million to 15 UN agencies¹ responding to humanitarian crises in 45 countries. Some \$307 million were allocated from the CERF rapid response (RR) window to quickly start response operations in new or rapidly deteriorating humanitarian emergencies. The remaining \$175 million were allocated through the CERF underfunded emergencies (UFE) window to life-saving programmes in underfunded humanitarian crises.

In 2013, CERF funded a total of 533 projects that were part of 83 consolidated applications. Given the six-to-nine month implementation time frame of CERF grants followed by a three-month reporting period, the complete reports on all 83 allocations and the 533 CERF-funded projects in 2013 were available at the beginning of 2015 for consolidation. The individual RC/HC reports used for the analysis included in this briefing note can be found on CERF's website.²

As a funding source directly prioritised by humanitarian partners at country level CERF adds value beyond simply being a source of funding. It enables the humanitarian community to jointly identify key needs and priorities and to strategically direct CERF funding where it has the greatest impact.

Therefore, to gauge the added value of CERF beyond project outcomes, RC/HCs and humanitarian country teams (HCTs) are asked to assess CERF's contribution to the following four objectives:

1 The terms "UN agencies", "UN agencies and IOM", and "agencies" are used interchangeably.
2 www.unocha.org/cerf/partner-resources/grant-reports/grant-reports-2013

"Overall, the CERF rapid response window contributed to enhancing WFP's capacity to respond rapidly to unforeseen needs."

"Pooled funds were generally available to WFP before other directed multilateral donations and were often one of the first sources of donor funds."

Strategic Evaluation: WFP's Use of Pooled Funds for Humanitarian Preparedness and Response (2009-2013)

“CERF recipient agencies highlighted the fact that RR grants had been very useful for responding to new and unforeseen humanitarian needs. UNICEF pointed out that it takes time to obtain bilateral funding so it approaches the CERF for the initial response to a new emergency while applying to other donors to continue the response.”

Sudan PAF review


- Fast delivery of assistance to people in need
- Better response to time-critical humanitarian needs
- Improved coordination among the humanitarian community
- Leveraging additional resources from other sources

Against each objective, RC/HCs provided in the CERF reports a rating along with a brief narrative justification. This feedback strongly confirms that CERF allocations in 2013 led to fast delivery of humanitarian assistance, enabled time-critical needs to be met, and helped strengthen coordination at country level. CERF’s role in leveraging additional funding from other sources was less clear, still, more than half of the reports could clearly confirm a correlation between CERF allocations and other contributions. CERF-related studies and reviews for the period have also provided evidence on CERF’s added value in these four areas. Selected examples are quoted in this note.

The following is a more detailed analysis of the reported information on the four strategic objectives of CERF.


1. DID CERF FUNDS LEAD TO A FAST DELIVERY OF ASSISTANCE TO BENEFICIARIES?

Out of 83 RC/HC reports in 2013, 74 (equivalent to 89 per cent of all reports) stated that the CERF funds led to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries, 8 reports stated that the CERF funds partly led to a fast delivery of assistance, and one stated that the CERF funds did not lead to fast delivery. This one report was from an emergency where the CERF implementation was delayed due to operational factors beyond the control of CERF.



2. DID CERF FUNDS HELP RESPOND TO TIME-CRITICAL NEEDS?

Out of 83 RC/HC reports, 96 per cent, or 80 reports, stated that the CERF funds helped respond to time-critical needs, while 3 reports stated that the CERF funds partly helped respond to time-critical needs. No report in 2013 concluded that CERF did not help respond to time-critical needs.



“There was broad agreement of the important role that CERF RR funding played in facilitating timely response to humanitarian crises. UNHCR CERF focal points in each of South Sudan, Myanmar, Yemen, Pakistan, Uganda and Kenya all emphasised the success of CERF funding in kick-starting humanitarian programming. The online survey endorsed this view with 9 of the 12 countries that responded to the question indicating that CERF generally provided timelier funding than bilateral humanitarian donors and other pooled funds.”


A review of UNHCR's utilisation of the CERF (March 2014)

“CERF funding to WHO to respond to an outbreak of yellow fever stimulated funding from ECHO, DFID and South Korea for the operational costs of the vaccination campaign. The CERF RR grant for the Darfur crisis in 2013 enabled UNICEF’s WASH partners to undertake assessments. The agency was then able to use this information for applications to other donors and received funding from OFDA. UNICEF has also been able to undertake nutrition assessments in White Nile state because of CERF funding and this is helping it to raise funds from other donors. UNICEF used CERF funding for a nutrition project in 2013 to provide mobile clinics and this prompted other donors to fund the service.”

Sudan PAF review


3. DID CERF IMPROVE COORDINATION AMONG THE HUMANITARIAN COMMUNITY?

Out of 83 RC/HC reports in 2013, 86 per cent, or 71 reports stated that the CERF funds improved coordination among the humanitarian community and 12 reports found that the CERF funds partly improved coordination. There were no reports in 2013 that indicated that CERF did not in some way improve coordination.



4. DID CERF FUNDS HELP IMPROVE RESOURCE MOBILIZATION FROM OTHER SOURCES?

Out of 83 RC/HC reports, 47 stated that CERF helped improve resource mobilization from other sources, 29 stated that CERF partially helped improve resource mobilization, and 7 stated that CERF did not help in this regard. While some clear examples were identified, several reports noted that determining a correlation between CERF allocations and possible donor contributions was often difficult.



“The prioritisation process was considered to offer an important opportunity to strengthen coordination as well as highlighting gaps in response.”

A review of UNHCR’s utilisation of the CERF (March 2014)