



United Nations

**CENTRAL  
EMERGENCY  
RESPONSE FUND**



A SOUND HUMANITARIAN INVESTMENT

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR  
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS  
ETHIOPIA  
RAPID RESPONSE  
CONFLICT-RELATED DISPLACEMENT**

**RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR**

**Gillian Mellsop**

## REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

Mid-Year Review, coordinated by UNHCR and ARRA, evaluating the overall response to the South Sudanese Refugee crisis was conducted in August 2015 with all partners and the refugee self-governing bodies and groups. The report is being prepared and will be shared with the Ethiopian Humanitarian Country Team (EHCT) and Refugee Taskforce members once finalized.

- b. Please confirm that the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator (RC/HC) Report was discussed in the Humanitarian and/or UN Country Team and by cluster/sector coordinators as outlined in the guidelines.

YES  NO

IOM, WFP, UNICEF and UNHCR compiled the draft report and shared with OCHA for review and consolidation. The guidelines and components of reporting were shared with the agencies prior to the preparation of the report.

- c. Was the final version of the RC/HC Report shared for review with in-country stakeholders as recommended in the guidelines (i.e. the CERF recipient agencies and their implementing partners, cluster/sector coordinators and members and relevant government counterparts)?

YES  NO

The final compiled report was shared with UNICEF, UNHCR, IOM and WFP for their review and comment, and feedback was received from all. The report was amended as per the feedback. The HC also reviewed and endorsed report.

## I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: US\$ 140,707,304		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	14,999,770
	COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND ( <i>HRF</i> )	4,726,405
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	64,364,793
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>84,090,968</b>

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 4 November 2014			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
WFP	14-RR-WFP-080	Food Aid	9,749,769
IOM	14-RR-IOM-042	Common Logistics	1,000,000
UNHCR	14-RR-HCR-045	Non-Food Items	3,250,000
UNICEF	14-RR-CEF-155	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	1,000,001
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>14,999,770</b>

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies/IOM implementation	13,765,840
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	98,360
Funds forwarded to government partners	1,135,570
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>14,999,770</b>

## **HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

On 15 December 2013, violence erupted in the headquarters of the South Sudan army's Presidential Guard in Juba. In the following days, the violence spread quickly to other locations. Most of South Sudan's states experienced heavy fighting between Government forces and forces allied to former Vice-President Riek Machar. The fighting was particularly intense in Central Equatoria, Jonglei, Unity, Upper Nile and Lakes states some of whom are bordering Ethiopia. While the conflict was sparked by political strife, it quickly took on an ethnic dimension, feeding on pre-existing ethnic tensions, mainly between the Dinka and Nuer communities.

With no political resolution in sight, the security situation remains dire until today. The fighting devastated South Sudan's civilian population. Thousands of civilians were killed or wounded, while hundreds of thousands lost their livelihoods and access to basic services. Humanitarian access in many parts of the country remains hampered by security concerns. As at 27 August 2015, some 1.6 million people have been displaced within South Sudan. An additional 616,000 people have fled to neighbouring countries, primarily to Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan and Uganda.

The number of South Sudanese taking refuge in Ethiopia stands at 219,107 as at 31 August 2015, of which 23,769 arrived in 2015. The majority of the refugee population are women and children (90 per cent), with almost 20,000 children registered as unaccompanied or separated. At the time of this CERF application, about 190,000 refugees were hosted in Gambella Region, and more than 500 were arriving every day. To accommodate the arrivals three new camps (Leitchor, Kule and Tierkidi) were established in 2014. Although up to an additional 170,000 South Sudanese were expected to arrive until March 2015, bringing the expected number of new refugee arrivals to 360,000 people, this did not happen due to the cross border assistance through airlift and airdrop operations and transporting of foods by roads and river. Nonetheless, the South Sudanese refugee population is the largest refugee group in Ethiopia today.

The asylum seekers arrived in Gambella Region primarily through Burbiey, Pagak and Akobo border entry points. Upon arrival in Ethiopia, people were exhausted, nutritionally weak and in poor health. Nutrition surveys conducted in three refugee camps in June-July 2014 revealed an extremely concerning nutritional status among the refugees. The Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) and Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) rates were above the emergency threshold of 15 per cent GAM and 1 per cent SAM in all surveyed camps, including 30.3 per cent GAM and 10 per cent SAM in Tierkidi, 28 per cent GAM and 7.8 per cent SAM in Kule, and 25.8 per cent GAM and 5.7 per cent SAM in Leitchor camp. The poor nutritional status of the refugees weakens the immune system, which increases their risk of contracting various communicable diseases, especially during the rainy season.

The rains received in July 2014 damaged basic infrastructure and hindered service provision in Leitchor and Nip Nip camps, which were almost completely flooded. The two camps had to eventually be closed and the flood-affected refugees were relocated to higher grounds and the surrounding villages. The already established camps that were not flooded had already reached their maximum capacity, and significant challenges in the approval of land for additional camps delayed the relocation of some 60,000 refugees from transit centers and flooded camps. This relocation increased pressure on the already vulnerable host communities in districts adjacent to the camps. The rains and floods posed major public health threats, with water borne diseases and malaria remaining the major causes of morbidity.

Water and sanitation facilities in the camps are below the minimum standard of 15 liters per person per day and 50 people per latrine. The ratio in the camps ranges from 10.5 liters per person per day in Tierkidi to 12.5 liters in Leitchor. Similarly, 63 people are using one latrine in Kule camp and 78 people share a latrine in Leitchor.

As of 1 October 2014, the number of unaccompanied and separated children registered was close to 20,000. The particularly high ratio of unaccompanied and separated children is of major concern and requires adequate measures, including a regional approach to strengthen family tracing and related activities. Enhanced registration and profiling is necessary to capture the needs and vulnerabilities of newly arrived people and facilitate an appropriate response. Protection monitoring to ensure the civilian nature of refugee camps and settlements, and regional input into reporting grave violations occurring inside South Sudan was also required.

Critical gaps were also reported in protection and in Education in Emergencies (EiE) interventions. In Ethiopia, like other neighbouring countries, there is a disproportionate number of women (76 per cent of the adult population) and children among the new arrivals from South Sudan. The risks to which this particularly vulnerable population is exposed require prevention and response mechanisms for sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), among others. Of 79,838 registered school-age children in Tierkidi, Kule and Leitchor camps (including 39,136 girls), an average of thirty per cent were receiving EiE support.

The Gambella Regional State is one of the least developed regions in Ethiopia, with very limited infrastructure and sub-standard services and facilities available. With the increasing South Sudanese refugee influx, it is expected that the number of refugees could surpass the region's population of 300,000 people. In addition, as camp capacity was surpassed and the flood-damaged camps were not

rehabilitated, more and more refugees were being hosted by the community, putting additional strain on the limited available services. Availing basic services for the refugees also offset increasing vulnerability within the local community.

Scaling-up emergency humanitarian responses was urgently required from all sectors, including food, nutrition, health, water, sanitation and hygiene, emergency shelter, protection, EiE and non-food items.

## II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

The CERF grant of nearly US\$ 15 million was prioritized for core life-saving sectors of Food, Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH), Core Relief Items (CRIs) and registration and border relocation support for South Sudanese refugees. The proposed activities are designed to cover the immediate needs of some 190,000 refugees and selected host communities in neighbouring Woreda (Itang). The CERF funds assisted in complementing ongoing key life-saving activities.

At the time of the CERF proposal submission, the GAM rates were as high as 30.3 per cent and SAM rates of 10 per cent (Tierkidi camp). Available food stocks could cover only a one month distribution and ration cutting was being considered. The water supply mainly depended on water trucking and the water available per person per day was below the standard in most locations (10 and 11 litres per day in Tierkidi, Kule and Akobo). The latrines coverage was equally alarming with up to 92 persons per latrine in Nip Nip. For the flood affected camps (Nip Nip and Leitchor) and the Mataar transit centre, where about 10,000 refugees got stranded waiting for relocation to a camp, the situation was reportedly worse in terms of food, WASH, shelter, health services, core relief items etc., and the need for relocation to a camp was imminent to prevent loss of life.

Provision of timely and adequate food and nutrition supplies to refugees was the main focus area. Most of the refugees (women and children) arrived after traveling for many days without adequate food, and hence provision of high energy and nutritious food on arrival was also a priority. Beneficiaries received life-saving supplies upon arrival and those with very weak situation were admitted to therapeutic feeding centres prior to relocation to camps.

The nutrition assessment conducted in the three new camps (Kule, Leitchor and Tierkidi) in June/July 2014 served as a basis to identify the most vulnerable groups among the newly arriving refugees. The results indicated a high prevalence of malnutrition rates (up to 30 per cent GAM and 10 per cent SAM) both exceeding the emergency threshold of 15 per cent and 1 per cent respectively. The recommendation from the survey results included expanded and enhanced targeted and blanket supplementary feeding for vulnerable groups (children 6-59 months and pregnant and lactating mothers), introducing scooping food distribution system to promote equity in general food distribution and ensure provision of full food ration entitlement to all refugees, strengthening outreach activities as well as improving WASH activities.

Accordingly, WFP purchased CSB+ and vegetable oil to respond to the high malnutrition rates through Targeted Supplementary Feeding (TSF) and Blanket Supplementary Feeding (BSF). While general food distribution continued for all refugees in the new and existing camps, priority was given to the three camps (Kule, Leitchor and Tierkidi) with higher malnutrition rates for the nutrition support activities. For this CERF application, WFP used the number of registered South Sudanese refugees at the time (191,000<sup>1</sup>) as beneficiaries for general food distribution. In emergency situations, about 25 per cent of the refugee population are in need of nutritional assistance, and hence about 47,750 refugees were targeted for supplementary food under TSF and BSF. The number of beneficiaries reached was slightly more than the planned (212,883) due to the increase in refugees between CERF grant confirmation and distribution.

IOM was tasked with the responsibility of providing emergency evacuation after initial registration was conducted by ARRA and UNHCR. The evacuation targeted new arrivals who had travelled for several days in extreme conditions without adequate food and water and who desperately needed immediate support. The operation included boat movements for Tiergol (Akobo), while all the other relocations involved bus movements to refugee camps following IOM standard operating procedures. In addition, in coordination with UNHCR and ARRA, through CERF funding, IOM conducted Pre-Departure Medical Screening (PDMS), and immediately provided transportation assistance to the camps for those who were in critical condition using UNHCR chartered helicopter flights escorted by IOM medical staff. In addition, IOM provided potable water and high energy biscuits (from WFP) during transit and en route to the refugee camps.

---

<sup>1</sup> The WFP figure was slightly above the planning figure of 190,000 at the time of the submission due to the continue arrival of refugees on daily bases.

Under this project, IOM targeted the evacuation of refugees from Akobo entry point to UNHCR and ARRA designated refugee camps by boat. IOM evacuated a total of 10,704 persons (4,710 female, 5,994 male). Of this number, 7,497 were children (2,402 female and 5,095 male). The project was short of its target of 11,300 persons as the number fell drastically within the period (October 2014 to April 2015) of the project duration compared to the projection. Some of the reasons that led to the reduction in numbers include the availability of food in South Sudan through food drops organized by WFP and the reluctance of arrivals to relocate to the new recommended site of Okugo refugee camp<sup>2</sup>.

The WASH response prioritized interventions in Itang Special Woreda, where Kule and Tierkidi camps are located. The camps consistently indicated low marks against the standard WASH indicator benchmarks and there is no reliable source of safe water near them. In Gambella, the WASH sector conducts gap analysis twice a month based on overall needs and available resources, including capacities. Indicators that fall below the benchmarks are given priority for funding. With acute watery diarrhoea (AWD) epidemic already in South Sudan and one confirmed AWD case reported from Leitchor camp in June 2014, there was an urgent need to scale up on WASH interventions in the camps and surrounding host communities. This needed to be done in order to safe guard the health and wellbeing of the refugees so as to prevent morbidity and mortality due to water borne illnesses. The reached beneficiaries with this CERF project are 130,000 men, women, girls and boys. The project addressed 20,000 people more than the planned 110,000 as a result of the significant increase in the populations in Itang and the junction trading centre as a high number of businesses have sprung up.

UNHCR prioritised the provision of emergency shelter and Core Relief Items (CRI) to targeted 40,000 refugees, including soap and sanitary materials for women in reproductive age. These activities were also prioritised within the Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP) as they are quick deliverables with an immediate impact and are critical life-saving activities.

### III. CERF PROCESS

Following the US\$ 15 million CERF RR supplementary allocation to respond to the South Sudan crisis in Ethiopia, OCHA (OCHA's Head of Office was acting Humanitarian Coordinator) convened an extraordinary meeting on 14 October with the major UN agencies involved in the refugee response, including UNICEF, WFP, WHO, UNHCR and IOM (all except WHO attended the meeting) to agree on the distribution of the allocation.

To cover the immediate needs of the new arrivals as well as those refugees that previously arrived and affected by the flooding, many agencies were redirecting resources from projects in other locations, which had serious impact on the operations and support provided to other refugee groups.

Additional funding was urgently required to provide core humanitarian assistance to the 170,000 new arrivals expected in the coming six months across the main life-saving sectors of food, WASH, Core Relief Items (CRI), emergency shelter and border relocation. Without additional funding, the refugees were at high risk to lose their lives due to lack of access to critical services. Out of the current requirement of US\$ 210 million included for Ethiopia in the Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP) for 2014 for some 300,000 refugees, only 31 per cent (US\$65.7 million) had been received at the time of the submission.

During the meeting it was agreed to use the funds as much as possible for inputs such as food, CRI (shelter and NFIs), emergency water supply systems with limited inputs on overheads. Core life-saving activities were prioritized in line with the current RRRP, as well as the WASH and health strategies as follows:

- \$9.75 million for immediate provision of food, and/or high energy biscuits at the entry points to prevent further malnutrition and loss of life (WFP);
- \$3.25 million for provision of emergency shelter (tents) and CRIs (UNHCR);
- \$1 million for transportation, including medical evacuation, from the entry points or transit sites to the camps to ensure refugees' access to services (IOM);
- \$1 million for provision of emergency WASH services to prevent outbreaks and reduce water borne diseases (UNICEF).

The agreed amounts were conveyed to the Ethiopian Humanitarian Country Team (EHCT) on 16 October 2014.

---

<sup>2</sup> Arrivals were concerned of the possibility to be relocated to Okugo refugee camp as it was based in an area of different ethnic group

It was agreed that this CERF allocation would not be used for the proposed relocation site in Okogo/Dimma. The camp is not favoured by humanitarian partners due to its remoteness (400km) from Gambella town and close proximity to the border where there is serious conflict. More than 90 per cent of the refugees are Nuer and are concerned about relocating to a camp close to a Dinka area in South Sudan. The site is also sometimes a “no go” area for humanitarian partners due to security-related access restrictions, challenging proper establishment and monitoring of projects.

Complementing the response, the in-country Humanitarian Response Fund (HRF) allocated US\$ 4.7 million supporting projects in WASH, shelter, nutrition and health sectors in camps and entry points/transit centers for new arrivals.

#### IV. CERF RESULTS AND ADDED VALUE

TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR <sup>1</sup>									
Total number of individuals affected by the crisis: 190,000 refugees (at the time of submission, with daily increases)									
Cluster/Sector	Female			Male			Total		
	Girls (below 18)	Women (above 18)	Total	Boys (below 18)	Men (above 18)	Total	Children (below 18)	Adults (above 18)	Total
Food Aid	70,251	48,963	<b>119,214</b>	74,509	19,110	<b>93,619</b>	144,760	68,123	<b>212,883</b>
Common Logistics	2,402	2,308	<b>4,710</b>	5,095	899	<b>5,994</b>	7,497	3,207	<b>10,704</b>
Non-Food Items	15,218	5,513	<b>20,731</b>	16,395	2,874	<b>19,269</b>	31,613	8,387	<b>40,000</b>
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	31,400	36,898	<b>68,298</b>	18,433	43,269	<b>61,702</b>	49,833	80,167	<b>130,000</b>

<sup>1</sup> Best estimate of the number of individuals (girls, women, boys, and men) directly supported through CERF funding by cluster/sector.

#### BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION

At the time of submission of the application to CERF in November 2014, Ethiopia had received over 190,000 and the numbers were increasing daily. In line with the Regional Refugee Response Plan (RRRP), another 110,000 new arrivals were anticipated for the last quarter of 2014 and 60,000 in the first quarter of 2015. Fortunately, these numbers did not materialise, and from 01 October 2014 to 01 May 2015, a total of 77,270 refugees from South Sudan arrived in Ethiopia and were provided with protection and life-saving assistance.

Beneficiaries of this grant are refugees from South Sudan, mostly accepted on prima facie basis, registered by UNHCR and ARRA. Refugees are registered at two levels – level 1 registration is conducted at the entry points and captures basic information at the household level including critical vulnerabilities, and ration cards are issued. At the camp, level 2 registration is conducted, taking individual data of each refugee, including biometrics and a full screening for vulnerabilities and specific needs.

IOM identified the beneficiary estimation based on the information received by UNHCR and ARRA who conducted registration. Based on the registration list, IOM verified the number, and re-registered refugees during pre-departure medical screening to identify unfit refugees for relocation by air. To avoid double counting, IOM registered beneficiaries who received wrist bands by ARRA and UNHCR after level 1 registration at entry points. Same manifest was used for onward movement from Burbiey way station to the designated refugee camps. UNHCR and ARRA staff in the reception centre constantly updated IOM staff members in the field on the number of individuals expected to be evacuated on a daily basis, particularly a day before to allow time for registration. Based on the registration list, IOM planned the population movement in a safe and dignified manner.

For the relief food response as well the basis for estimation of beneficiaries in refugee camps is UNHCR’s database of registered persons of concern. Arriving refugees are initially registered in the UNHCR progress database, and ration cards are issued when second-level registration is complete. WFP distributes monthly rations to all refugees registered by UNHCR and ARRA residing in camps or settlements. Beneficiary numbers for nutrition interventions are based on the prevalence of GAM in children under 5 and estimates of the number of PLW.

All refugees are targeted for general food distribution. Households receive monthly rations based on the number of family members under them. In addition to the general ration, children under five and PLW who are found to be malnourished receive supplementary nutritious food. In camps where GAM rates are very high, blanket supplementary feeding is administered for all children under five regardless of their nutritional status. For this CERF application, WFP used the number of registered South Sudanese refugees at the time (191,000) as beneficiaries for general food distribution. In emergency situations, about 25 per cent of the refugee population are in need of nutritional assistance, and hence about 47,750 refugees received supplementary food under TSF and BSF.

For the WASH response, the total number of beneficiaries was calculated based on the camp populations in Kule and Teirkidi, estimated at 50,000 each and the host community populations in Itang town as 20,000 and the emerging trading center at the Gambella Itang junction, as 10,000 people. The planned beneficiaries at the time of submission of estimated at 100,000 in the two camps and 10,000 in the host community of Itang town. The coverage changed due to increased population in the town and concentration of people nearby due to business opportunities.

<b>TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING<sup>23</sup></b>			
	<b>Children (below 18)</b>	<b>Adults (above 18)</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Female</b>	119,271	93,682	212,953
<b>Male</b>	114,432	66,152	180,584
<b>Total individuals (Female and male)</b>	233,703	159,834	393,537

<sup>2</sup> Best estimate of the total number of individuals (girls, women, boys, and men) directly supported through CERF funding. This should, as best possible, exclude significant overlaps and double counting between the sectors.

## **CERF RESULTS**

Funding from CERF enabled the timely implementation of the most critical life-saving activities to ensure protection and well-being of South Sudanese refugees in Gambella Region.

Under the CERF funding, IOM was able to quickly provide emergency evacuation assistance to 10,704 persons who were in dire need of life-saving assistance. In preparation for the border evacuation and transportation assistance, IOM deployed and recruited 40 operations and medical staff, signed agreements with bus and boat companies, procured lifejackets and life savers and prepared travel manifests. IOM provided emergency evacuation assistance to 10,704 persons that entered Ethiopia through Akobo entry point using the boats to Burbiey Way station and Matar transit center with onward transportation by bus to Pugnido and Kule refugee camps.

Pre-departure medical screening was also provided to ensure refugees were fit to travel and every relocation was escorted by medical personnel to ensure support was available during the long travel (approximately nine to 10 hours) from the entry points to refugee camps. For medical cases, a referral system in close coordination with partners was set up to facilitate access to health services for emergency medical cases and UNHCR chartered helicopter was available to for the same. Some 663 individual medical cases were evacuated by helicopter during the same period to Pugnido refugee camp. During the relocation, the beneficiaries also received high energy biscuits and water to ensure their well-being. In addition, cargo boats were also modified to accommodate passengers, including the adding of wooden plank for sitting.

With the CERF funding, WFP purchased a total of 14,260 MT of assorted commodities (10,575 MT of wheat, 1,339 MT of pulses, 1,245 MT of CSB+, 659 MT of vegetable oil, 400 MT of iodised salt and 40 MT of Ready to use supplementary food). The food was delivered to

<sup>3</sup> We continually advocate for CERF to avoid requesting for total number of beneficiaries so as to avoid double counting. Each implemented projects have different targets, and are requested to provide disaggregated data of the beneficiaries for their activities. Moreover, taking the total beneficiary number (in this case 190,000) for all projects as target/ reached is also misleading as some projects target certain percentage from the overall.



beneficiaries through general food distribution and nutrition support to targeted groups of the refugee population. A total of 212,883 beneficiaries received CERF-funded food assistance for about three months. As a result of the refugee influx, WFP assisted 21,883 more refugees compared to the planned 191,000.

The CERF support has also contributed to the reduction of Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rates in the refugee camps. A nutrition survey conducted in early 2015 indicated that the average GAM rate in these camps dropped to 20 per cent from about 30 per cent in mid-2014. Although GAM rates decreased by about 33 per cent, the 20 per cent rate recorded in most camps is still high compared to the emergency threshold of <15 per cent. The percentage of households with at least borderline (borderline and acceptable) Food Consumption Score has also improved from 86 per cent in April 2014 to 97 per cent in June 2015.

Funding from CERF allowed UNICEF to support the Gambella Regional Water Bureau with the procurement of services for the construction of central water storage tanks at Itang and the supply and laying of over 19.5 km main pipe works with the necessary fittings and accessories to the reservoirs in Kule and Teirkidi camps. Works are still ongoing on the pipe works and the storage tank. This CERF grant is part of the multi-donor fund that UNICEF received for the construction of the Itang permanent water scheme, which will ensure improved access to safe and reliable water to over the 100,000 women, men, boys and girls in two refugee camps (Kule and Teirkidi) and the host community of Itang through the construction of the over 19.5 km pumping mains from the water source to the respective camp and community central reservoirs. Other donors including the HRF, ECHO, DFID and KfW have contributed a total of \$3.5 million towards the construction of the scheme.

With the CERF funding, UNHCR targeted refugees relocated from the flood affected NipNip and Leitchor camps as well as new arrivals that had been stranded for months at the Matar transit centre. The new arrivals and flood affected refugees from Nip Nip were mostly accommodated at the extension of the existing Pugnido camp that was granted in October 2014. Flood affected refugees transferred from Leitchor to Jewi camp (granted March 2015) also benefitted from the funding.

UNHCR was able to provide emergency shelter and CRIs to 10,000 refugee households, or about 40,000 individuals (with a standard household size of 4). This ensured the new arrivals that had been stranded for months at the Matar transit centre and other transit/reception sites as well as refugees from the flooded Nip Nip and Leitchor camps could be relocated to the Pugnido extension and the new Jewi camp. With CERF funds, 1,178 emergency shelters were pitched for the most vulnerable households in the Pugnido extension and another 1,107 tents were erected in the new Jewi camp for the refugees relocated from Leitchor.

In addition, using the CERF funding, CRI package, including basic household items such as kitchen sets, jerry cans, blankets etc, were provided to all new arrivals to ensure the refugee families are able to collect water and prepare their own food with the provided WFP food rations. Soap and sanitary materials for women in reproductive age were provided for three months to 40,000 refugees (10,000 HH), ensuring the hygiene and dignity of the refugees.

Organizations faced various challenges during this operation, mainly with service providers, damaged roads and availability of fuel. Reducing river levels during the operation made navigation more difficult. There was also a need for armed security escorts along the river as some zones had security concerns. The lack of adequate communication along the river meant a heavy dependence on satellite phones, which did not necessarily work at all points along the river. With the designated refugee camps filling up, the movement flow from the entry points has been particularly slow as partners waited for new refugee camp to open. Furthermore, arrivals were reluctant to relocate to suggested area, Okugo camp, for fears of security (dominated by different ethnic group). Chronic fuel shortages in the region also disrupted several days of movements and services (including water trucking).

## **CERF's ADDED VALUE**

### **a) Did CERF funds lead to a fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The CERF funding was instrumental for IOM to deliver fast assistance to beneficiaries as the funding led to quick emergency evacuation of South Sudanese, fleeing violence with very little services available, including health services, and protection. This funding enabled the refugees to access appropriate services at refugee camps, particularly children with high levels of malnutrition and health concerns.

The CERF funds allowed WFP to deliver relief assistance to refugees in a short period of time. WFP was able to take advance financing against the CERF grant and buy from corporate stock of Forward Purchase Facility prepositioned in Djibouti. This significantly reduced the lead time and enabled for the fast delivery of assistance to beneficiaries.

For UNHCR, the quick disbursements of funds allowed for the fast delivery of assistance to the refugees fleeing South Sudan.

The CERF funds enabled UNICEF to award the contract for the construction of the piped scheme as the funds were very crucial in processing the initial 30 per cent advance payment to contractors after the award of the contract in January 2015.

### **b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs<sup>4</sup>?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

Providing emergency evacuation and relocation of South Sudanese from the entry points, where services were limited, helped respond to critical needs of refugees, including food, shelter, protection and health services. Funding from CERF allowed UNHCR to mobilize immediate support to refugees relocated, ensuring their protection and well-being. Particularly when the extension of Pugnido was finally approved in October, the CERF funding helped to kick-start the development of the camp.

CERF funds enabled WFP to respond to the critical food and nutritional needs of the South Sudanese refugees. The refugee influx put a lot of pressure on the refugee food pipeline resulting in dwindling of resources earlier than planned. By the time the CERF funds were confirmed, WFP's refugee food pipeline had only a one-month ration left with no new resources in sight. The CERF funding covered a three-month food requirement for the South Sudanese beneficiaries, which allowed for the remaining resources from other donors to be reallocated to the pipeline for Somali and Eritrean refugees. Had it not been for the CERF grant, WFP would have reduced rations, distributed incomplete food basket and/or skipped distributions altogether, which would have had adverse effects on the beneficiaries.

For UNICEF, support for the construction of the water supply scheme in Itang could not have come at a more critical time as it was the key driver for the award of the contracts.

### **c) Did CERF funds help improve resource mobilization from other sources?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The CERF funding helped to improve resource mobilization for WFP. This was mainly by allowing WFP the time to approach a number of donors and explain the critical pipeline shortages so that they could alert their capitals. WFP highlights contributions from its donors in its situation reports and newsletters, which helped to improve transparency and accountability to the donor community. In the three months after confirmation of CERF grant, WFP managed to mobilize US\$ 70.6 million from Saudi Arabia, United States, European Commission and Ireland.

IOM received funding from Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (BPRM) and Department for International Development (DFID) through UNHCR. For UNICEF, the contribution of CERF towards the Itang water supply scheme raised confidence amongst other donors on the viability of the entire project and also to the fact that the majority of the costs were already covered meant donors that had relatively small amounts of funds were able to contribute towards the completion of the works.

---

<sup>4</sup> Time-critical response refers to necessary, rapid and time-limited actions and resources required to minimize additional loss of lives and damage to social and economic assets (e.g. emergency vaccination campaigns, locust control, etc.).

d) **Did CERF improve coordination amongst the humanitarian community?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

The process and negotiation to agree on CERF priority areas and agency allocations involved lots of discussion and coordination to ensure that the funds are used in the most effective way. UN agencies applying for this underfunded allocation discussed their pipeline situation and partnership arrangements so that duplication of effort and unreasonable allocation to a sector could be avoided. WFP, UNHCR and ARRA used the monthly task force and ad hoc meetings at head office and field levels to better coordinate activities funded under the CERF grant. In addition WFP coordinated allocation of resources and prioritization of activities among its partner NGOs working in Gambella region (ACF, GOAL and Concern Worldwide) to deliver nutritional assistance. IOM also daily coordinated with ARRA and UNHCR at the field level for the relocation/movement of refugees. IOM also coordinated with partners such as ZOA, Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) and United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) in Akobo during the vaccination phase and later relocation. Additionally, the Coordination between Gambella Regional Water Bureau (RWB), UNHCR, ARRA and UNICEF including the Gambella WASH technical working was enhanced as a result of the CERF grant, which contributed to the construction of the Itang water supply scheme.

e) **If applicable, please highlight other ways in which CERF has added value to the humanitarian response**

The CERF funding was instrumental as it contributed to expedited emergency evacuation of South Sudanese refugees from the entry points with very little services to the refugee camps where they could access appropriate services. These services were particularly helpful to children with high levels of malnutrition and health concerns.

**V. LESSONS LEARNED**

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u>		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Advance financing from CERF grants and purchase from WFP’s FPF facilitated swift delivery of food assistance	This practise resulted in reducing the time to procure, transport and distribute food and should be continued in te future	WFP, CERF

TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR <u>COUNTRY TEAMS</u>		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Continued assessment of alternative routes to the refugee camps and negotiations with service providers on the flexibility of prices on new routes was crucial to this operation to ensure enough boats and buses were available for the operation.	Constant negotiation with the service providers to get the best rates depending on the emergency phase	IOM
Coordination of resource allocation	For refugee response projects, the lead in the coordination and allocation of resources should be with UNHCR in collaboration with the UN sister agencies.	OCHA and UNHCR

<p>Formulate alternative ways to preposition food in refugee camps in advance so that distributions would not be disrupted during floods as witnessed in Leitchor in 2014</p>	<p>Better site identification before establishing refuge camps and effective coordination is needed to quickly move to higher grounds in case of floods to minimize disruptions in distribution of supplies and loss of property</p>	<p>UNHCR, WFP, ARRA, OCHA</p>
<p>Mechanisms should be in place to address port congestion in Djibouti and truck problems to move the food from port</p>	<p>Get Government commitment to prioritize movement of humanitarian supplies; Allocate dedicated transport services that can be available at all times; Better plan arrival of commodities in Djibouti not to coincide with the peak time to transport fertilizers and other government commodities</p>	<p>WFP, OCHA, All other UN agencies</p>
<p>Coordination between UNHCR, UNICEF, ARRA, Gambella RWB and other relevant stakeholders is needed if WASH service delivery is to be aligned</p>	<p>All stakeholders should come together and develop a viable management structure for the Itang water scheme through the establishment of the Itang Water Utility</p>	<p>UNICEF &amp; UNHCR</p>

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS						
<b>CERF project information</b>						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNHCR		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	10.10.14 – 09.04.15		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	14-RR-HCR-045		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Non-Food Items			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Core Relief Items and emergency shelter for South Sudanese refugees in Ethiopia					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 90,707,304	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 53,515,064	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$0	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 3,250,000	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 94,308	
<b>Beneficiaries</b>						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) directly through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<b>Direct Beneficiaries</b>	<b>Planned</b>			<b>Reached</b>		
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	9,428	9,695	19,123	15,218	16,395	31,613
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	12,080	8,797	20,877	5,513	2,874	8,387
<b>Total</b>	21,508	21,508	21,508	19,269	20,731	40,000
<b>8b. Beneficiary Profile</b>						
<b>Category</b>	<b>Number of people (Planned)</b>		<b>Number of people (Reached)</b>			
<i>Refugees</i>	40,000		40,000			
<i>IDPs</i>			-			
<i>Host population</i>			-			
<i>Other affected people</i>			-			
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	40,000		40,000			
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	Beneficiaries include 13,671 refugees relocated to Pugnido, 9,888 new arrivals and 16,441 refugees transferred to Jewii.					
<b>CERF Result Framework</b>						

<b>9. Project objective</b>	Critical life-saving Core Relief Items and emergency shelter to vulnerable refugee households in Gambella provided		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	All refugees received the standard CRI package and targeted households are sheltered in tents		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	CRI provision		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	# of HH provided with Core Relief Items	10,000 HH	10,000
Indicator 1.2	# of HH provided with sanitary materials	10,000 HH for 3 months	10,000
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Procurement of CRI for 10,000 HH	UNHCR	10,000
Activity 1.2	Procurement of soap and sanitary kits for 10,000 HH for 3 months	UNHCR	10,000
Activity 1.3	Distribution of CRI		UNHCR/ARRA
Activity 1.4	Distribution of sanitary kits		UNHCR/ARRA/IMC
<b>Output 2</b>	Emergency shelter		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	# of HH provided with emergency shelter	2,285 vulnerable HH	2,285 HH
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Procurement of 2,285 family tents	UNHCR	UNHCR
Activity 2.2	Shipping of tents and arrival in country	UNHCR	UNHCR
Activity 2.3	Distribution of tents to partner	UNHCR	UNHCR

**12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:**

During the design of the project, an additional 100,000 new arrivals had been anticipated for the following months, which fortunately did not materialise. In October 2014, a new extension of the Pugnido camp was granted and 13,671 refugees that had been stranded in Matar and other transit or reception centres as well as 400 refugees from the flood-affected NipNip site were subsequently relocated to the new Pugnido extension and provided with shelter (tents) and the full Core Relief Item kits as well as sanitary materials. With funding from CERF, 2,116 tents were pitched in Pugnido.

At the same time, a total of 9,888 new arrivals were registered at the various entry points and mostly taken to Pugnido as well as smaller numbers to Kule and Tierkidi camps where they were provided with shelter (tents) and the CRI package.

After lengthy negotiations, a site for a new camp was finally granted in March 2015. Preparatory work commenced right away, including the pitching of tents and prepositioning of CRI, partially funded by the CERF. A total of 16,441 refugees in Jewii benefitted from the CRI; 1,107 tents were pitched with CERF funding in Jewii.

**13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:**

<p>UNHCR implements a Results Based Management framework and has well-defined targets and indicators; during an emergency situation, key indicators such as protection, health or WASH are reported on a monthly basis.</p> <p>The design of projects is based on assessments conducted as well as consultation of the refugees through established committees as associations, such as the Refugee Central Committee or the Women's Association. These bodies are also involved in the implementation and monitoring of the projects through regular consultations by UNHCR Field Officers.</p>	
<p><b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b></p>	<p>EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>UNHCR monitors direct and partner implemented projects through its own system. That includes regular partner progress and financial reports, technical assessments and monitoring missions as well as close monitoring of the well-being of the refugees through field based UNHCR staff. UNHCR compiles key indicators twice a year for the non-emergency situations , including for example the mortality rates, measles vaccination coverage or amount of kilocalories available per person per day; in emergency operations key indicators, such as malnutrition rates or the amount of water per person, are collected and published on a monthly basis The health of the population is monitored through the UNHCR lead Health Information System, while the protection needs are recorded through the UNHCR ProGres database. Similar information management systems are being established for SGBV and education as well.</p> <p>For the South Sudan emergency, an indicator report is prepared on a monthly basis, showing the key indicators for protection, registration, health, WASH, nutrition, shelter or education; the report is shared with all partners.</p>	<p>EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/></p>
	<p>NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	WFP		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	20.11.14 – 19.05.15		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	14-RR-WFP-080		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Food Aid			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Food Assistance to South Sudanese refugees					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 120,000,000 (2014)	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 90,789,807	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ 4,052	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 9,749,769	▪ Government Partners:		US\$ 200,990	
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (below 18)	63,030	66,850	129,880	70,251	74,509	144,760
Adults (above 18)	43,930	17,190	61,120	48,963	19,110	68,123
<b>Total</b>	106,960	84,040	191,000	119,214	93,619	212,883
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees	191,000			212,883		
IDPs				-		
Host population				-		
Other affected people				-		
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	191,000			212,883		
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	The number of beneficiaries reached was slightly more than the planned due to the increase in refugees between CERF grant confirmation and distribution.					



CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Save lives and protect livelihoods in emergencies . The project targets 191,000 South Sudanese refugees hosted in the Gambella region who have arrived since mid-December 2013 due to the conflict erupted in the country. The refugees will be supported for a maximum of four and a half months with this CERF fund under General Food Distribution and Targeted Supplementary Feeding programme.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Stabilized or improved food consumption over assistance period for targeted households and/or individuals		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Food, nutritional products and non-food items, cash transfers and vouchers distributed in sufficient quantity, quality and in a timely manner to targeted beneficiaries		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food assistance (disaggregated by activity; beneficiary category, sex, food, non-food items, cash transfers and vouchers) as % of planned  Planned beneficiary numbers under GFD: 191,000 (Male: 84,040 Female:106,960) Female under 18: 63,030 Female above 18: 43,930 Male under 18: 66,850 Male above 18: 17,190  Planned beneficiary numbers under TSF: 14,325 under five years children (7,306 girls, 7,019 boys) 2,292 pregnant and lactating women	100%	111.4%
Indicator 1.2	Quantity of food assistance distributed, as % of planned distribution (disaggregated by type) GDF: Cereals: 13,909 MT Pulses: 950 MT Vegetable oil:300MT TSF: Supercereals: 188MT	100%	93%
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Purchase of food commodities	WFP	WFP
Activity 1.2	Delivery and distribution of food commodities to the Gambella camps	WFP, ARRA, NGOs (ACF, GOAL, CWW)	WFP, ARRA, NGOs (ACF, GOAL, CWW)
Activity 1.3	Food distribution monitoring	WFP, UNHCR and ARRA	WFP, UNHCR and ARRA

**12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:**

The decrease in the amount of commodities purchased (from the planned 15,347 MT to the actual 14,260 MT) was due to the fact that more CSB+ was purchased than planned, which is more expensive than cereals, hence lowering the amount in terms of total quantity.

**13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:**

WFP focused on addressing beneficiary protection and accountability issues in programme design and implementation with overall positive results. Results of a protection survey conducted in 2014 indicated that most of the refugees felt safe travelling to and from the distribution sites. In the camps where combined cash and food assistance was implemented nearly all refugees reported feeling safe. Some women from the Sudan and South Sudan reported fear of travelling due to their previous experiences in tribal conflicts at their countries of origin.

Nearly all of the refugees reported that they were informed about the programme and their ration entitlements. Entitlement boards displaying the food ration are present at the distribution sites in the local language, and have been updated in 2014 in the camps implementing the cash distribution. Whenever an item is missing from the basket, this is discussed with the refugee committee and announced to the refugees ahead of the distribution.

Complaint hearing committees representing the refugees themselves, ARRA (government partner), WFP and UNHCR are set up in most camps; they record complaints and try to address them on the spot.

**14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?**

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

An external evaluation of the refugee PRRO is planned to be conducted in the third quarter of 2015. WFP will share the report with CERF and other partners once it is finalized.

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	IOM		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	20.11.14 – 19.05.15		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	14-RR-IOM-042		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Common Logistics			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Emergency Border Evacuation and Transportation Assistance to South Sudanese Refugees in Gambella					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 15,000,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 6,100,000	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>	US\$ -		
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$1,000,000	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>	US\$ -		
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) <u>directly</u> through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
<i>Direct Beneficiaries</i>	<i>Planned</i>			<i>Reached</i>		
	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>Children (below 18)</i>	3,970	4,165	8,135	2,402	5,095	7,497
<i>Adults (above 18)</i>	2,532	633	3,165	2,308	899	3,207
<b>Total</b>	6,502	4,798	11,300	4,710	5,994	10,704
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>			<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>		
<i>Refugees</i>	11,300			10,704		
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	11,300			10,704		
<i>In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:</i>	The expected numbers of new arrivals was lower during the project period after months of searching for alternative camp site and reluctance by arrivals to be relocated to initially suggested refugee camp, Okugo refugee camp. In addition, WFP started the food drop in South Sudan which reduced the number of South Sudanese crossing into Ethiopia.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To provide emergency border evacuation and transportation and travel health assistance to 11,300 South Sudanese new arrivals and those stranded at waiting stations and entry points in Gambella Regional State for six months		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Refugees have timely access to safe and dignified movement from entry/reception centre to all dedicated camps		
11. Outputs			
<b>Output 1</b>	Refugees PDMS conducted, medical escort provided to all and special assistance provided to persons with significant health conditions		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of refugees provided with pre-departure medical screening (PDMS)	11,300	10,704
Indicator 1.2	Percentage of unfit refugees provided with special medical assistance	100%	100%
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Register and conduct PDMS	IOM – Medical unit	10,704
Activity 1.2	Identify FTT and provide medical escort	IOM – Medical unit	10,704
Activity 1.3	Identify special cases and provide medical escort using Air or IOM vehicle	IOM – Medical unit	663
<b>Output 2</b>	Refugees assisted and moved in safe and dignified manner		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	Number of refugees registered and manifest prepared	11,300	10,704
Indicator 2.2	Number of refugees transported with their personal belongings	11,300	10,704
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Undertake road and river assessments	IOM - Operations	IOM - Operations
Activity 2.2	Prepare travel manifests	IOM - Operations	IOM - Operations
Activity 2.3	Provide transportation assistance as per the manifest	IOM - Operations	IOM - Operations
Activity 2.4	Procure and distribute water	IOM - Operations	IOM - Operations
Activity 2.5	Distribute high energy biscuits for refugees	IOM - Operations	IOM - Operations

<b>12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:</b>	
<p>From the onset of the project on 24 October 2014, IOM facilitated the movement of 10,704 individuals by boat from Akobo, Burbiey and Matar to Kule and Pugnido refugee camps by 23 April 2015. The expected number of arrivals was lower during the project period due to the availability of food in South Sudan as the food drops were organized by WFP across the border and also the reluctance of arrivals to relocate to the new recommended site of Okugo refugee camp.</p>	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
<p>Due to limited services being provided and security situation at the border points, there was an urgent need to relocate the beneficiaries from the border points to the designated refugee camps. Assessment of the border points were regularly conducted with UNHCR and ARRA to assess the dire situation, including identifying accessible road/river to the refugee camps where refugees can access much needed basic services. Particular emphasis was given to safety of the new arrivals. During the registration of the affected population, the movement/departure plan was also given to the beneficiaries and they were scheduled for the Pre-Departure Medical Screening (PDMS) to determine the fitness to travel prior to the movement/relocation. The vulnerable cases that were declared medically unfit for transportation by boat were airlifted by the helicopter provided by UNHCR.</p>	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>If evaluation has been carried out, please describe relevant key findings here and attach evaluation reports or provide URL. If evaluation is pending, please inform when evaluation is expected finalized and make sure to submit the report or URL once ready. If no evaluation is carried out or pending, please describe reason for not evaluating project.</p> <p>Evaluation is not planned under this project as it was not a requirement.</p>	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNICEF		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	18.11.14 – 17.05.15		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	14-RR-CEF-155		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene			<input type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Support the Construction of Emergency Water Supply System for the South Sudanese Refugees in Gambella					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 4,500,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 3,500,000	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ NIL	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,000,001	▪ Government Partners:		US\$ 943,580	
Beneficiaries						
<b>8a. Total number (planned and actually reached) of individuals (girls, boys, women and men) directly through CERF funding (provide a breakdown by sex and age).</b>						
Direct Beneficiaries	Planned			Reached		
	Female	Male	Total	Female	Male	Total
Children (below 18)	29,400	15,433	44,833	31,400	18,433	49,833
Adults (above 18)	31,898	33,269	65,167	36,898	43,269	80,167
<b>Total</b>	61,298	48,702	110,000	68,298	61,702	130,000
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees	100,000		100,000			
IDPs			NA			
Host population	10,000		30,000			
Other affected people			NA			
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	110,000		130,000			
In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:			Due to the very rapid expansion of the Gambella – Itang “Junction” into a commercial/trading centre and the higher number of small businesses in Itang town, the total number of host community beneficiaries is estimated at 30,000 instead of the initial 10,000 thought of.			

<b>CERF Result Framework</b>			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To support the construction of Emergency Water Supply System in Kule and Tierkidi refugee camps and surrounding host communities		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Target population enjoy a decent life, free of public health risks associated with inadequate access to safe water		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Improved access to safe and reliable water to 110,000 women, men, boys and girls (100,000 in Kule and Teirkidi refugee camps and 10,000 in the host community of Itang) through the construction of the over 25km pumping mains from the water source to the respective camp and community central reservoirs		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Quantity of water supplied per person per day	20 litres	Scheme not yet functional
Indicator 1.2	Faecal coliform count/100ml in water at point of use	0FC/100ml	Scheme not yet functional
Indicator 1.3	Number of days water supply is interrupted	0.5 days	Scheme not yet completed
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Tender and procurement of the services of a private contractor for the supply and laying of 25km pumping pipe works	Gambella Regional Water Bureau	Gambella Regional Water Bureau, Technical Support from UNICEF
Activity 1.2	Award of contract for the pipe works with detailed specifications and standards to be adhered to	RWB with peer review and no objection of UNICEF	Gambella RWB
Activity 1.3	Supply and installation of pipe works complete with all fittings and necessary accessories – Turnkey contract - procurement of materials locally in Ethiopia, transport to site, excavation and backfilling of trenches, laying of pipes and fittings and accessories and testing of the pipeline for leakages	Private contractor	Two local contracting firms were engaged – WAGERET Ltd. and BIGETA Ltd.
Activity 1.4	Turnkey contract for the construction of 750m3 capacity tank complete with perimeter fencing, gates and ancillary buildings	Private contractor	BIGETA Construction Co. Ltd
Activity 1.5	Water quality surveillance	Government Agency	Gambella RWB
Activity 1.6	Routine maintenance	NGO partners & Government Agency	To be determined

**12. Please provide here additional information on project's outcomes and in case of any significant discrepancy between planned and actual outcomes, outputs and activities, please describe reasons:**

The overall outcome of this project and all associated outputs and activities remain unchanged - that is providing 110,000 people

with safe and sustainable access to potable water supply

**13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:**

The project is based on a water supply design process that was undertaken through a thorough consultative process with the end-users and through a demographic profiling by the design consultants. The consulting firm that undertook the design of the entire water scheme held meetings with community members including women to understand issues related to access to water and their preferences on exact locations of kiosks for water collection.

Engineering designs are standards which have been largely tested upon and adopted from other refugee operations which put gender and protection considerations as key priorities. Physical access to the water collection points is part of the design criteria to make sure that all sections of the community especially women, boys and girls (who have the primary responsibility for water collection) including the elderly and disabled have safe access.

As part of plans for the establishment of the Itang Water Utility (the agency to be responsible for the operation and maintenance of the water system), a willingness and ability study will be undertaken. The outcome of the study will be used to set tariffs for water collection at kiosks and government institutions.

**14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?**

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

If evaluation has been carried out, please describe relevant key findings here and attach evaluation reports or provide URL. If evaluation is pending, please inform when evaluation is expected finalized and make sure to submit the report or URL once ready. If no evaluation is carried out or pending, please describe reason for not evaluating project.

EVALUATION PENDING

NO EVALUATION PLANNED



### ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

CERF Project Code	Cluster/Sector	Agency	Implementing Partner Name	Sub-grant made under pre-existing partnership agreement	Partner Type	Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner US\$	Date First Installment Transferred	Start Date of CERF Funded Activities By Partner*	Comments/Remarks
14-RR-CEF-155	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	Gambella Regional Water Bureau	Yes	GOV	\$934,580	1-Mar-15	15-Jan-15	The programme is implemented by RWB as client under close supervision of UNICEF staff, executed by Private Contractors
14-RR-HCR-045	Multi-sector refugee assistance	UNHCR	AHADA	Yes	NNGO	\$94,308	23-Jan-14	10-Oct-14	Previous installment for other activities (not CERF)
14-RR-WFP-080	Food Assistance	WFP	ARRA	Yes	GOV	\$200,990	15-Dec-14	15-Jan-15	N/A
14-RR-WFP-080	Food Assistance	WFP	ACF	Yes	INGO	\$4,052	15-Dec-14	15-Jan-15	N/A

## ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

ACF	<i>Action Contre La Fame</i>
AWD	Acute Watery Diarrhoea
ARRA	Administration for Refugees and Returnees Affair
BPRM	Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration
BSF	Blanket Supplementary Feeding
CERF	Central Emergency Response Fund
CRIs	Core Relief Items
CSB	Corn Soya Bean
CWW	Concern World Wide
ECHO	European Commission for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection
DFID	Department for International Development
ECHO	European Commission Humanitarian Aid.
EFSRA	Emergency Food Security Reserve Administration
EHCT	Ethiopian Humanitarian Country Team
EiE	Education in Emergencies
EPI -	Expanded programme of immunization
FPF	Forward Purchasing Facility
FTT	Fit To Travel
GAM	Global Acute Malnutrition
GFD	General Food Distribution
GoE	Government of Ethiopia
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HH	Household
HRF	Humanitarian Response Fund
IOM	International Organization for Migration
JAM	Joint Assessment Mission
KfW	Kreditanstalt für Wiederaufbau (KfW)
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MT	Metric Tonnes
MUAC	Mid-Upper Arm Circumference
NFIs	Non-Food Items
NGOs	Non- Governmental organizations
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PDMS	Pre-Departure Medical Screening
PLW	Pregnant and Lactating Women
PRRO	Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations
PSEA	Prevention of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse
PSNP	Productive Safety Net Programme
Region	The highest administrative structure
RR	Rapid Response
RRRP	Regional Refugee Response Plan
RUTF	Ready To Use Food
SAM	Severe Acute Malnutrition
SGBV	Sexual and gender-based violence
TFPs	Therapeutic Feeding Programmes

TSF	Targeted Supplementary Food
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WaSH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WSPs	Water Safety Plans
WFP	World Food Programme
Woreda	Administrative/geographic unit equivalent to district
Zone	Administrative unit consisting of several woredas