



CERF funding in food and nutrition, including the recent response in the Horn of Africa

CERF Secretariat
12 October 2011

A. Introduction

During the last Advisory Group meeting in Nairobi from 27 to 29 April 2011, the members of the Advisory Group noted a decrease in allocations to the food sector and asked the CERF Secretariat to provide some analysis on this matter.

The objective of this paper is to provide the Advisory Group with an overview of the CERF response to food security crises and a review of the trends in funding since CERF inception. It should be noted that since the last Advisory Group meeting, the humanitarian community is responding to the most serious drought since the early 90's, in the Horn of Africa. The CERF provided significant support (over US\$ 80 million) in July and August 2011 for the agencies and IOM to jump start their response. The CERF also provided a \$5 million loan to UNICEF, which had an unrealized pledge from another donor. In light of the size of the response, the second part of the paper will focus on the way CERF responded to this particular crisis.

B. Definition

The updated CERF Life-Saving Criteria are clear and the provision of minimum food requirement to people affected by emergencies is undeniably considered as life-saving. The activities consist mainly of general food distribution and targeted distribution for the most vulnerable. Albeit being context specific, the decision to fund food requirement is usually straightforward. There may be debate, however, as to when the CERF should be utilized to address a food security crisis. For example, does a pipeline break in an ongoing program constitute a new emergency and eligibility for CERF rapid response funds?

It should be noted nevertheless that the responses to food insecurity crisis go beyond food assistance and comprises a more comprehensive package including but not limited to nutrition interventions, and agricultural and livelihood activities. Consequently, the evolution of the CERF response to food insecurity should be viewed through this angle.

C. Trends

*Table 1 Food assistance activities funded by CERF since its inception by year
(As of 20 September 2011)*

By Year	Rapid Response Amount Requested US\$	Rapid Response Amount Approved US\$	UFE US\$	TOTAL
2006	86,058,374	68,011,689	8,878,018	76,889,708
2007	78,667,980	67,857,851	24,602,178	92,460,029
2008	252,116,948	112,525,454	24,957,103	137,482,557
2009	106,269,453	95,335,362	30,492,638	125,828,000
2010	96,727,740	73,288,086	17,156,793	90,444,879
2011	67,498,264	55,915,732	26,785,934	82,701,666
TOTAL	687,338,759	472,934,174	132,872,664	605,806,838

While this table suggests that CERF funding for food assistance peaked in 2008, the reality is more complicated. The sudden increase in 2008 was related to the global food price crisis which affected most of the developing countries. In light of the gravity of the crisis, the then Emergency Relief Coordinator, allocated \$100 million to respond to the global food price crisis. Grants were made to 26 countries over a period of three months. Of this amount, 51 per cent was allocated to food, 22 per cent to agriculture and 20 per cent to nutrition. The effects of the crisis continued into 2009. In addition, due to significant funding shortfalls during the second half of 2009, WFP faced a food gap for its operations in Somalia for early 2010. As a result, the CERF allocated some \$33 million towards Somalia including a \$25 million grant to WFP for food in December 2009 which accounts for the higher than average allocation that year.

It is also noteworthy that the amounts allocated were related to the number of requests for funds, rather than a change in behaviour from the CERF Secretariat, as demonstrated by the information provided in the above table 1. In addition, the following table 2 shows that the number of WFP project for food varies during this period.

This suggests that the shifts in funding for the food sectors are related to the changing nature of humanitarian emergencies from year to year. In this regard, 2011 spending on food is likely to match or exceed 2010 spending. It should be noted that the Umbrella LOU was implemented in 2011 and the RR time frame changed from six months to three months whereby the size of the requests increased.

Table 2: Number of WFP Requests/approved per Year

Year	No. of Project requests	No. of Project approved	% of rejection
2006	34	33	3
2007	58	54	6
2008	78	67	14
2009	50	47	6
2010	47	40	14
2011	36	34	5
Total	303	275	9

Overall, the food sector received 27.6 per cent of CERF grants since its inception making it the largest recipient sector. In comparison, the food sector represented 50 per cent of contributions to Consolidated Appeals over this period, according to OCHA Financial Tracking System.

Table 3: Nutrition activities funded by CERF since its inception by year (As of 20 September 2011)

By Year ¹	Rapid Response US\$	Underfunded Emergencies US\$	TOTAL US\$
2008	29,694,838	12,727,438	42,422,275
2009	17,984,445	20,705,045	38,689,490
2010	19,183,051	30,787,869	49,970,920
2011	32,551,367	19,966,150	52,517,517
TOTAL	99,413,701	84,186,502	183,600,202

This table shows that the nutrition component of the CERF funding rose in 2010 and has continued to increase in 2011, due to the response to the food security crisis in the Horn of Africa.

¹ During the first 2 years of the CERF, nutrition was included within the health sector which did not allow to have a detailed breakdown.

Overall, the nutrition component represents 8.4 per cent of CERF grants since 2008 when the Secretariat began tracking this sector.

*Table 4: Agriculture activities funded by CERF since its inception by year
(As of 20 September 2011)*

By Year ²	Rapid Response US\$	Underfunded Emergencies US\$	TOTAL US\$
2006	9,429,655	8,342,289	17,771,944
2007	21,732,047	8,530,747	30,262,794
2008	30,862,492	12,893,955	43,756,447
2009	17,981,887	15,501,845	33,483,732
2010	23,459,611	19,918,646	43,378,257
2011	17,910,017	14,234,894	32,144,911
TOTAL	121,375,709	79,422,376	200,798,085

This table indicated the agriculture component of the CERF funding fluctuated from year to year. Overall, the agriculture component represents 9.6 per cent of the CERF grant since its inception.

The total of the three sectors, which could be considered the core elements to a food security crisis, amount to \$990 million which represents 46 per cent of CERF grants since its inception.

The amount allocated to these sectors during the first three quarters of 2011 indicates an increase compared to the same period in 2010.

D. CERF Response to the 2011 Horn of Africa crisis

While the United Nations declared the state of famine in two regions of Somalia on 20 July 2011, information and reports regarding the dire food security situation in the Horn of Africa were available much earlier. In particular, Fewsnets pointed out the severity of the crisis, as well as the inadequacy of the humanitarian response, in early June. The food security situation in the Horn of Africa is the combination of several factors, including two consecutive seasons of below average rainfall, an insecure environment in particular in some regions of Somalia and the overall context of increases of food and fuel prices, specifically acute in Eastern Africa.

In January 2011, the ERC approved CERF underfunded allocations for Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya and Somalia. Recognizing the early warning signs of worsening food insecurity as early as February, the Humanitarian Country Teams in the four countries prioritized food security and nutrition interventions, as well as WASH and health projects in drought-stricken areas. Of the \$35 million allocated, \$30.4 million (or 87 per cent) was approved for these activities. The funds were disbursed beginning in March with a project implementation period through 31 December 2011.

The possibility of approaching the CERF rapid response window began to discuss among the Humanitarian Country Teams in the region in early June 2011. The first official submission was sent on behalf of the Ethiopia Country on 23 June 2011, and Djibouti, Kenya and Somalia followed on 14 July 2011.

² During the first 2 years of the CERF, nutrition was included within the health sector, which did not allow to have a detailed breakdown.

Food assistance and nutrition were the main components of the requests. Between 1 July and 31 August 2011, the CERF allocated some \$82.4 million from its rapid response window to support the response to the food security crisis in the Horn of Africa broken down as follows: Djibouti: \$3.1 million, Ethiopia: \$24.7 million, Kenya: \$16.7 million and Somalia: \$37.9 million. At the time the CERF began to contribute, the Kenya and Somalia CAPs were each only funded at 47 per cent.

While, the CERF contributions are relatively small compared to the overall needs, estimated at \$ 2.4 billion, they are significantly higher compared to the average grant provided from the CERF. This amount equals 24.1 per cent of the average overall amount yearly allocated in the rapid response window. The table below indicates the requirements by country and the total CERF contribution (rapid response and underfunded).

Table 5

Country	Requirements	CERF contribution	% of CERF contribution
Djibouti	33,264,338	6,138,419	18
Ethiopia ^{3*}	644,439,730	46,604,597	7
Kenya	741,050,000	22,683,472	3
Somalia	983,987,901	52,953,336	5
Total	2,402,741,969	128,379,824	5

Of the total requirement of \$2.4 billion for the response to the food security situation in the Horn of Africa, CERF provided 5 per cent. While this represents a small percentage of the overall needs, it is a very significant contribution for a single source of funds, in particular in the case of Somalia. The timing to provide the allocations was also very short. As a comparison, in 2008, \$100 million was set aside for the food crisis and grants were made to 26 countries over a period of three months. This year the CERF provided over \$83.3 million to four countries in less than two months.

It is too early to identify the impact and added value of the CERF's contribution in the response to the drought in the Horn of Africa as the grants have been made too recently. The CERF Secretariat has decided that this region will be covered in the 2012 reviews in the Performance and Accountability Framework (PAF). However, it can already be said that the CERF's quick and significant reaction to the crisis is perceived positively by the recipient Agencies.

*CERF Secretariat
New York, 13 October 2011*

³ Humanitarian requirements June-December 2011 and refugees related requirements