

**RESIDENT / HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR  
REPORT ON THE USE OF CERF FUNDS  
IRAQ  
UNDERFUNDED EMERGENCY/ROUND I 2015**

**RESIDENT/HUMANITARIAN COORDINATOR**

**Ms. Lise Grande**

## REPORTING PROCESS AND CONSULTATION SUMMARY

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

The AAR was conducted at the end of January at the Humanitarian Country Team (HCT) level, initiating the reporting process. The AAR followed the interim report prepared and discussed in October 2015.

- 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

The report will be formally discussed at the next HCT the 25 April.

- 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 report has been shared with the HCT and the ICCG members during finalization. The recipient agencies and the cluster coordinators are discussing it with the counterparts.

## I. HUMANITARIAN CONTEXT

TABLE 1: EMERGENCY ALLOCATION OVERVIEW (US\$)		
Total amount required for the humanitarian response: USD\$ 425.8 million		
Breakdown of total response funding received by source	Source	Amount
	CERF	7,988,899
	COUNTRY-BASED POOL FUND (if applicable)	
	OTHER (bilateral/multilateral)	106,148,175
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>109,662,802</b>

TABLE 2: CERF EMERGENCY FUNDING BY ALLOCATION AND PROJECT (US\$)			
Allocation 1 – date of official submission: 03-Mar-15			
Agency	Project code	Cluster/Sector	Amount
UNDP	15-UF-UDP-003	Protection - Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence	248,775
UNFPA	15-UF-FPA-008	Protection - Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence	249,985
UNHCR	15-UF-HCR-014	Protection - Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence	248,775
WFP	15-UF-WFP-018	Food Aid	3,900,002
UNICEF	15-UF-CEF-025	Protection - Child Protection	725,002
UNICEF	15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	417,503
UNHCR	15-UF-HCR-013	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	283,684
UNHCR	15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	615,250
UNFPA	15-UF-FPA-007	Health	199,999
FAO	15-UF-FAO-010	Agriculture	1,099,924
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>7,988,899</b>

TABLE 3: BREAKDOWN OF CERF FUNDS BY TYPE OF IMPLEMENTATION MODALITY (US\$)	
Type of implementation modality	Amount
Direct UN agencies /IOM implementation	5,336,790
Funds forwarded to NGOs for implementation	2,214,304
Funds forwarded to government partners	437,805
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>7,988,899</b>

## **HUMANITARIAN NEEDS**

Prior to the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) allocation over 233,000 Syrian refugees had sought refuge in in the northern Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KR-I) since the end of 2012, particularly in Erbil, Dohuk and Sulaymaniyah. Around 40 percent were residing in nine formal camps and 60 percent in informal settlements or rented shelter in host communities. Intensified fighting in the northern Syrian town of Kobane at the end of 2014 had triggered some 50,000 additional refugee arrivals, necessitating a daily presence at the Ibrahim Khalil and Peshkabour border crossings to monitor access to the territory and undertake reception activities.

Refugees are transferred to various camp locations where they are registered, including biometrically, and documented by United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the authorities. Arrivals from Syria are directed to the four Syrian refugee camps in Erbil (Qushtapa, Basirma, Kawergosk and Darashakran), to Arbat refugee camp in Sulaymaniyah, and to Domiz and Gawilan camps in Dahuk. As of 31 December 2014, 26,057 refugees from Kobane were hosted in KR-I, with around 72 percent accommodated in Erbil, 22 percent in Dahuk and 6 per cent in Sulaymaniyah.

The new influx created concern for humanitarian actors as camp facilities and services were required to expand. Many new arrivals were women and children, some of whom had previously been displaced inside Syria, or were refugees in Turkey. Timely registration, in an operational environment where protection space is affected by the large number of displaced in the KR-I, is critical for refugees to access their rights and be protected from refoulement. Through registration, vulnerable refugees – including female headed households, elderly, and separated and unaccompanied children – were identified in a timely manner and referred to specialised services. Family reunification requests were high. Constant population movement required continuous updating of registration data to allow humanitarian partners to plan and deliver different type of assistance.

Further, in the context of heightened insecurity, the accurate documentation of asylum seekers was essential. Support to ongoing verification and biometric registration of Syrians in country protects asylum seekers from deportation and ensures that residency documents are issued following the presentation of valid and up-to-date asylum seeker certificates.

The new refugee arrivals, combined with the large presence of Internally Displaced People (IDPs), increased demand for already overstretched Sexual & Gender Based Violence (SGBV) services, which struggled to address the large-scale needs. The response focused on enhancing psychosocial, health, legal and other protection services including safety and security and investigative capacity, supporting national partners and the institutional capacity of government. Activities benefited refugees and indirectly IDPs and host community members. For instance, working with mixed committees in various locations, and working with the Directorate for Combating Violence against Women (DCVAW) staff, benefitted all populations of concern in this response.

With the prolonged violence in Syria, and the lack of solutions in sight, there was a need to continue to strengthen SGBV services, the quality and quantity of which remain a major concern especially in non-camp locations. Refugees are in need of rehabilitation services and require support to integrate with communities, become more resilient and mitigate violations of their rights. Assessments demonstrate that providing information pertaining to the availability of services and improving their private and non-discriminatory character builds trust and confidence, encouraging survivors to seek assistance.

The Wash, Sanitation & Health WASH sector had only received 23 per cent of its total funding requirement in 2014, with about 18 per cent of 112,500 targeted refugees for water supply unassisted, including through the envisaged water supply system from Mosul dam for Domiz camps in Dohuk. More than 53 per cent of 195,000 refugees targeted for solid waste and wastewater management, and hygiene promotion activities were not met. More than 72 per cent of 195,000 refugees targeted for hygiene kits, did not receive them, and more than 70 per cent of 60,938 targeted children had no access to safe drinking water, improved sanitation and hygiene activities. In 2015, the Sector targeted 244,993<sup>i</sup> Syrian refugees, and more than 48,000 individuals of the host population. With the majority of refugees living out of camps, public WASH services were under stress, and local authorities required support to improve and run public water, sewage, wastewater treatment, and municipal solid waste collection and disposal systems.

Much of Iraq's agricultural production comes from the now volatile north of the country and nearly all of Iraq's water resources flow through areas under the control of armed groups, including the Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant (ISIL). The conflict has disrupted the Government's Public Distribution System (PDS) of food rations. An estimated 2.4 million people require food assistance in Iraq, including IDPs, host communities, refugees and other vulnerable groups impacted by the conflict. Vulnerable rural communities need sustainable food security through agriculture production by provision of agriculture inputs such as seeds, fertilisers, farm tools, livestock feed and vaccinations. Many of the refugees from the Syrian north are herders and smallholder farmers that have depended on their livestock for livelihoods income.

The Iraqi Ministry of Agriculture has estimated that around 160,000 livestock crossed the border with refugee families – today only 95,000 remain as many refugee families have slaughtered their animals and sold them on local markets because of their inability to feed them, and out of a desperate need for cash. It is essential that these refugees maintain at least a minimum flock/herd to ensure an income and future livelihood.

## II. FOCUS AREAS AND PRIORITIZATION

### Health (UNFPA)

The huge influx of Syrian refugees to Northern Kurdistan and the increasing number of IDPs have stretched the health sector response capacity of the Kurdistan regional government. United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) focused on the provision of maternal and reproductive health (RH) clinics in each of the Syrian refugee camps, including Domiz, Kawergosek, Dara Shukran, Basirma, Gawilan, Qushtpa and Arbat. The project also aimed to support maternity departments in hospitals in districts with large numbers of refugees to ensure availability of emergency obstetric and neonatal care.

The CERF funds ensured access for around 54,000 Syrian refugee women of reproductive age (15-49 years) to emergency reproductive health services, mitigating morbidity and mortality. The support minimized the impact of the refugee influx on the host community, promoting peaceful coexistence. The project included deployment of one doctor, one midwife and one nurse to each of the seven camps, as well as distribution of RH kits containing drugs and commodities.

### Protection (UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR)

The inter-agency response funded by CERF, in line with the inter-agency SGBV strategy, focussed on prevention and response activities aimed at improving the protection of refugees most at risk, and especially those new arrivals who fled the outbreak of violence in Kobane. Dohuk and Erbil Governorates received most of the new arrivals in already over-crowded camps and other areas where refugees find it difficult to sustain themselves and are at high risk of adopting negative coping mechanisms. The project focused on women at risk, female heads of household, survivors of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) including men and boys, and members of communities with the ability to shape the opinions and practices.

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNFPA, and UNHCR worked closely together with members of the SGBV Working Group for the KR-I to provide quality services and empower refugees and their communities to prevent and respond to SGBV and restore the dignity of the individual survivors. Through CERF funding the agencies supported the development of DCVAW, improving individual case management capacity, investigative capacity, and the ability to make legal referrals to courts to address the culture of impunity. Through various capacity building and awareness sessions with refugees and other stakeholders, community-based protection was strengthened. Working with national institutions and national partners, as well as the community, the project aimed to make services more sustainable and improve community resilience. In this way although the activities were part of the immediate emergency response, the project contributed to longer term improvements in prevention and response.

### Protection: Syrian refugees registration/verification (UNHCR)

Timely registration, in an operational environment where protection space is affected by the presence of large number of displaced, is critical for refugees to access their rights and be protected from refoulement. Further, through registration, vulnerable refugees are identified in a timely manner and can be referred to specialised services. UNHCR noted that there was a large percentage of vulnerable refugees amongst the new arrivals including female headed households, elderly and separated and unaccompanied children.

Further, in times of heightened security, the accurate documentation of asylum-seekers is essential. For this reason, the support to the ongoing verification and biometric registration of Syrians already in the country is essential to protect asylum-seekers from deportation and ensure that residency documents are issued following the presentation of valid and up-to-date asylum-seeker certificates.

Family reunification request are high among new arrivals. Therefore, inclusion of registered caseload in provision of protection and assistance type of programmes has to be factored when addressing registration needs of new arrivals. In addition, constant population movement requires continuous update of registration data to reflect the urgent situation that will in turn allow humanitarian partners to plan and deliver different type of assistance.

In sum, the outputs are:

- Registration and biometric registration of new arrivals
- Verification and biometric registration of asylum seekers in the KR-I

- Documentation (i.e. asylum seeker certificate)
- Establishing the platform for the issuance of the residence permit by the authorities

UNHCR also held workshops for the border guards. The workshops were conducted in all three Governorates addressing border guards on land and air borders.

### **Child protection (UNICEF)**

During waves of displacement caused by active conflict, children are among the most vulnerable. Loss of homes and familiar surroundings, and displacement into new environments and stressful situations can create trauma for children; for populations in movement, the risk of children and minors becoming separated from families or relatives is a particular concern. With the support of CERF, in combination with other donors, United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and child protection actors aimed to ensure child protection services for Syrian refugee children and adolescents, with a special focus on the areas affected by new arrivals from Kobane, by identifying and responding to their key child protection concerns. Actions for children were guided by the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) 2015.

In coordination with protection sector actors, and taking into account the locations to which Syrian refugees from Kobane were being directed on arrival, CERF-funded response formed part of the overall protection sector response, with CERF funds engaged to support provision of community-based child protection and psychosocial support services to 6,000 refugee children (3,000 girls, 3,000 boys) and specialised services to 300 separated and unaccompanied children (150 girls, 150 boys). Complementing these services, the funds were intended to support awareness to 500 community members on child protection issues. CERF supported child protection interventions in the three governorates of the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KR-I), namely Dahuk, Erbil, and Sulaymaniyah. Child protection programming was implemented in the refugee camps of Domiz 1 and Domiz 2, Gawilan, Darashakran, Qushtapa, Barsima, and Kawargosk camps, as well as in non-camp host community areas hosting Syrian refugees in Sulaymaniyah.

### **WASH (UNICEF)**

The CERF-funded interventions aimed to provide safe drinking water through water trucking in the four refugee camps of Basirma, Qushtapa, Kawegorsk (Erbil) and Domiz (Dohuk) for nine months. The CERF funds enabled UNICEF to upgrade existing water facilities and continue with construction of new facilities until there were sustainable water supply systems in all the camps by end of 2015. The overall goal was to build the resilience of local communities. This included augmenting and improving existing water, sewage and waste collection systems for residents, host families and refugees alike. Another focus of the WASH strategy was to hand over responsibility to local authorities through capacity building as well as including local NGOs and WASH committees. Strategic advisory services have been provided to the Government on how to improve preparedness and contingency planning, water conservation and management policies.

### **WASH (UNHCR)**

UNHCR has been involved in the care, maintenance and upgrading of sanitation facilities, as well as the management of liquid waste in the two Domiz Camps since the camps were opened. The main objective was to ensure that refugees have adequate sanitation facilities available, that privacy is maintained, and that no WASH-related diseases occur. Hence it was essential to maintain and guarantee daily desludging of the sewage holding tanks. The work related to sanitation included desludging of the sewage holding tanks; upgrading or reconstruction of existing holding tanks; new construction of septic tanks and cesspools as part of new family plot construction. Furthermore, the intervention involved construction of drainage channels for grey water and construction of additional family toilets where needed. All activities were implemented in close cooperation and coordination with WASH actors, the affected refugee families, and the camp management.

### **Food (WFP)**

The findings of the UNHCR/World Food Programme (WFP) Joint Assessment Mission conducted in June 2014 found that household income is the main factor determining the diversity, quality and quantity of the refugee diet. As such, it concluded that it is possible to do targeting in camps. A comprehensive household-level census was undertaken to determine the precise level of vulnerability amongst registered refugees. Findings indicated that most Syrian refugees in Iraqi camps are moderately food secure. During 2015 WFP shifted from food distributions to all refugees living in camps towards targeted food assistance to vulnerable refugees. The vulnerability assessment results combined with serious funding constraints led to the implementation of a tiered targeted approach for moderately and extremely food insecure families. Funding shortfalls led to a reduction in WFP assistance to refugees.

### **Agriculture (Food and Agriculture Organization)**

Livestock owned by the Syrian refugees faced a serious threat to their health and productivity due to lack of basic feed. Through the CERF funds, the urgently needed feed supply was provided to restore local livelihood and boost life-saving food production.

## **III. CERF PROCESS**

### **Health (UNFPA)**

The intervention was coordinated together with the Health cluster and the Ministry of Health of KR-I. Looking at reproductive health as crucial issue to be addressed under this Under Funded Emergency window (UFE) for Syrian refugees, UNFPA focused on the provision of a reproductive health clinic in each of the HCT in which Syrian refugees are residing including Domiz 1, Kawergosek, Dara Shukran, Basirma, Gawilan, Qushtpa and Arbat. The CERF filled the maternal health gap created by the withdrawal from the camps due to lack of funding. The project also aimed to support maternity departments in hospitals in mostly refugee concentrated districts to ensure availability of basic and comprehensive emergency obstetric and neonatal care.

### **Protection: SGBV (UNHCR, UNDP, UNFPA)**

Prioritisation of CERF funds was coordinated through the Protection sector, ensuring clear alignment of response, needs, and funding between sub-clusters, including the Child Protection sub-cluster, targeting the most vulnerable refugees. UN partners worked closely with the Kurdistan Regional Government to ensure a coherent and coordinated series of actions in response to the increased number of Syrian refugee arrivals. The project has been in line with the KR-I SGBV strategy for refugees and IDPs, and reinforces the approach to SGBV in the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP). Priorities have therefore been linked to increasing access to quality services for women, girls, boys and men (WGBM) while mitigating protection risks through awareness raising, advocacy, and mainstreaming SGBV in all sectors across the refugee and resilience response plan. The project enabled SGBV actors to quickly increase their collective capacity to respond to the new arrivals from Kobane by expanding services, assuring that already established centres could quick-start their services to cater for an increasing number of beneficiaries, and working across the board on a better qualitative survivor centred response in accordance with humanitarian principles. The CERF funding thus enabled the agencies to provide legal, social and material protection for the most vulnerable WGBM refugees including those who recently escaped violence in Syria.

### **Protection: registration/verifications Syrian refugees (UNHCR)**

UNHCR has been monitoring the Ibrahim Khalil and the Peshkabout border points on a daily basis with a view to ensuring access to safety and reception of new arrivals for onward transportation to the registration centre in Gawilan refugee camp or other destinations in the KR-I. Upon arrival, UNHCR registered and documented the asylum-seekers within 72 hours, and referred the asylum-seekers to the residency department for their application for the residency permit.

### **Child Protection (UNICEF)**

Prioritisation of CERF funds was coordinated through the Protection sector, ensuring clear alignment of response, needs, and funding between sub-clusters, including the Child Protection sub-cluster, targeting the most vulnerable refugees. UN partners worked closely with the Kurdistan Regional Government to ensure a coherent and coordinated series of actions in response to the increased number of Syrian refugee arrivals.

### **WASH (UNICEF and UNHCR)**

In-country coordination took place between UNICEF and UNHCR by which UNICEF was responsible for provision of water supply in the refugee camps, while UNHCR supported environmental sanitation activities in the same camp location under the same CERF window.

A multi-sector needs assessment (MSNA) in refugee camps was conducted in May 2014 and the report was published in September 2014. The assessment highlights that sanitation, among other sectors, was a priority need for 20 per cent of refugees. In addition to the MSNA, regular assessments were conducted at the camp level to assess the needs and measures that need to be taken to improve sanitation. The CERF funds enabled these much needed WASH activities to be kick-started in a timely fashion.

### **Food (WFP)**

Since July 2012, the regional emergency operation (EMOP) has been WFP's operational framework for delivering food assistance to Iraq. The EMOP is aligned with the inter-agency Syria Regional Response and Resilience Plan (3RP), led by the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which provides the international community's strategic framework for support to Syrian refugees.

WFP's ongoing efforts to continuously assess the vulnerability of the refugee population are the basis against which assistance is channelled to those most in need. However, continued limited resources have resulted in reduced support to vulnerable Syrian families, even within these plans. As the funding attained thus far is insufficient to meet the needs of refugees in the region, WFP is continuously updating its Syrian Emergency implementation plan to ensure the extremely vulnerable are taken account of.

### **Agriculture (Food and Agriculture Organization – FAO)**

The identification process of the targeted beneficiaries was conducted during the inception phase by an FAO-led team in consultation with the Directorates of Agriculture, local community leaders and non-state actors, community-based organisations. The final list of beneficiaries was jointly endorsed by the federal MoA, the Kurdistan Regional Government Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (MoAWR) and FAO.

## **BENEFICIARY ESTIMATION**

<b>TABLE 4: AFFECTED INDIVIDUALS AND REACHED DIRECT BENEFICIARIES BY SECTOR<sup>1</sup></b>									
<b>Cluster/Sector</b>	<b>Female</b>			<b>Male</b>			<b>Total</b>		
	<b>Girls ( &lt; 18 )</b>	<b>Women ( ≥ 18 )</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Boys ( &lt; 18 )</b>	<b>Men ( ≥ 18 )</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Children ( &lt; 18 )</b>	<b>Adults ( ≥ 18 )</b>	<b>Total</b>
Health	5,160	94,428	99,588				5,160	94,428	99,588
Child Protection	3,130	947	4,077	3,264	351	3,615	6,394	1,298	7,692
Protection SGBV	3,573	12,901	16,474	2,189	756	2,945	5,762	13,657	19,419
Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	20,148	25,514	45,662	25,410	34,399	59,809	45,558	59,913	105,471
Food Aid	18,127	25,030	43,157	18,867	16,688	35,555	36,994	41,718	78,710
Agriculture	6,864	7,488	14,352	7,800	9,048	16,848	14,664	16,536	31,200
<b>Total</b>	<b>57,002</b>	<b>166,308</b>	<b>223,310</b>	<b>57,530</b>	<b>61,242</b>	<b>118,772</b>	<b>114,532</b>	<b>227,550</b>	<b>342,082</b>

<b>TABLE 5: TOTAL DIRECT BENEFICIARIES REACHED THROUGH CERF FUNDING</b>			
	<b>Children ( &lt; 18 )</b>	<b>Adults ( ≥ 18 )</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>Female</b>	57,002	166,308	223,310
<b>Male</b>	57,530	61,242	118,772
<b>Total individuals (Female and male)</b>	114,532	227,550	342,082

### **WASH (UNICEF)**

With only four refugee camps with discrete populations targeted through the CERF funded action, beneficiaries were calculated using total camp populations as per UNHCR registration data; post this UNICEF utilises a general disaggregation of 51 per cent male/49 per cent female (agreed demographic breakdown according to last reliable census/survey data) to estimate the gender of beneficiaries. Similarly for age, UNICEF works with agreed demographic percentage of 49 per cent of children under 18 when calculating beneficiaries per location.

## **Child Protection (UNICEF)**

The estimation of children beneficiaries reached by UNICEF and its partners was estimated through filtering the partner-reported datasets using the following criteria; child protection partners supported directly through CERF funds; posting/payment dates for transfer of funds to child protection partners; and the specific locations against which payment was made for service delivery. Filtering with these criteria supported estimation of direct beneficiaries supported by CERF funding, as part of the wider child protection response during the CERF grant period of April and December 2015. The difference between the planned (500) versus the actual numbers (1,289) of adults over 18 who were reached with the intended awareness raising activities through CERF-funded partners is attributable to the effective social mobilization undertaken by social workers from the Directorate of Labour and Social Affairs (DoLSA).

## **CERF RESULTS**

### **Health (UNFPA)**

The CERF funding has enabled UNFPA and its partners to support the Ministry of Health (MoH) of KR-I to ensure quality maternal health services to the Syrian refugees in camps and out-of-camp locations as well as to IDPs and host community in the Kurdistan region. The support has led to provision of reproductive health care services including referral services, and ensuring availability of critical life-saving reproductive services to women of reproductive age including pregnant Syrian refugees in the three governorates during the time resources to support refugee caseload in Iraq became minimal as the country is managing another emergency concerning Iraq IDPs.

The number of beneficiaries has been almost doubled (from 54,000 to 99,588) as medical staff, supported through CERF funding, provided services in PHCCs and maternities which delivered services for all category of beneficiaries (refugees, IDPs and host community). Moreover, taking into account the short implementation period of the CERF-funded project, other categories of population also benefited from the implementation of funds.

In summary, through the supported interventions to the affected community pregnant women have been followed, treated and supported to have safe motherhood. Hundreds of lives that were in danger have been assisted and thousands of women have received pain relief. The situation in the camps has not been ideal but without the CERF-supported interventions it would have been much worse.

### **Protection GBV (UNDP, UNHCR, UNFPA)**

Through the CERF funds awareness of GBV risks and available services was increased among Syrian refugee women and girls in Camp and non-camp locations. In total 6,455 women and girls were reached. Capacity among various actors was enhanced through CERF funding support (i.e. social workers from I/NGO on case management was enhanced to facilitate quality care for GBV Survivors).

The Project also assisted in ensuring legal services are sustained. This assisted women refugees' access to courts, and combatting the culture of impunity, whilst being protected against possible negative consequences including reprisals from perpetrators.

The three agencies (UNFPA, UNHCR and UNDP) targeted 19,429 direct beneficiaries under the SGBV-interventions.

### **Protection: Syrian refugee's registration/verification (UNHCR)**

Systematic and independent border monitoring was fully carried out during the project period. The border monitoring conducted has verified 9,398 spontaneous returns of registered Syrians into Syria. Furthermore, during the period April – August 1,970 individuals were recorded re-entering Iraq from Syria. All newly arrived Syrian refugees have benefited from registration – from April to August 2015 this amounts to over 11,700 new arrivals who have been newly registered and assessed to identify cases where special assistance is required.

All new arrivals have also been issued with the UNHCR asylum-seeker certificate. Between new arrivals and refugees who had to renew or replace their asylum seeker certificates a total of 29,803 persons were issued with asylum certificates during the period April – August 2015. Among the new registrations, 2,096 persons were identified and referred for specialized assistance. Of those identified as requiring specialized assistance, the most common categories were: those with no legal documentation, unaccompanied or separated children (UASC), and persons with illnesses. 277 UASC cases were identified and referred for specialized assistance.

During the project, a total of 59,044 Syrian refugees above three years of age have been provided with Biometric/IRIS scans (this figure includes new arrivals).

The target of 160,000 Syrian refugees benefiting from the verification service has not been achieved due to slower than expected verification rate (linked to outreach and the complexity of government procedures) and a lower than expected rate of new arrivals. As per the project proposal the baseline number of persons already verified was 76,784. The total number of verifications as of 31 December 2015 was 203,960, minus the baseline figure and the total assisted with CERF funding during the reporting period is 127,176.

At the start of the project 50% of the total number of Syrian refugees had gone through the verification process. The figure at the end of August was 75 per cent so significant progress had been made towards full verification but as the percentage of the total neared 100 per cent, axiomatically the rate of refugees being accessed by this service decreases as the remaining target group decreased.

### **Child Protection (UNICEF)**

The overall objective of the Regional Refugee and Resilience Plan (3RP) 2015 was to ensure enhanced child protection services for Syrian refugee children and adolescents by identifying and responding to their key child protection concerns. Other components aimed to provide family tracing and reunification services, including alternative care services to separated refugee children in the two governorates of Erbil and Dahuk. The project has been implemented in Basirma, Qushtapa and Kawgosc camps in Erbil governorate and Gawilan camps and surrounding communities in Duhok governorates. A total of 6,394 refugee children have been supported with psychosocial support and with specialised services to vulnerable children. 658 children have received special care. The project has also provided specialised services to 300 (150 girls, 150 boys) separated and unaccompanied children as well as creation of awareness to 500 community members on child protection issues. 5,729 Child Friendly Spaces have been established. All cases of child protection concern of refugee children in camps and non-camp in the two governorates of Erbil and Dahuk were have been identified and documented.

CERF funding strengthened UNICEF's partnership with the Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development (ACTED), Terre des Hommes (TDH) and the Directorates of Labour and Social Affairs in Erbil, Sulaymaniyah and Dahuk. Child protection programming was implemented in the refugee camps of Domiz 1 and Domiz 2, Gawilan, Darashakran, Qushtapa, Barsima, and Kawargosc camps, as well as in non-camp host community areas hosting Syrian refugees in Sulaymaniyah.

As mentioned above, 6,394 Syrian refugee children under 18 were reached out of the planned 6,300 including 94 more children reached with assistance by CERF funding. This includes: children reached with psychosocial support (PSS) and children who received Specialised Protection Assistance (identification of cases of unaccompanied and separated children - UASC). UNICEF does not include cases of UASC traced, reunified, or provided with alternative care services under the cumulative result achieved with the support of CERF funding, as this causes double-counting of child beneficiaries (a child identified as UASC can also be a child traced, reunified or provided with alternative care).

Specified by activity, CERF-supported partners reached 5,729 children (under 18) with recreational activities and psychosocial support in Child Friendly Spaces (CFSs) between April and December 2015. Through the same partners, seven cases of unaccompanied and separated children (UASC) were identified, with children being documented and helped with family tracing and reunification services, or alternative care services, as necessary. This is lower than the planned number; however, the figure represents those children reached through the particular CERF-funded partners during the grant lifetime and cannot be generalised for the total number of UASC identified and documented by other protection or child protection actors during the period.

Through these partners, 658 cases were recorded of children being referred to specialised protection assistance and services, including legal and health services. This represents 91 per cent of the originally planned 6,300 children beneficiaries, on top of the proposal's baseline value of 14,029 children. Of the planned 500 adults (community members and parents over 18) to be reached with awareness raising activities, an actual number of 1,298 adults were reached by CERF-funded partners during the grant period, representing an almost three-fold additional reach among adults than was originally anticipated; this is attributable to the most effective mobilization by the child protection partners and DoLSA social workers engaged by UNICEF with CERF funds.

Additionally, UNICEF procured and distributed supplies to facilitate the running of Child Friendly Spaces (CFS) activities for partners Public Aid Organisation (PAO) and ACTED in camps; procurement was undertaken directly in line with UNICEF procurement regulations before transfer by UNICEF to its partners.

Staff operating at the Child Friendly Spaces reported improved children's behaviour, reduced challenging behaviour among children, improved daily attendance and discipline at the Child Friendly Spaces, and increased sense of confidence among refugee children when communicating with staff and their peers.

## **WASH (UNICEF)**

UNICEF has provided the following services with the help of CERF funding:

- Water trucking services were provided in Erbil refugee camps (Basirma with 3,670 refugees, Qushtapa with 5,777 refugees, Kawegorsk with 9,818) and in Domiz camp in Dohuk with 50,699 refugees) to complement available water in the camp being provided with water through network (5-31ltr/person/day).
- Water quality of drinking water was verified through monitoring of residual chlorine levels at between 0.2 to 0.5mg/liter, and microbiological levels of 0 fecal coliforms at 100 mg/liter of water through associated water testing at various levels during the reporting period in collaboration with the Directorate of Surrounding Water of Erbil for Erbil-based refugee camps and the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) for Domiz.
- As a result of the water trucking provision, the total water available in Basirma, Qushtapa, Kawegorsk and Domiz camps reached the agreed cluster indicator of water of 50 liter per person per day, reaching a critical result particular in consideration of the hygiene needs during the hot months of May and August 2015 and, more in general, of the cooking and household requirements of families with a six-member average size.

In total UNICEF managed to reach 69,964 direct beneficiaries under the CERF-funded WASH intervention.

## **WASH (UNHCR)**

The desludging activity – targeted by the 2015 CERF project proposal of UNHCR - was implemented over five months (from August 2015 to December 2015). In total, close to 1,500 sewage collection points and single pits had to be serviced regularly in the two Domiz Camps. This figure was decreased from 1,800 points thanks to decommissioning of single pits by linking the toilets to existing or new sewage collection tanks. Through its partner French Red Cross (FRC), UNHCR desludges an average of 714m<sup>3</sup> of sewage from an average of 99 collection points (tanks, pits) per day. In total in 2015, 33,500m<sup>3</sup> of sewage has been desludged using up to 14 sewage trucks doing more than 19,000 trips between the collection points and the disposal site.

The implementing partner FRC has developed an excellent data base on all desludging activities, enabling all actors involved to have accurate information on desludging progress, desludging problems and challenges and thus formulating and implementing appropriate action. Thanks to this efficient service, none of the sewage collection points caused any problems, no complaints were received from the 35,471 refugees in Domiz 1 and 2, and, despite the appearance of cholera in parts of Iraq, not a single case of suspected cholera was reported from the Domiz Camps. The desludging activities benefitted the entire Domiz 1 and Domiz 2 refugee population.

## **Food (WFP)**

Following the overall reduction in funding, a decision was taken to reduce the monthly voucher value from \$28.20 to \$19. As a result, more beneficiaries were reached (78,710) than initially planned (53,015). Results from the second quarter post distribution monitoring found a slight increase in poor and borderline food consumption level from the first to the second quarter, from 1 per cent to 4 per cent and an increase in the coping strategies index (CSI) from 3 to 4.0. In addition, a change in household's purchasing patterns, for example, a higher proportion of respondents indicated that they did not consume selected food items (pulses and fish) than in previous quarter. These modifications in household's purchasing behaviour and other changes in the outcomes are seen as the results of the reduction in the voucher value, and can explain the changes in food consumption scores and dietary diversity. CERF funding went towards the ongoing response. The accountability to affected populations mechanisms were already in place prior to the funding. These included beneficiary contact monitoring at distribution sites, help desks at distribution sites managed by the cooperating partner staff to answer to any questions or concerns that the beneficiaries may have. In addition, WFP had an established

## **Agriculture (FAO)**

5,200 targeted affected Syrian refugee households (31,200 people) comprising destitute animal owners receive animal feed. The following activities were carried on:

Rapid food and nutrition baseline survey was conducted to gather information on Syrian refugees and community's households' in the target intervention areas;

1. Beneficiary selection committees were set up at provincial, district and village levels for the identification of beneficiaries;

2. Project implementing partners (IPs) were selected and the related Letters of Agreement (LoAs) were finalized;
3. Animal feed was procured and transferred to the distribution sites;
4. 1,400 MT of animal feed were distributed to 5,200 poor/destitute Syrian refugee's and household's animal breeders affected by the crisis (with particular attention to female-headed households);
5. Monitoring and evaluation of the impact of the interventions was conducted, including a base line rapid household food and income generating assessment.

The emergency supplementary feeding provided to livestock owners has helped ensure animals' survival and provided Syrian refugees with life sustaining food production (milk, dairy products and meat) and thus reduced food and nutrition insecurity and increase incomes generated by those Syrian refugees.

## **CERF's ADDED VALUE**

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

Not only did CERF funds led to fast delivery of assistance, but it enabled partners to sustain interventions which were otherwise at the verge of being discontinued due to lack of funds for refugee population (UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR); UNICEF (WASH) engaged with local government counterparts and other relevant implementing partners to transfer required funds and initiate supplies procurement in a timely manner to fill service gaps created by the arrival of additional Syrian refugee children and families as a result of the Kobane conflict. Through CERF funding, the service of desludging the sewage holding tanks continued for the last five months of the year without interruption, thus benefitting the refugee population in Domiz 1 and Domiz 2 camps (UNHCR WASH); WFP was able to programme these funds immediately for food vouchers upon the confirmation of the CERF contribution. The timely release of CERF funds enabled FAO to plan its response in providing critical assistance to refugees and hosting community. CERF funding has enabled FAO in Iraq to procure and distribute animal feed to those in need during the difficult times where natural pastures are not available and where people have no income to buy necessary inputs to sustain the lives of their livestock.

### **b) Did CERF funds help respond to time critical needs<sup>1</sup>?**

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

At the time of the request for CERF funding, WFP had reduced the food voucher rate given funding constraints. The CERF UFE allocation ensured WFP's continued assistance to the vulnerable Syrian refugees with food vouchers while efforts to secure additional funding resources were pursued. CERF funds supported UNICEF in responding to the increased needs for psychosocial support for refugee children as well as for the continuation of provision of specialised protection assistance for children found to be unaccompanied and/or separated during their journeys (UNICEF Protection). The identification of persons in need of specialized assistance was critical for newly registered refugees. As part of the project for example, 277 unaccompanied and separated children were referred for specialized assistance. The provision of SGBV services remains critical in light of the environment of continued displacement and increase in the reports of SGBV cases. Case management service providers make referrals to medical services for life saving interventions; Without daily desludging of sewage holding tanks in Domiz, the camp would face major health hazards (UNHCR WASH); The CERF funding enabled UNICEF to secure continuity to the water trucking services in in the four target camps particularly during summer time, when the increased temperatures, combined with limited sanitation conditions, can increase the risk of water-borne disease transmission. The support from the CERF grant ensured safe water access through an average of 5-6 water trucks which delivered water on daily basis to over 69,000 refugees who would not have adequate access to the water pipes due to the functional challenges described above (UNICEF WASH). Most refugees who crossed the borders and arrived to Iraq had nothing but their livestock, and the UFE CERF fund has been instrumental in providing them with the necessary means to support their livelihoods, generate income and elevate their food intake and protect them from vulnerability (FAO Agriculture).

---

<sup>1</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.).

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

CERF funds helped to mobilise more resources for refugee caseload from Denmark (UNDP, UNFPA, and UNHCR - protection). UNICEF (protection) used the funds provided by CERF to obtain additional funds from other donors such as the Government of Germany. UNICEF also used CERF funds to obtain additional funds from other donors such as the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) and the Government of Germany to sustain the water trucking service provision until replacement of the water trucking with more feasible, long-term solutions (i.e. establishment of new water distribution pipelines in the camps and/or upgrade of the existing water network). WFP used CERF funds to ensure continued provision of assistance, thereby reinforcing the resource mobilization efforts which yielded positive results for the rest of the year. Following the success of the targeting of vulnerable Syrian refugees under CERF funding, FAO is in the final stage of discussion with GIZ a livelihoods support project that targets Syrian refugees, IDPs and host community with greenhouse and micro-gardening training, backyard chicken distribution, skills and technologies in food processing, bee keeping and honey production.

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

YES  PARTIALLY  NO

CERF funds, through the implementing agencies UNFPA, UNCHR and UNDP, enabled a conducive environment for creating synergies on related interventions. CERF funds for SGBV also created an opportunity from complementarity and ensured division of tasks for the identified gaps. At the planning phase, each agency contributing to the SGBV component worked closely with the others to ensure coordination for the prevention and response to the SGBV amongst the targeted population. UNICEF coordinated with the specific Child Protection partners as well as with the wider protection sector to ensure equitable distribution of funds across protection-related activities. Through ongoing collaboration and coordination with the relevant Directorates of Labour and Social Affairs (DoLSA) in Erbil, Dahuk and Sulaymaniyah, including direct financial support, UNICEF worked to ensure continued and coherent services for the protection of vulnerable children including new arrivals from Kobane. WFP initiated a consultative decision-making process on the allocation of the CERF UFE grant. Cluster leads unanimously agreed on the priority areas for the grant allocation as a reflection of a shared vision on the humanitarian situation in Iraq. As the activity was carried out by one implementing partner, coordination was not a prime issue (UNHCR WASH). FAO used the CERF allocation to support the sharing of information and communication within the humanitarian community and improved coordination of humanitarian interventions under the UN country team umbrella through data sharing, reporting on activities and dissemination of information via the Food security cluster/Inter-sector working group. Furthermore the Humanitarian Coordinator and OCHA provided support to ensure the rapid delivery of assistance which helped better organize planned interventions with the Government and local authorities on the ground.

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

The CERF underfunded window came at the time when the operation was struggling to raise funds for refugee amidst millions of IDPs. The funding became available when identified gaps and potential vulnerability of the new Kobane caseload in camps including congestion, shared toilets and lack of information on SGBV services and strengthened risk mitigation among the Kobane caseload. The CERF funds helped the partners to address these gaps and enhance the services (UNDP, UNHCR, UNFPA protection). CERF funding supported coordination across geographic locations affected by the influx of refugees from Kobane. In so doing, CERF supported services that contribute to maintaining normalcy in the lives of children who have been affected by armed conflict and displacement, progressively contributing to local capacity through child protection committees, and to the elements of children's lives that help them to build resilience (UNICEF protection). Due to the prioritization exercise, the allocation and utilization of the CERF Underfunded Emergency Window (UFE) grant was received at a time when most humanitarian actors were facing critical funding shortages. The WASH cluster was poorly funded through the Syria Regional Response Plan (RRP6) by shortfall of 77 per cent of the \$85 million required for the operations. This specific CERF contribution had a valuable humanitarian response to the Syrian refugees in the four camps, especially during the hot summer when water demands were extremely high. Furthermore, the CERF grant enabled UNICEF to mobilize additional resources which enabled UNICEF to reach a two-fold scope: continue the water trucking provision to secure safe water access to refugee families; and initiate the required infrastructural works to progressively phase out of water trucking, building resilience capacity within the target refugee camps themselves. The immediate and complete utilization of the grant demonstrates the timeliness and effective use of the grant towards addressing critical gaps in the overall humanitarian response (WFP Food). With the escalation of violence in the country, Syrian refugees who fled the conflict in Syria seeking refuge in North Iraq are neglected and don't receive the attention their situation requires. This CERF funding has assisted those groups through challenging times and enhanced the delivery of aid in a timely and efficient manner (FAO Agriculture).

## V. LESSONS LEARNED

TABLE 6: OBSERVATIONS FOR THE <u>CERF SECRETARIAT</u>		
Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
CERF remains a strategic and critical funding mechanism for humanitarian response in Iraq.	CERF should continue to support Iraq on refugee caseload, especially this time around where funding for refugees is becoming thinner and yet the refugee crisis continue to exist in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq	CERF secretariat/OCHA
Joint Submission for CERF enables partners to complement the response and avoid Duplication e.g the SGBV Joint programme (UNFPA, UNHCR and UNDP)	More clusters should be encouraged to conduct joint programming to ensure maximum utilisation of resources	Agencies/OCHA
CERF remains a strategic and critical funding mechanism for humanitarian response in Iraq, particularly in light of the multiple waves of displacement, which required UNICEF to swiftly and timely adjust and adapt its humanitarian response, using flexible funding sources such as CERF.	CERF is still required to fill in the gaps while the Humanitarian Country Team engages in dialogue with donors to support the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP). The CERF mechanism remains a critical source of support particularly at a time funding for IDP response in Iraq is diminishing at an alarming rate. Thus, the CERF should allow for increased funding to address the most critical and yet unmet needs and challenges UNICEF and its WASH partners face to fund the three lines of humanitarian response.	OCHA
Early allocation of CERF funds was useful as it provided adequate time to plan and implement the activity.	n/a	n/a
Flexibility in terms of implementation and the constantly changing situation.	Many of the initially targeted Syrian refugees' herders have slaughtered their animals and/or sold them in local markets because of their inability to feed them, and out of a desperate need for cash. Though has changed the target beneficiaries, FAO has worked with local authorities to include the host communities in areas where refugees are residing. This has enhanced the social cohesion between the two communities while reaching the project's goal.	CERF secretariat and concerned UN Agencies
The proposals should be broad enough to allow for flexibility in implementation.	Future proposals be broad, some of detail demanded during the proposal writing is not necessary – a specific example is the mileage in the budgets	In-country CERF focal point + Inter-cluster leads.

**TABLE 7: OBSERVATIONS FOR COUNTRY TEAMS**

Lessons learned	Suggestion for follow-up/improvement	Responsible entity
Effective consultation within the country team leads to with early consensus-building on the prioritization and use of CERF resources.	n/a	In-country CERF focal point + Inter-cluster leads
Joint review of CERF implementation at country level, cluster and sub-cluster level is important.	Joint reviews of progress of implementation of CERF funds by the Country Team. More regular joint reviews would help in assessing progress but also identify service gaps.	
Expanding the project's activities might have been essential.	Expansion of the activities by ensuring availability of fund.	HCT
Involvement of the local authorities at all stages of implementation is a key element in supporting successful engagement with and handover to national actors (Directorate of Surrounding Water (DoSW) )	<p>Due to the devolved nature of the DoSW (which has separate directorates in Erbil and Dahuk governorates) it was necessary to maintain two functional working relationships over time in order to ensure that capacities were built to an appropriate standard to take over the operations and maintenance in the Erbil and Dahuk refugee camps; the arrangement is that the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG) is both willing and able to assume responsibilities for the operations and maintenance of WASH facilities in these locations.</p> <p>It is recommended to ensure that the DoSW is capable of continuing provision of these services is to engage DoSW representations on a regular basis through WASH sector meetings, and that WASH sector/UNICEF technical advisers remain available should the DoSW require technical support and guidance.</p> <p>Overall, the partnership was perceived to be positive and productive and efforts should go into maintaining this situation.</p>	WASH sector/UNICEF

## VI. PROJECT RESULTS

TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS						
CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNHCR, UNFPA, UNDP		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	01/04/2015-31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-HCR-014 15-UF-FPA-008 15-UF-UDP-003		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Sexual and/or Gender-Based Violence			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Prevention and Response of SGBV by mitigating the risks and providing quality services					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 3,750 000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 1,247,535	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ 539,500	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 747,535	▪ Government Partners:			
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 (< 18)	3,000	600	3,600	3,573	2,189	5,762
Adults (≥ 18)	6,000	600	6,600	12,901	756	13,657
<b>Total</b>	<b>9,000</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>10,200</b>	<b>16,474</b>	<b>2,945</b>	<b>19,419</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees	10,200			19,419		
IDPs	300					
Host population	600					
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>11,100</b>			<b>19,419</b>		
In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:	N/A					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Risk of SGBV reduced and quality of services improved		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Mitigation of SGBV risks and provision of quality services for survivors to rehabilitate, integrate within communities.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Improved quality of services provided by SGBV service providers.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	# of refugee survivors of SGBV provided with quality services.	1650	30 (ToT sessions) *15 (participants per session) *5 (each ToT beneficiary trained an average of 5 staff) =2250. 2250*5 (all of these staff have a case average of 5/month) = 11,250 direct beneficiaries (average figures used are from DCVAW)
Indicator 1.2	No. of DCVAW and HRI centres for Vulnerability and Monitoring operational in the refugee camps	3 centres	Erbil 4 Suly 2 Duhok 1 7 centres total
Indicator 1.3	Percentage of centres with improved quality of case management for survivors of SGBV	20 centres	30 centres
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Continuous monitoring of survivors of SGBV's situation and accordingly provision of quality multi-sectoral SGBV services.	UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR	UNHCR, UNDP, UNFPA, DVAN, HARIKA, Almassela
Activity 1.2	Technical support to specialized government entities; DCVAW, HRIs and National NGOs to provide appropriate follow-up and protection services,	UNHCR will support individual case management and referrals, UNDP will address institutional technical support on SGBV, UNFPA will train military uniform personnel on SGBV.	UNHCR, UNFPA, DVAN trained DVAW staff and outreach teams on identification, response, and referral.
<b>Output 2</b>	Refugee community empowered to prevent and respond to SGBV.		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	# of community based protection structures empowered	20	35 (8 female, 27 male).
Indicator 2.2	# of community based awareness raising sessions on prevention and response to SGBV	50	284

Indicator 2.3	# of training done to the community representatives on prevention of SGBV	60	60
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Establishing community based protection structures.	UNHCR and UNFPA	UNHCR,AL massela, HARIKA,UNFPA
Activity 2.2	Training community representatives and providing them with a referral pathways for a 24/7 response.	UNHCR and UNFPA	UNHCR,UNFPA,UNDP,AI massela
Activity 2.3	Conducting community mobilization activities on risks and mitigation of SGBV	UNDP, UNFPA, UNHCR	UNHCR,UNFPA,UNDP,AI maseela,DVAN

**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:**

There are no significant differences in the project outcomes, save for the fact that capacity building activities also benefitted service providers for IDPs and vulnerable members of the host community as indirect benefits to the project.

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

In the Iraq Humanitarian context there are accountability measures in place to addressing complaints, each of the camps has a complaint box that is opened by an accountability officer, and complaints are filtered accordingly to the concerned partners through referrals. If it is related to PSEA, UNHCR has its internal SoPs for reporting Sexual Exploitation and Abuse of Authority.

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

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

EVALUATION PENDING

The final report on the project revealed the necessity for increased communications with the affected communities and sensitizing them on SGBV prevention and response as well as the need to raise awareness of DVAW staff on SGBV related matters.

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	WFP		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	DD.MM.YY – DD.MM.YY		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-WFP-018		<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 vulnerable Syrian populations in Iraq affected by conflict in Syria					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 215,875,412	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 96,214,948	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 294,523	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 3,900,002	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
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 (&lt; 18)</i>	12,283	12,581	24,864	18,127	18,867	36,994
<i>Adults (≥ 18)</i>	17,116	11,035	28,151	25,030	16,688	41,716
<b>Total</b>	<b>29,399</b>	<b>23,616</b>	<b>53,015</b>	<b>43,157</b>	<b>35,553</b>	<b>78,710</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>		<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>			
<i>Refugees</i>	53,015		78,710			
<i>IDPs</i>						
<i>Host population</i>						
<i>Other affected people</i>						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>53,015</b>		<b>78,710</b>			
<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>	Following the overall reduction of funding, a decision was taken to reduce the monthly voucher value from \$28 to \$19. As a result, more beneficiaries were reached in June than initially planned.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Save lives and protect livelihoods in protracted crisis situation		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Improved food consumption of Syrian refugees in Erbil and Dohuk governorates		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Vouchers distributed in sufficient quantity and quality to 53,015 Syrian refugees, under secure conditions		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of women, men, girls and boys receiving WFP assistance disaggregated by sex, as percentage of planned distribution	100%	148%
Indicator 1.2	Total value of e-vouchers distributed to targeted beneficiaries (expressed in cash) and as percentage of planned distribution	100%	99.2% \$2,967,521
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Monthly distribution of food vouchers to Syrian refugees in Erbil and Dohuk governorates	Islamic Relief Worldwide, ACTED and INTERSOS	Islamic Relief, Worldwide, ACTED and INTERSOS
Activity 1.2	Monitoring activities (see section 13c for more details)	WFP	WFP
<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>Results from the second quarter post distribution monitoring (April – June 2015) found a slight increase in poor and borderline food consumption levels from the first to the second quarter, from one per cent to four per cent and an increase in the coping strategies index (CSI) from 3.3 to 4.0.</p> <p>In addition, a change in household purchasing patterns, for example, a higher proportion of respondents indicated that they did not consume selected food items (pulses and fish) than in the previous quarter.</p> <p>These modifications in households' purchasing behaviour and other changes in the outcomes are seen as the result of the reduction in the voucher value, and can explain the changes in food consumption scores and dietary diversity.</p>			
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>			
<p>The CERF UFE was used towards the ongoing response. The accountability to affected populations mechanisms were already in place prior to the funding. This included beneficiary contact monitoring at distribution sites, help desks at distribution sites managed by cooperating partner staff to answer to any questions or concerns that the beneficiaries may have. In addition, WFP had an established hotline which has been operational since August 2014 where beneficiaries may call to seek information, report any issues and receive feedback on their concerns and entitlements.</p>			
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>		EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>	
The WFP Iraq Country Office is currently going through an evaluation, but there is not a specific evaluation for this CERF project. This evaluation is due to be completed by November 2016.		EVALUATION PENDING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
		NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>	

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNICEF		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	30/03/2015-31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-CEF-025		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Child Protection			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Child protection services for Kobane refugee children and other children at risk					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 12,600,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 5,199,274	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 248,080	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 725,002	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 219,355	
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 (< 18)	3,150	3,150	6,300	3,130	3,264	6,394
Adults (≥ 18)	250	250	500	947	351	1,298
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,400</b>	<b>3,400</b>	<b>6,800</b>	<b>4,077</b>	<b>3,615</b>	<b>7,692</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees	6,300		6,394			
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people	500		1,298 ('other affected populations' may also include refugee beneficiaries; however in line with the original proposal targets of 500)			
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>6,800</b>		<b>7,692</b>			
In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:			The difference between the planned versus the actual numbers of adults over 18 who were reached with the intended awareness-raising activities through CERF funded partners is attributable to the effective social mobilization undertaken by social workers from the Directorate of Labour and Social Affairs.			

<b>CERF Result Framework</b>			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To provide quality and equitable child protection services to boys and girls affected by the Syria crisis.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Community based child protection services that include psychosocial support and specialised child protection services provided to 6,300 boys and girls affected by the Syrian crisis.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Community based child protection and PSS interventions to 6,000 boys and girls affected by the Syrian crisis is provided in targeted locations in Erbil and Duhok for 6 months.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Number of girls and boys who access Child Friendly Spaces	20,029	19,758
Indicator 1.2	Number of girls and boys who receive psychosocial support services	20,029	19,758
Indicator 1.3	Number of community members reached with awareness	500	1,298
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Expand services in 5 child friendly and adolescent friendly spaces in targeted locations in the two governorates of Erbil and Duhok.	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA
Activity 1.2	Provide psychosocial services to refugee children through group and individual counselling.	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA
Activity 1.3	Provide psychosocial support to distressed families, parents and care givers in targeted communities in Erbil and Duhok to be able to support children with psychosocial related problems.	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA
Activity 1.4	Create awareness on child protection issues to 500 community members	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA
<b>Output 2</b>	Specialised child protection services provide to 300 boys and girls affected by the Syrian crisis in targeted locations in Erbil and Duhok including separated and unaccompanied children.		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	Number of cases identified and documented as unaccompanied & separated	706	7
Indicator 2.2	Number of cases referred for specialised care	1,890	658
Indicator 2.3	Number of family traced cases and children reunified	450	6
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Identify and document all cases that are of child protection concern of refugee children in camps and non-camp in the two governorates of Erbil and Duhok.	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA
Activity 2.2	Refer cases that require additional services	ACTED, POA,	ACTED, POA, TDH,

		TDH, DoLSA	DoLSA
Activity 2.3	Provide family tracing and reunification services, including alternative care services to separated and refugee children in the two governorates of Erbil and Duhok.	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA	ACTED, POA, TDH, DoLSA
<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>			
UNICEF and child protection partners achieved key targets in providing psychosocial support to children. However, the number of unaccompanied and separated children is very low; as outlined above, the number of UASC reported through directly-CERF funded partners during the project lifespan is not representative and cannot be generalized.			
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>			
UNICEF ensured involvement of Child Protection Committees in camp environments; committees are comprised of camp residents, offering a window for engagement and feedback on provision of services and allowing adjustment to services according to issues and bottlenecks raised by the Committees. Participation in the committees also counts as an awareness-raising measure, improving the knowledge of camp residents on key child protection issues, in addition to involving them in programme implementation.			
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>		EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>	
No evaluation is planned		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>	07/04/2015-31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-CEF-024		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	To respond to unmet high priority lifesaving needs in WASH for 70,000 Syrian refugees in four specific camps of Basirma, Qushtapa and Kawegorsk in Erbil and Domiz in Dohuk for nine (9) months					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 1,935,146	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 1,935,146	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 132,665	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 417,503	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>		US\$ 218,449	
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 (< 18)	12,696	16,892	29,588	12,696	17,326	30,022
Adults (≥ 18)	17,326	23,050	40,376	16,892	23,050	39,942
<b>Total</b>	<b>30,022</b>	<b>39,942</b>	<b>69,964</b>	<b>29,588</b>	<b>40,376</b>	<b>69,964</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees	69,964		69,964			
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>69,964</b>		<b>69,964</b>			
In case of significant discrepancy between planned and reached beneficiaries, either the total numbers or the age, sex or category distribution, please describe reasons:			Note about the total number of reached beneficiaries: According to UNHCR statistics on Syrian refugees in Iraq (November 2015), the total Syrian population residing in the four refugee camps targeted within this project was 71,181 individuals (children and adults). The planned number of beneficiaries, as formulated at the time of submission of the CERF funding application, was 69,964. In light of this, during the reporting period, the population demographics remained stable over time.			

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To respond to unmet high priority lifesaving needs in WASH for 70,000 Syrian refugees in four specific camps of Basirma, Qushtapa and Kawegorsk in Erbil and Domiz in Dohuk for nine months.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Refugees in the camps will have access to sufficient quantity and quality of safe drinking water.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Refugees in four camps (Domiz, Basirma, Kawegorsk and Qushtapa) of KRG have access to cluster agreed standard of quantity of water.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	69,964 individuals will continue to have access to drinking water as per cluster agreed standards - 50 litre per person per day (12,696 girls, 16,892 boys, 17,326 women and 23,050 men)	69,964	69,964
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Water trucking	DoSW / Erbil and Dohuk	69,964
Activity 1.2	Water treatment with chlorine	DoSW / Erbil and Dohuk	69,964
Activity 1.3	Water quality monitoring	DoSW / Erbil and Dohuk	69,964
<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>			
At time of developing the CERF proposal it was envisioned that the Dahuk DoSW would have the capacity to cover water quality monitoring in the targeted locations; however at start-up it became apparent that an INGO partner would have to be engaged as temporary support / capacity building for the DoSW. For the targeted locations in Erbil, water quality monitoring was successfully carried out by the Erbil DoSW, where capacity already existed and was utilised			
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>			
UNICEF and UNHCR worked and collaborated very closely with each other. The project, progress and results were all shared and discussed during the cluster meetings as well as UNICEF-UNHCR-NRC and local authorities meetings in Erbil and Duhok.			
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>		EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>	
No specific evaluation was carried out as the CERF was contributing to other funds for the complete provision of sufficient quantities of water and of good quality as well.		EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>	
		NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS 15-UF-HCR-013 (WASH)**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNHCR		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	01.08.2015 – 31.12.2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-HCR-013		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	WASH			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Support to maintenance of sanitation facilities (desludging of septic and holding tanks)					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 600,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 600,000	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ 265,125	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 283,684	▪ Government Partners:			
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 (< 18)	7,474	8,385	15,859	7,452	8,084	15,536
Adults (≥ 18)	8,618	13,023	21,641	8,622	11,349	19,971
<b>Total</b>	<b>16,092</b>	<b>21,408</b>	<b>37,500</b>	<b>16,074</b>	<b>19,433</b>	<b>35,507</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)			Number of people (Reached)		
Refugees	37,500			35,471		
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>37,500</b>			<b>35,471</b>		
<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 refugee population is not 100 per cent stable. At the time of the project proposal in March, 2015, the figure of 37,500 refugees was correct. At the time of reporting, end of December 2015, 35,471 refugees were present in Domiz 1 and Domiz 2 Camps. The difference can be due to refugees moving to non-camp, returning to Syria, being relocated or moving to a third country.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Refugees in Domiz camp have access to operational latrines.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Latrines are operational and sanitary conditions in Domiz camp is maintained through regular desludging of septic tanks and holding tanks.		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Septic tanks and holding tanks are desludged.		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	No. of septic tanks and holding tanks desludged	900	1,473
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Desludging of septic tanks and holding tanks	UNHCR through French Red Cross	UNHCR through French Red Cross
<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>			
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>			
A complaints desk was established for any issues the refugees are concerned with. In the past, many worries were raised by the refugees concerning WASH. However, in 2015, complaints about desludging activities dropped to zero.			
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>		EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>	
As desludging is an ongoing activity, there is no evaluation planned. However, to decrease desludging costs for 2016, 11 desludging trucks have been purchased. They will be handed over to BRHA/Camp Management, who will be in charge of desludging as from March 2016. Rental costs of desludging trucks will thus be nulled.		EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>	
		NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS - 15-UF-HCR-012 (Protection)**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNHCR		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	01/04/2015-31/08/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-HCR-012		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Protection			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Ensure access to the territory and facilitate timely registration and documentation of new arrivals; conduct verification and biometric registration					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 1,900,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 615,250	▪ NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:		US\$ 575,000	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 615,250	▪ Government Partners:			
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 (< 18)	24,997	28,180	53,177	41,152	44,672	85,824
Adults (≥ 18)	43,213	63,631	106,844	51,149	66,987	111,659
<b>Total</b>	<b>68,210</b>	<b>91,811</b>	<b>160,021</b>	<b>95,301</b>	<b>118,136</b>	<b>203,960</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees	160,021		203,960			
IDPs						
Host population						
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>160,021</b>		<b>203,960</b>			
<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 target of 160,000 Syrian refugees benefiting from the verification service has not been achieved due to slower than expected verification rate (linked to outreach and the complexity of government procedures) and a lower than expected rate of new arrivals. At the start of the project 50 per cent of the total number of Syrian refugees had gone through the verification process. The figure at the end of August is now 75 per cent so good progress has been made towards full verification but as the percentage of the total nears 100 per cent, axiomatically the rate of refugees being accessed by this					

service decreases as the remaining target group decreases. The figures used are the verification figures at the end of 2015. As per the project proposal the baseline number of persons already verified was 76,784. The total number of verifications as of 31 December 2015 is 203,960, minus the baseline figure and the total assisted with CERF funding during the reporting period is 127,176.

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Ensure access to territory, facilitate transfers of new arrivals, and register and document new arrivals across the KR-I		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	All persons with international protection needs are accessing the territory, are transferred to camp locations where the new arrivals are registered in ProGres, their biometric features are taken, and asylum seeker certificates and residency permits are issued in a timely manner. UASC and persons with specific protection needs are identified and referred at an early stage		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Advocacy on improved access to the territory		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Advocacy on improved access to the territory (UNHCR Staff)	50	50
Indicator 1.2	Workshops for border guards (UNHCR Staff)	4	3
Indicator 1.3	Border monitoring analytical reports produced (UNHCR Staff)	3	12
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Advocacy on improved access to the territory	UNHCR	UNHCR
Activity 1.2	Systematic and independent border monitoring	UNHCR	UNHCR
<b>Output 2</b>	Registration conducted for all new arrivals with a minimum set of data, and biometric registration		
<b>Output 2 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 2.1	No persons registered and verified	160,021	127,176
Indicator 2.2	No of children registered	7,103	6,432
Indicator 2.3	No of persons with specific needs	1,230	2,096
Indicator 2.4	No of persons with residency permits	10,500	Exact figures not available. For the in-camp population over 95 per cent of refugees have residency documents; out-of-camp circa 45 per cent of refugees have residency documents.
<b>Output 2 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 2.1	Registration and biometric registration in ProGres	Harrikar, Qandil, CDO	Harrikar, Qandil, CDO

Activity 2.2	Registration of UASC and children at risk and persons with specific needs	Harrikar, Qandil, CDO	Harrikar, Qandil, CDO
Activity 2.3	Referral to residency department for issuance of residency permits	Residency Department, Harikar, Qandil, CDO	Residency Department, Harikar, Qandil, CDO

**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 target of 160,000 Syrian refugees benefiting from the verification service has not been achieved due to slower than expected verification rate (linked to outreach and the complexity of government procedures) and a lower than expected rate of new arrivals. At the start of the project 50 per cent of the total number of Syrian refugees had gone through the verification process. At the end of December more than 80% of Syrian refugees had their registration records biometrically updated including iris scan enrolment. 100% could not be achieved due to huge number of new arrivals which peaked in September 2014, new births, activations and in-activations due to spontaneous departures to Syria and Turkey for onward movements (accounting for 31.96% of total population between July 2014-October 2015). The evaluation exercise was done and those who did not participate in the verification given several opportunities to come forward for biometrics and only those who failed to do so have been inactivated.

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

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

EVALUATION CARRIED OUT

EVALUATION PENDING

The evaluation exercise is now completed and 98% of the registered Syrian refugees in Iraq are now biometrically registered

NO EVALUATION PLANNED

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	UNFPA		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	27/03/2015-31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-FPA-007		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Health			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Supporting the reproductive health needs of Syrian Refugees in the Kurdistan region of Iraq					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 1,700,000	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 449,999	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 106,951	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 199,999	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
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>						
<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 (&lt; 18)</i>	8,000		8,000	5,160		5,160
<i>Adults (≥ 18)</i>	46,000		46,000	94,428		94,428
<b>Total</b>	<b>54,000</b>		<b>54,000</b>	<b>99,588</b>		<b>99,588</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
<i>Category</i>	<i>Number of people (Planned)</i>		<i>Number of people (Reached)</i>			
<i>Refugees</i>	54,000		22,322			
<i>IDPs</i>			50,655			
<i>Host population</i>			26,611			
<i>Other affected people</i>			0			
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>54,000</b>		<b>22,322 camps only 99,588 camps + host population</b>			
<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>	UNFPA supported staff working in all refugee camps in KR-I and same period of time has provided support to maternity hospitals by RH kits and staffing who delivered service for all category of beneficiaries (refugees, IDPs and host community). For this reason there is a discrepancy between planned and reached population by categories. Taking into account of short implementation period other categories of population also benefited from implementation of fund.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	To address urgent reproductive health needs of Syrian refugee women of reproductive age in camp and non-camp settings of Erbil, Dohuk and Suleymania Governorates.		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Increased utilisation of basic and comprehensive reproductive health services by pregnant Syrian refugees the three governorates		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	Increased availability of reproductive health services for pregnant Syrian refugee women in three Governorates of Kurdistan region		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Percentage of women attending ANC at least once during pregnancy with support of skilled health personnel in the camps.	90	95%
Indicator 1.2	Number of facilities in camps with functional basic essential obstetric care per 500,000 population	7	1
Indicator 1.3	Numbers of RH kits procured and distributed to clinics and referral hospitals	30	72 kits
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Deployment of seven doctors to clinics in the camps	Zhian NGO, Harikar NGO	9 3
Activity 1.2	Deployment of seven midwives to clinics in the camps	Zhian NGO, Harikar NGO	19 7
Activity 1.3	Procurement and distribution of RH kits to 10 clinics (camps), 11 PHCs non-camps and 10 referral hospital	UNFPA	72 kits

<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>The plan was to have one nurse or midwife per clinic but due to the workload, more nurses were hired per clinic which doubled the number of nurses in Erbil and Sulaymaniyah governorates.</p> <p>During the nine months RH kits were procured from another fund but distributed through service providers were supported by CERF funds.</p> <p>In Dohuk, the three RH units in the camps, have a total of three doctors, seven nurses/midwives and one laboratory staff (One RH Unit, also provides delivery services and it has more than one nurse/midwife; another RH unit has more than one nurse due to the location of the camp which is far from the referral hospital, thus the need for further professional support).</p>
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>
<p>Through the supported interventions to the affected community: pregnant women have been followed, treated and supported to have safe deliveries, thousands of women received timely treatment and pain relief. While the situation is far from ideal, it could have been much worse without the CERF supported interventions.</p>

<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
The Evaluation was not part of the project and was not planned.	EVALUATION PENDING <input type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**TABLE 8: PROJECT RESULTS**

CERF project information						
<b>1. Agency:</b>	FAO		<b>5. CERF grant period:</b>	09/04/2015-31/12/2015		
<b>2. CERF project code:</b>	15-UF-FAO-010		<b>6. Status of CERF grant:</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Ongoing		
<b>3. Cluster/Sector:</b>	Agriculture			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Concluded		
<b>4. Project title:</b>	Emergency supplementary feeding of productive animals to ensure their survival					
<b>7. Funding</b>	a. Total project budget:	US\$ 1,099,866	d. CERF funds forwarded to implementing partners:			
	b. Total funding received for the project:	US\$ 1,099,866	▪ <i>NGO partners and Red Cross/Crescent:</i>		US\$ 52,460	
	c. Amount received from CERF:	US\$ 1,099,866	▪ <i>Government Partners:</i>			
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 (< 18)	6,864	7,800	14,664	6,864	7,800	14,664
Adults (≥ 18)	7,488	9,048	16,536	7,488	9,048	16,536
<b>Total</b>	<b>14,352</b>	<b>16,848</b>	<b>31,200</b>	<b>14,352</b>	<b>16,848</b>	<b>31,200</b>
8b. Beneficiary Profile						
Category	Number of people (Planned)		Number of people (Reached)			
Refugees	31,200		24,960			
IDPs						
Host population			6,240			
Other affected people						
<b>Total (same as in 8a)</b>	<b>31,200</b>		<b>31,200</b>			
<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>	Only 95,000 of the original 160,000 livestock remain, as many refugee families have slaughtered their animals and sold them on local markets because of their inability to feed them, and out of desperate need for cash.					

CERF Result Framework			
<b>9. Project objective</b>	Emergency supplementary feeding of productive animals to ensure their survival to provide Syrian refugees with life sustaining food production (milk, dairy products and meat).		
<b>10. Outcome statement</b>	Keep livestock of affected rural household alive, healthy and productive		
<b>11. Outputs</b>			
<b>Output 1</b>	31,200 Syrian refugees embedded in host communities will be assisted by the animal feed distribution		
<b>Output 1 Indicators</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Reached</b>
Indicator 1.1	Animal feed distribution reaches Syrian refugees in targeted regions. Total number of targeted animals 52,000	31,200 individuals reached	31,200 individuals
<b>Output 1 Activities</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Implemented by (Planned)</b>	<b>Implemented by (Actual)</b>
Activity 1.1	Survey & beneficiary identification	FAO, MOA, IPs	FAO, MOA, IPs
Activity 1.2	Distribution of animal feed	FAO&IPs	FAO&IPs
Activity 1.3	Monitoring and evaluation of implementation	FAO	FAO

<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>The project addressed the critical problem of food insecurity of Syrian refugees and supporting their life saving food supply by assisting in the revival of agricultural food generation activities in one of the most affected governorates in Iraq. Provision of the necessary inputs (animal feed) provided the means to supply lifesaving food inputs (milk, dairy products, meat etc) to Syrian refugees and their host communities.</p>	
<b>13. Please describe how accountability to affected populations (AAP) has been ensured during project design, implementation and monitoring:</b>	
<p>FAO implementing strategy is based on participatory approach where the target community identifies priorities interventions as well as needs and gaps.</p> <p>Feedback channels were put into place for complaints and response mechanisms, so FAO and its partners know what impact programmes are having on the community and can incorporate feedback or address problems rapidly. Community representation enabled the most marginalized, vulnerable and affected to have a voice.</p>	
<b>14. Evaluation: Has this project been evaluated or is an evaluation pending?</b>	EVALUATION CARRIED OUT <input type="checkbox"/>
Internal on-going evaluation is in progress.	EVALUATION PENDING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
	NO EVALUATION PLANNED <input type="checkbox"/>

## ANNEX 1: CERF FUNDS DISBURSED TO IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

CERF Project Code	Cluster/Sector	Agency	Partner Type	Total CERF Funds Transferred to Partner US\$
15-UF-UDP-003	Protection	UNDP	NNGO	\$60,000
15-UF-UDP-003	Protection	UNDP	NNGO	\$60,000
15-UF-UDP-003	Protection	UNDP	NNGO	\$60,000
15-UF-FPA-008	Protection	UNFPA	NNGO	\$31,000
15-UF-FPA-008	Protection	UNFPA	NNGO	\$96,000
15-UF-HCR-014	Protection	UNHCR	NNGO	\$232,500
15-UF-WFP-018	Food Assistance	WFP	INGO	\$180,561
15-UF-WFP-018	Food Assistance	WFP	INGO	\$109,868
15-UF-WFP-018	Food Assistance	WFP	INGO	\$4,094
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$81,919
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$83,700
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$82,461
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$167,410
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$13,545
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$38,400
15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	GOV	\$140,817
15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	GOV	\$77,633
15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	INGO	\$132,665
15-UF-HCR-013	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNHCR	RedC	\$265,125
15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	UNHCR	NNGO	\$102,219
15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	UNHCR	INGO	\$306,670
15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	UNHCR	NNGO	\$166,111
15-UF-FPA-007	Health	UNFPA	NNGO	\$34,051
15-UF-FPA-007	Health	UNFPA	NNGO	\$72,900
15-UF-FAO-010	Agriculture	FAO	NNGO	\$52,460
15-UF-UDP-003	Protection	UNDP	NNGO	\$60,000
15-UF-UDP-003	Protection	UNDP	NNGO	\$60,000

15-UF-UDP-003	Protection	UNDP	NNGO	\$60,000
15-UF-FPA-008	Protection	UNFPA	NNGO	\$31,000
15-UF-FPA-008	Protection	UNFPA	NNGO	\$96,000
15-UF-HCR-014	Protection	UNHCR	NNGO	\$232,500
15-UF-WFP-018	Food Assistance	WFP	INGO	\$180,561
15-UF-WFP-018	Food Assistance	WFP	INGO	\$109,868
15-UF-WFP-018	Food Assistance	WFP	INGO	\$4,094
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$81,919
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	INGO	\$83,700
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	NNGO	\$82,461
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$167,410
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$13,545
15-UF-CEF-025	Protection	UNICEF	GOV	\$38,400
15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	GOV	\$140,817
15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	GOV	\$77,633
15-UF-CEF-024	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNICEF	INGO	\$132,665
15-UF-HCR-013	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene	UNHCR	RedC	\$265,125
15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	UNHCR	NNGO	\$102,219
15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	UNHCR	INGO	\$306,670
15-UF-HCR-012	Protection	UNHCR	NNGO	\$166,111
15-UF-FPA-007	Health	UNFPA	NNGO	\$34,051
15-UF-FPA-007	Health	UNFPA	NNGO	\$72,900
15-UF-FAO-010	Agriculture	FAO	NNGO	\$52,460

## ANNEX 2: ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS (Alphabetical)

ACTED	Agency for Technical Cooperation and Development
ANC	Antenatal Care
B-EONC	Basic-Emergency Obstetric Newborn Care
CFS	Child Friendly Spaces
DCVAW	Directorate for Combating Violence Against Women
DHRD	Democracy and Human Rights Development
DoLSA	Directorate of Labour & Social Affairs
DoSW	Directorate of Surrounding Water
IBHR	Independent Board for Human Rights
IDP	Internally Displaced People
IP	Implementing Partners
KRG	Kurdistan Regional Government
KR-I	Kurdistan Region of Iraq
LoA	Letter of Agreement
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoAWR	Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources (Kurdistan Region of Iraq)
MoH	Ministry of Health
MoLSA	Ministry of Labour % Social Affairs
MT	Metric Tons
NGO	Non Government Organisation
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OFDA	Office of Disaster Assistance (USAID)
PAO	Public Aid Organisation
PHCC	Primary Health Care Centre
RH	Reproductive Health
SGBV	Sexual & Gender Based Violence
TDH	Terre des Hommes-Italy
ToT	Training of Trainers
UASC	Unaccompanied and Separated Children
UFE	Underfunded Emergency Window
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFPA	United Nations Population Fund
UNHCR	United Nations High Commission for the Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WASH	Water, Sanitation & Health
WFP	World Food Programme
WGBM	Women, Girls, Boys and Men
WHO	World Health Organisation

<sup>i</sup> Source: UNHCR Erbil Office